

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
<p><b>The Council has reviewed and considered the below comments, where possible we have made appropriate changes within the new proposals.</b></p> <p><b>Due to the number of comments received it is not possible to respond to each and every one but please be assured that they have been considered.</b></p>		
1	Gurney Court Road	<p>Please accept this letter as an objection to the proposals put forward. Having considered the proposals we provide the following observations which should be read as our grounds for objection:</p> <p>1.Public parking by payment. The proposals allowing public parking during a restricted time frame of 11am – 1pm for a cost is highly likely to compound the problem in what are some of the most affected areas. Indeed, the cost of £2.90 is far too low when considered against the cost of parking at St Albans Stations (which costs circa £8.50 per day). Far from discouraging parking and encouraging people to utilise purpose built parking facilities the difference will actually entice people to use the surrounding roads.</p> <p>2.The exclusion of certain areas. There appears no logical reason why the proposals, as bad as they are, should exclude roads such as York Road and Gainsborough Avenue (that we point out have no through traffic) from the possibility of allowing the public to pay to park during restricted times. This suggestion results in the problem being concentrated and compounded to certain areas which, in the case of our road (Gurney Court Road), is a busy through road between Sandpit Lane and Marshalswick Lane.</p> <p>3.The lack of consideration to speed. The proposals have little to no regard to the fact that cars travel at some speed down certain through roads. Allowing continuous parking, even on one side of the road, for any distance along these busy roads causes a considerable risk to residents as they seek to exit their properties. The lack of necessary viability when considered against the speed and density of traffic (particularly during peak times) is a serious accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>4.Lack of drive protection. Linked to the above point, any section of road that would be affected by ladder parking should automatically be assured of an access protection line. The suggestion that residents may have to separately apply and pay for such lines in a scheme where the Council is making money is outrageous.</p>
2	Battlefield Road	<p>As well as the two of us, we have two adult children who live here and who drive and one adult child who lives away and who drives, but visits here regularly. Obviously we also have visitors and tradespeople visit.</p> <p>At our end of Battlefield Road, there is no parking problem. We would be happy to leave things as they are with “H” bars to provide driveway access where necessary at the Sandpit Road end. We agree that for some of the time during the working week (but not every day and not all day ) there is a problem at the Sandpit Lane end of our road.</p> <p>The current proposal creates a serious problem for residents which currently does not exist. The public/resident bays are very likely to be filled each day right up to our end of the road as many residents will park in the road to leave their driveways free for guests/ tradespeople and if there are spaces, these will be filled by people parking and walking into town. Once filled, residents and their visitors arriving in the road will have nowhere to park between 11am and 1pm.</p> <p>We would please urge you not to implement the scheme as currently proposed. The solution we believe is to have one or two places at the Sandpit Lane end of the road marked with either single or double yellow lines to provide extra passing places. This, combined with “H” bars to protect residents driveways should be sufficient and there is no need to introduce residents parking. We also believe some parking in the road is actually beneficial to slow down cars which otherwise use the road as a fast rat-run through to Sandridge Road (which used to happen during the working day before the parking levels increased, and still does happen on evenings and weekends) and which causes its own dangers – especially at the corner of the road shortly before the Lancaster Road junction. If residents parking were to be introduced it is likely that the driveways in Battlefield Road would be paved over to provide free off street parking which would be a real shame from an environmental point of view.</p>
3	Monks Horton Way	<p>I can well understand why Monks Horton Way has been omitted from these restrictions as we are, by definition, very definitely not a “ladder road”, but the surrounding restrictions will have a very pronounced effect upon us. We shall, in effect, be a “free parking island” in a sea of parking restrictions – it will therefore not be long before all and sundry are trying to cram themselves into this small, and narrow, cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Monks Horton Way is very obviously a residential road, with a width of less than 5.5m . Each house has its own driveway, and the opposite space between each drop kerb is basically used for easy reversing on to the road. If anyone does park there, it creates immediate difficulties for anyone reversing out of their home. This is something with which we have all become used over the years, and take action accordingly – but indiscriminate parking will create major problems.</p> <p>Added to this, on road parking - coupled with the narrow width of the road - already creates difficulties for emergency, refuse and delivery vehicles, and residents consequently park with care – “commuter parkers” are unlikely to be so careful or so understanding.</p> <p>My personal strong belief is that, if the proposed restrictions are indeed implemented, SADC will have to do something to protect the residents of this quiet cul-de-sac from the results of their actions, if we are not to be “overrun” by those who are seeking “free parking”. Could I please suggest that a prominent notice is placed at the entrance to Monks Horton Way stressing “strictly residents parking only”, with a continuation of the present double yellow lines down to no 34 (on both sides of the road). The exit from Monks Horton Way is already “not good”, and is made worse by those rogue vehicles who indiscriminately park here. (We have already raised this with Cllr Chris White).</p>
4	Homewood Road	<p>I am a resident of Homewood Road and if I am reading your proposals correctly, you are recommending introducing many parking controls around Homewood Road - on Faircross Way, The Park, Charmouth Road, Gurney Court Road? And no such parking controls on Homewood Road.</p> <p>Will these parking controls just again once again move the problem? Homewood Road will become the place for free parking and cause significant congestion to our road.</p> <p>As you know, people are using all the aforementioned roads for parking, being close enough to walk to St Albans Station. Surely the logic of having parking controls on the top end of Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road (which are further from the station than Homewood Road) should also apply to Homewood Road?</p> <p>By also introducing similar parking controls on Homewood Road, I believe we will provide adequate parking opportunities in the area. This will also distribute all parked cars fairly amongst our area rather than creating a sought after free carpark on Homewood Road.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
5	Blandford Road	<p>I understand the council has had previous complaints on this matter but the issues with the church related parking have never been addressed satisfactorily. They are ignored. Its difficult to understand why it is not considered important to give residents an equal chance to be able to park near their homes on all roads.</p> <p>Consideration should be given for specific relief to these specific problems that continue to build and will not just disappear in the future.</p> <p>A suggestion for Blandford road is to consider 1 allocated parking space per house in the evenings. Additional cars per household could continue to park on a first come first serve basis and need permits.</p> <p>Not every house has a car. The beginning of Blandford near the church can continue to handle the over spill.</p> <p>In reference to the other issues raised in your review there appears to be a lack of medium to long term planning around the heart of the matter, underutilised car parks, increased car parking around surrounding roads resulting in more dangerous traffic situations, especially for cyclists and buses and dissatisfied residents.</p> <p>Can the council not consider reducing parking fees at station car parks to relieve some pressure on the streets?</p> <p>Why cant we have a much more frequent bus service, effectively creating park and ride?</p> <p>Actual Park and ride in the long term?</p> <p>The current resolutions are short sighted and shift the increasing parking problems to other roads rather than deal with the root cause, making the roads more dangerous.</p>
6	Woodstock Road South	<p>Thanks for your letter about the ladder roads parking changes. I have one small specific question. It looks like it is proposed for the single yellow line opposite my house on the far side, which I can currently park on on Sundays, to become a double yellow line. Can you confirm? It is very useful having the flexibility on Sundays.</p>
7	Monks Horton Way	<p>We notice that Monks Horton Way has not been included in the above scheme. We don't particularly want a residents only parking scheme, however, we feel that under the current proposals we will become a free car park for people who are now unable to park on surrounding roads. The road is narrower than other surrounding roads and although there are parking spaces outside our houses for visitors, it can be tight reversing out of the drives. At least with visitors we can ask if a car can be moved. I can imagine we would have great difficulties if non residents used our road for all day parking. There are a few extra spaces at the top of the road. These are sometimes used if a resident is having some work done on their drive but they do make the junction tight and it is too narrow to be used as permanent parking bays. Our conclusion is that we need dedicated residents only parking.</p>
8	Monks Horton Way	<p>1. Double yellow lines at junctions need to be extended to improve sight lines.</p> <p>2. The lines indicating driveway access need to be wider to improve sight lines.</p> <p>3. At present , in ladder roads such as Blandford Road there are no passing points for the entire length of the road outside of parking restrictions.</p> <p>4. Changing no waiting times in Blandford Road to 11-1pm will have a major impact on activities for the local community held at St Paul's church.</p> <p>5. As a resident in Monks Horton Way and with no parking restrictions planned and not being known as a private road, we anticipate people parking all day here with subsequent problems as the road is narrower than nearby roads and the space between drives is very short. We would then anticipate problems of access for emergency and service vehicles.</p> <p>6. Sandpit Lane will only have restrictions at junctions and on the railway bridge. There is a real problem with parking outside St Saviours church, often on the footpath and in the bus stop and at weekends with difficulties for motorists and also footpath users, especially for disabled or for people with infants in buggies. What is to stop all day parking in Sandpit Lane?</p>
9	Jennings Road	<p>Jennings Road is one of the nearest roads to the station, well within walking distance for commuters. Allowing commuters to pay by phone so that they are covered for the restricted parking period will lead to a recurrence of the parking seen when there were no restrictions at all, and caused the original residents-only parking restrictions to be put in place. The proposed fee of £2.90 is no disincentive to a commuter who would otherwise pay £150 per month to use one of the station car parks.</p> <p>If Jennings Road is used as an extended car park for the station, it will once again cause significant congestion and make it difficult for residents to get in and out of their drives. This was the case before restrictions were put in place - parking too close either side of an entrance and directly opposite. On a number of occasions it has proved extremely difficult and time consuming to manoeuvre a car 4 or 5 times backwards and forwards to get in or out without touching cars parked at the side and opposite.</p> <p>Allowing cars to be parked via this scheme on both sides of the road will recreate the congestion and is particularly dangerous when children are crossing the road to get to Verulam school during peak periods. Given the congestion, it would seem more sensible if the new parking system was only applied to one side of the road and the other side left controlled by existing restrictions, for residents. That would allow more space for manoeuvring and would provide a safe and clear view of oncoming traffic for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>If this new scheme of car park extension into residential streets must go ahead, I strongly urge the council to consider applying it only to one side of the road rather than both. Simply converting the residents only scheme to pay-as-you-go for anyone will be disastrous for those living on the road and who have to deal with the problem on a daily basis.</p>
10	Homewood Road	<p>1. Response too long to include fully, brief summary: Councils priority should be safety. Including junctions, driveways etc.</p> <p>2. Next priority should be residents parking, should be a basic right for residents to have free parking allocated.</p> <p>3. Reduce station car park charges and/or allocate council land for station parking</p> <p>4 If parking must be allocated to commuters, this should be in the streets closest to the station including Clarence Road with no free for all parking with parking charges high to encourage commuters to use station parking.</p> <p>5. Homewood Road should be included in the schem</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
11	Not Provided	<p>I would like to comment on the existing parking restrictions in Clarence Ward and the proposed parking restriction.</p> <p>It would seem there were no parking issues in roads such as Charmouth Road and Faircross Way before the Clarence Ward restriction were put in place. The problems has been past to the new area, therefore it seems that both areas should be considered at the same time.</p> <p>I agreed all roads where residents do not have drives should be 100% for residents only, however roads like Gainsborough and Jennings, where residents have their own drive should be treated the same as residents in the new zone are ie it can't be just residents only if you have a drive way. Why should certain roads be just residents only when they have their own driveway, or all the areas in question should be residents only. Clarence ward residents should be treated the same as the other wards and not be given special treatment especially as they benefit from living near station and schools.</p> <p>It was made very clear at the consultation meeting roads like Charmouth can't be residents only as people had drives, why does this not apply to some of the roads in Clarence ward ie Gainsborough?</p>
12	Not Provided	<p>I fear lessons have not been learnt. Extending the CPZ will only push the problem in to neighbouring roads eg Eaton Road, Salisbury Avenue, Beaumont Avenue, Homestead Road and even Marshals Drive. If the current proposal is implemented then these roads will need to be included.</p> <p>I would prefer that the original CPZ is removed as much as possible. Only roads where the residents do not have off-street parking should have residents only parking. Everywhere else should be available for residents and commuters to park.</p> <p>The station car park fee is expensive and it is inevitable that commuters will want to park in the surrounding residential roads. Those living closest to the station should expect parking problems. It is not acceptable to push the problem on to others.</p>
13	Homewood Road	<p>Surely commuters park on local roads because of insufficient parking at the station and its high cost. The recent annual increase was over 9%, taking the daily cost to £8.70 . The advertised rates are now £150.10 per month, equivalent to £1,801 a year.</p> <p>The parking owner (railway company?) has a local monopoly. More parking restrictions strengthens this position and allows it to increase fees every year well in excess of inflation. Has the local council any power to challenge this ? Is there any evidence of our council doing so?</p> <p>Surely, rather than deal with the symptoms by introducing parking restrictions, the solution is to increase cheaper parking in the area. Does the council have any access to land that can be developed to enable this?</p> <p>St Albans benefits greatly from residents commuting to London. They bring wealth which benefits the city in many ways. Why introduce proposals that punish rather than encourage them?</p> <p>I understand that council workers and councillors benefit from free parking. Is this correct? A solution could be to open council parking to everyone and charge £4.35 per day, 50% of the station's daily rate. This would end the station's monopoly.</p> <p>Most houses in the area under consideration for parking restrictions have large front gardens and drives, suitable for a few cars with little need for parking on roads. Should a household have many cars then they can expand their drives rather than clog the roads. Absolutely no need for resident parking.</p> <p>Homewood Road can be busy for short times with activities at the local church. Surely we should be encouraging local community activities rather than chasing them away. Sometimes a few of those parking can be a little inconsiderate by partially blocking drives or parking in dangerous areas but on the whole it does not cause problems. A few elements of the restrictions' proposal may help but absolutely no need for resident parking.</p>
14	Gurney Court Road	<p>I am very pleased with all the proposed changes around the junctions of the roads in question primarily as safety will be increased. In particular, I am very pleased that my request to extend double yellow lines up to no. 12 Gurney Court Rd has been accepted- this will improve the vision, therefore safety, of drivers going in both directions, and myself, at bottom end of the road at the dangerous double junction with Sandpit Lane. Recently, there has been an increase in all day parking on the pavements at this end and along both sides of Gurney Court; on numerous occasions I have not been able to reverse my car out of my drive and then when I have managed to manoeuvre out, usually a car/van comes hurtling down the road.....very dangerous indeed.</p> <p>Significantly, Gurney Court Rd is a through road particularly used for commuter traffic during rush hour. Many drivers travel at dangerous speeds on a what is a residential road; I hope that the proposed Order will be implemented quickly so that "the accident waiting to happen" doesn't.</p>
15	Battlefield Road	<p>suggest that the north end of Homewood Road and Marshals Drive be included, also suggest the inclusion in the parking scheme of Cunningham Hill Road, Cunningham Avenue and any other residential streets of similar characteristics within say a 15 minute walk of the City Station. Objects to the parking charge for commuters and asks why the Council intends to provide parking for them. Their preference is a maximum of 4 hours parking at any visit with pro rata charges to non-resident parking permit holders. After a full empirical study of town centre parking, it may also be advantageous to consider using the Council owned land at the old Fire Station on Harpenden Road as part of a Park facility to City Station and Town Centre.</p> <p>Battlefield Road has suffered badly from potholes and very uneven pavements making walking dangerous. Exiting the road at the junction with Sandpit Lane is very dangerous due to poor visibility to the right caused by tree and shrub foliage on the corner residential site. Can the Council request HCC and the owners of the property to take remedial action? As you may be aware the Road has become a rat run particularly at peak traffic times with traffic driving south along Lancaster Road and then diverting down Battlefield to avoid the dangerous right turn at the junction of Lancaster and Sandpit Lane. It may be that the only cost-effective remedy for this to improve road safety is to introduce a 20mph limit in Battlefield as we note Council have done with a number of other streets.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
16	Blenheim Road	<p>I consider that the scheme is working very well in Blenheim Road, where prior to the scheme, it was very difficult to park at all as the road was full of commuter parking. Blenheim Road has lots of houses without drives and hence these residents have to park on the street. This problem has been solved by the permit scheme , for which I am very grateful. Thank you.</p> <p>However, I do think the scheme is a bit patchy. Some roads ( where everyone has a drive) , has noone parking on it during the day and that does seem a terrible waste, especially now that Charmouth Road etc are now full of parking. I do not understand why roads like this were included.</p> <p>I think the cost of parking by phone is very small and will not necessarily deter people from parking in these areas.</p> <p>I do appreciate that parking and traffic in general is a terrible problem in St Albans. As this problem is fundamentally commuter parking, is there anywhere that can be found to house commuter parking? ( unused space in existing car parks? A park and ride scheme from a convenient point? Innovative use of business/ private car parks? Incentivising people with drives to use them through council tax? Incentivise bike riding through a licencing scheme with benefits? Ditto walkers to station? Campaigning to increase stops at Harpenden as some of the parkers come from Harpenden.)</p>
17	Homewood Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b></p> <p>Objects on the grounds that the proposals do not comply with the grounds for the original proposals as stated in the letter.</p> <p>o Reduce instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking, o Improve visibility at road junctions and property entrances o Reduce congestion o Improve road safety. They suggest that this is the first time they have had sight of any proposals following the review of the original Ladder Roads Scheme and that this proposal brings the problem to their door.</p> <p>They suggest Homewood Road is included and that the cost to none residents should be higher</p>
18	Jennings Road	<p>Please could you note that in respect of the parking consultation ending today which affects Jennings Road AL 1, that residents of the West part of Jennings Road (railway line to Clarence Road) are very happy with the scheme that is currently on place. Most houses have either no drive or one that only takes one car, so the restrictions recently put in place are necessary and the road well used for parking in accordance with those. Please could we request that you make no change to the current set up? We were the part of the road that suffered for years from dangerous and inconvenient commuter and airport parking on our road and we finally have a system which works well.</p>
19	Not Provided	Will a yellow line be painted along the exit to Clarence Park Mews please?
20	Gurney Court Road	<p>I am replying to express my objection to the parking restriction proposals.</p> <p>I live in Gurney Court Road. There is no need for these restrictions and these just add to my outlay at a time I cannot afford to pay extra as I am unemployed. Additionally, at a time of global warming all you are doing is encouraging householders to dig up there gardens which does not look good and also affects the planet.</p> <p>For some, this proposal will also cause householders to use there cars more rather than public transport. This is because the parking costs at the destination may be less than what is being levied by the council.</p> <p>The proposals appear to be a money making venture and are unwarranted. Please terminate the proposals made.</p>
21	Lancaster Road	<p>We are writing about your proposals for parking in Lancaster Road. We want to thank you for taking time to speak to the residents and listen to our concerns.</p> <p>We agree that something needs to be done as driving up and down the road has become very dangerous with double parking by commuters.</p> <p>The idea of parking bays staggered up the road to allow traffic to move freely seems sensible.</p> <p>Our concern is the payment to park from 11 am-1pm being too low. We know that you are reassessing this. It seems that people will pay rather than use the station car park which although is not full is much more expensive. Is there no way this can be looked at? Commuters will still use our roads and not be deterred by the cost of parking.</p> <p>We are not happy about paying for parking outside our own house. We already pay high Council Tax and this is unwelcome addition having to pay if we have guests that want to park over the restricted times.</p> <p>We agreed with the idea to make one side of the road for residents.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing the final decisions on this matter.</p>
22	Charmouth Road	<p>Thank you for the letter regarding Parking Review (Zone P) Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane).</p> <p>Sorry for the delay in responding, I hope my comments can still be taken into consideration.</p> <p>I feel that if the roads outlined all have parking restrictions as proposed, together with all the roads with existing parking restrictions nearer to the station, eg Clarence Road, York Road, Bleinham Road, Jennings Road etc, there will be gridlock at the station in the mornings. If all the cars that have been parking in these roads now have to park at the station this will make the station area busier and more polluted.</p> <p>I think that if all the roads surrounding the station areas, where the residents do have their own driveway parking (including Charmouth Road where I live), were to have some free parking spaces where commuters could park this would spread out the traffic a bit. If these commuters park some way from the station and walk the rest of the way to the station it cuts down a little on pollution.</p> <p>Would it be possible to change the parking restrictions that are already in place to having some areas of free parking and some of restricted parking so that some commuters can park and not have to try and park at the station car park?</p> <p>For the proposed parking restrictions in the Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South, could the same be possible? - some areas of free parking and some restricted, so that we don't have parking on both sides of the road, which can be hazardous especially near to junctions / roundabouts.</p> <p>STATION SHUTTLE BUSES?</p> <p>If public transport could be reliable, regular and affordable and ELECTRIC this would possibly be the best solution - keeping traffic off the roads, therefore less pollution, less wear and tear on the roads, less wear and tear on people's own vehicles and heather people? Possibly a more social way to get to work/school so maybe could even create happier people!</p> <p>If there was less traffic on the roads, many commuters and students would be more inclined to cycle to the station, work or school.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
23	Lancaster Road	<p>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised: To summarise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Share the restrictions fairly to include other streets as well.</li> <li>*Put up the daily parking cost.</li> <li>*Please make any signage and associated street furniture related to this scheme sympathetic. We live on a quiet residential road, not a commercial car park.</li> <li>*A share of the bays should be residents only.</li> <li>*Deal with the danger of people paving their front gardens.</li> <li>*Limit the speed limit to 20mph.</li> <li>*Don't charge residents for line markings preventing parking over their driveways.</li> <li>*A better train service from Harpenden and better bus service in SA district would avoid people having to drive to park at all ...</li> </ul> <p>To conclude, we need an environmentally friendly solution, not one encouraging car use at cheap rates and at the expense of local residents.</p>
24	Woodstock Road South	<p>Here would be my counterproposals in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Do nothing. The current system is not perfect but works reasonably well.</li> <li>2.Do nothing major new and pull back from some of the things that have already been done. Ironically, in the first part of your document you yourself point to some of the problems resulting from the last wave of restrictions/residence permits that were introduced. And you have proposed a series of micro responses to each. But I would encourage you to look at the more macro situation. I don't think, if you look at it in terms of the community gestalt, it is appropriate for streets like Jennings Road and Hamilton Road with large frontages and off-street parking to have exclusive residency permits when people in streets nearby have major problems finding anywhere to park. Of course if you ask them, the residents of those former streets will say their preference is not to have other people's cars parked in front of their houses. But we live in an interconnected neighbourhood where that luxury needs to be set against the problems of parking in other streets. It is surreal to live in this area and walk down somewhere like Jennings Road with lots of off-street parking and see not a single car parked on either side of what is a wide road, while only a few streets away people are struggling to park their car anywhere within walkable range. The solution seems pretty obvious to me. Create a larger residency zone (rather than the increasingly atomistic one you are proposing) and so let people in the adjacent densely packed streets (e.g. Woodstock Road South, Burnham Road) have access to e.g. Brampton Road and Jennings Road to park when they cannot park in their own street. This strikes me as a pretty non-interventionist, community spirited solution. I understand you are concerned with some people from the east of the area taking their cars the short distance to park nearer the station. This issue can be addressed within my broader proposal by indeed having a zonal barrier somewhere along the east-west axis.</li> <li>3.My strong preference is for the more minimal proposals above. However regrettably I have to be ready for an atomistic push forward to more restrictions/permits along the lines you propose. If that is the case, I strongly insist you look again at what you propose for Woodstock Rd South and make sure you are offering sufficient spaces for the houses here. We live here every day. We have no idea why you are proposing introducing a double yellow line either side of the traffic bump at 24/26 WRS. Similarly, to remove any evening parking from the other side of the road does not make much sense. Such proposals would seem to be being taken in isolation, oblivious to the other more pressing issues. You are proposing to remove maybe 10 car parking spaces in this road which already has dense parking and we do not see any serious safety concern prompting this. So if you do insist on the contracting of parking zone areas and increasing the number of streets with residential parking permits, you will need to make sure there is adequate parking within each street for its residents and pull back from other restrictions you are intending to make Just to reiterate, I am strongly in favour of you carrying out proposals like 1 or 2 above, rather than getting into 3. Seen on a bigger canvas of what is best for the area as a whole, it is close to obscene to be introducing the current proposals for densely packed streets while less dense streets only a short distance away have hardly any cars at all. Please examine your conscience. And please be pragmatic. What you are proposing is blatantly unfair and it also has the consequence of creating more problems for the residents who cannot find anywhere to park.</li> </ol>
25	Lancaster Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.I can find no mention in the letter on how your proposals impact on Blue badge holders. It would be helpful if this could be clearly articulated. If this issue is not properly considered then the parking restrictions could have a detrimental impact on disabled people . I hope that this has been properly considered and that reassurance can be given on this issue. For example, I am a blue badge holder and the proposed restrictions indicate that I will not be able to park on the road outside my house between 11am and 1pm. I think it is particularly disappointing that this issue is not covered in the letter of the 17 January - the parking situation for blue badge holders generally is not particularly easy to understand and therefore the situation under the new arrangements needs to be very clearly explained.</li> <li>2.It looks from the maps provided that there is no commuter parking in some roads - it would seem fairer to share this across all roads in the scheme</li> <li>3.The cost for commuter parking is low and therefore is not likely to reduce the number of cars parking in the impacted roads and given the areas of no parking being introduced could mean that residents are not able to find parking spaces during the day.</li> <li>4.Can consideration be given to areas where only residents can park for roads where there is shared parking ?</li> </ol>
26	Lancaster Road	<p>Firstly, a charge of £2.90 per day is simply not enough to deter commuters. Given the cost of the parking at the Station, many would simply pay this and then park in the designated bays, meaning there would be a shortage of overall parking. However, an increase in the cost would make it disproportionate for local parkers. It would appear that the only solution would be to restrict it to residents only.</p> <p>Secondly, we have a concern about the potential location of parking bays which could block driveway access. This relates to points two and four in the letter dated 17 January 2020 and unless properly thought through, could actually make to problem worse and more widespread. Many houses on Lancaster Road (such as ours) have wider driveways accommodating at least two cars. This eases the overall parking situation. The suitability for parking for more than one car was taken into account (and agreed with) when we were given planning approval to extend out house a few years ago. This will naturally have been the case for other houses on the road. However, the original dropped curbs are not generally wide enough to cover this.</p> <p>At present, people parking on the road usually use their common sense and can see that, although the curb is not dropped, their parking to the edge of it could limit access to the driveway and therefore make room. We are concerned that the introduction of parking bays, unless well set back from the actual entrance (and not a the limit of the dropped curb), would mean that we are unable to fully use the driveway. The "tight" placement of parking bays could lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the damage of vehicles whilst manoeuvring;</li> <li>- increased risk of accidents due to restricted visibility (given the speed at which some cars come along the road, using it as a "cut through");</li> <li>- overall reduced parking, as residents may no longer able to fully utilise the parking on their drives;</li> <li>- increased costs for residents if they have to buy a permit, as they cannot be guaranteed in fully accessing their driveway; and</li> <li>- issues for neighbours opposite who are trying to manoeuvre into/out of their driveways.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, if bays are implemented, we would like to have some form of engagement as to where they are placed (or perhaps an agreed distance from the dropped curb). Between us and 100 Lancaster Road it could, in theory, be possible to squeeze in two bays, however in reality it is only safe and reasonable for there to be a single car. Many of the other houses on the road are in this same position.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
27	Battlefield Road	I have been a resident of Battlefield Road for 10 years and for the first several years the on street parking by non-residents has not been an issue and that fact that probably every house in the street has a drive, it still isn't too much of an issue. The introduction of the ladder roads around Clarence Park hasn't helped. However, the main reasons for my objection are the suggestion of a single yellow line , no waiting restriction outside my house. Not having the ability to park outside my own house is a problem. Also the fact that outside my house would now be a passing point is not only going to cause additional noise but also emissions.
28	Not Provided	<p>I have three points to offer please:</p> <p>1.Any system which allows anyone to park legally across access to a resident's drive should not be permitted. If the system allows someone known to the resident (eg a trade visitor or friend) to park across the resident's drive and the resident chooses not to complain, that visitor can decide take the risk of being given a ticket. Or the resident can give them a resident's visitor permit, at a modest cost.</p> <p>2.Thought must be given to how to be fair to residents who are both near the border of a subzone within P (eg where P1 joins P2) AND where the pay-per use zones allow commuter parking. For example, on Clarence Road just north of the junction with York Road. Here the residents are in P2. They cannot get permits for P1, which lies a few yards east, west and south. And in their bit of P2, the pay-per use zone means that commuter parking will dominate from about 7am to about 5pm, like in the bad old days when the local parking rules were in failure. The new rules must allow those on the borders of zones with non-resident parking to apply for permits in either zone.</p> <p>3.The current minor difficulties in the scheme revolve around the clash between evident commuter parking in a residential area, the need for local residents to be able to have trade visitors and friends visit with the prospect of being able to park and the risk of increased traffic speed when restrictions leave spaces empty for part of the day. The least bad solution to all of these is for blocks of parking with different rules: for example, four bays with pay-per-use for non-residents, then four bays strictly for residents only or for users of Resident Visitor Permits. A similar mixed system currently works on the western side of Clarence Road between York Road and Jennings Road. It is a simple and cheap solution which will only require clear marking of each group of bays. But having any long stretches of bays with only pay-per-use for non-residents will result in the poor and unacceptable former outcome: residents with no parking for a long way, as it is all full of commuters who decline to pay to use the unfilled spaces at the train station car parks.</p> <p>Mr Payne's letter of 17 January 2020 says that "We have designed a proposal which will prioritise available parking for residents but at the same time still allow parking for non-residents in a more controlled way". I believe that in certain zones the current proposals go too far in putting the interests of non-residents equally with that of residents. It is important that in all zones the council continues to prioritise the needs of residents, who pay local council tax and vote locally, and not the needs of non-residents, who are valued citizens but do not pay local council tax and do not vote locally.</p>
29	Salisbury Avenue	<p>I am writing as a Resident of Salisbury Avenue (adjacent to Eaton Road). I would like to raise my concerns on the review of the ladder road scheme.</p> <p>My main concern is the lack of holistic thinking throughout the process of evaluating initial surveys of residents views. More specifically, many residents do not want the expense and inconvenience of residents parking, but when a decision is taken to convert all adjacent roads to a scheme, changing the dynamic, that view is clearly and immediately different. This brings me to my main points of concern with regard to the proposals.</p> <p>1. The huge overspill of parking caused by the scheme has already created a compression of available spaces along Eaton Road and parts of Salisbury avenue.</p> <p>2. This causes the following issues</p> <p>Residents to park further and further from their homes, Reduced or no passing points and pulling in places for two way traffic, delivery drivers etc</p> <p>Increased danger and reduced visibility at Fleetville, Beaumont and Verulam school drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>3. The proposed alterations to the scheme not including Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue, yet including surrounding roads (even those further from the station). This will inevitably mean that all visitors and family members without permit parking will all elect to use Eaton and Salisbury, together with a possible increase in commuter parking from marshalswick and surrounding areas etc, as other ladder roads are restricted.</p> <p>4. I am also aware that Eaton Road is now committed to push for Residents Parking, and has submitted a petition for consideration. Although not all of Salisbury Avenue would perhaps be effected equally, I live adjacent to Eaton Road, and we feel that this leg of Salisbury Avenue would become an immediate overspill car park as soon as Eaton Road joins the scheme.</p> <p>5. Our kerb drop, which is already abused as a passing point (and parking area for delivery drivers with little choice!!) will become even more or a jousting spot, as the corridor effect continues up Salisbury Avenue.</p> <p>I would urge the council not to make the same mistakes again, pushing the problem somewhere else. The review must consider the knock on effect, not just the concerns of those affected by the previous iteration. If a theme is implemented, it must be implemented wide enough to remove imbalance between residents.</p>
30	Brampton Road	<p>My comments are as follows:</p> <p>This will inconvenience us because we won't be able to freely park in Park Avenue between 11am-1pm M-F, as it's the same time as parking in Brampton Road.</p> <p>This we have always done when it hasn't been possible to park in upper Brampton Road.So it's a restriction to our parking.</p> <p>similarly the proposed time change to the end of Blandford Road which we can currently direct tradespeople to when they are trying to park nearby. At the moment the existing time restrictions work reasonably well.This will be a further restriction to our parking.</p> <p>Brampton Road is quite densely housed. Park Avenue less so and a very useful overflow to many people at this end of Brampton Road.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
31	Jennings Road	<p>I recognise many of the problems and concerns that you have identified and welcome your review of the scheme. However, I do have concerns over some of your proposed solutions. Could Jennings Road be considered for residents and school users ONLY...both having to display an appropriate permit? Traffic in Jennings would increase, (which I agree is probably currently underused), but the traffic would be relevant to the area. I am also on the staff team at St Paul's Church on Blandford Road and I understand from your proposals that the parking restrictions in Blandford Road are to be changed from 1.30-3.30pm to 11.00am-1.00pm. This would have major impact on both the church and the general community in this area. Alongside these more 'community service' groups, we also have several groups aimed at parents-to-be and new parents, namely NCT classes, Jolly Bookworms, Baby Signing and Baby massage; groups aimed at health and exercise among adults of all ages - Pilates, Zumba and Adult ballet and tap; and also some educational groups such as Computer Friendly (for older people) and a literacy class (until recently funded by WEA). These are all private groups run from St Paul's halls for those in the wider community.</p> <p>All of the above mentioned groups currently run between approximately 9.00am and 12.30pm. A change in parking to residents only between 11.00-1.00pm would prevent almost all of these groups from running, affecting a very large number of individuals. Alternative rental opportunities in St Albans are hard to find at similar reasonable prices and some of these groups may be forced to close as a result.</p> <p>A further, more direct, concern is the ability of the church to play it's full role of offering basic services to the community, such as funerals. Funerals often move from the church and on to either the cemetery or the crematorium, and as such, many of our funerals are therefore held around 11.30am-2.00pm to give enough time to complete the service elsewhere. Today we held a service at 12.30pm, next week we have a service at 12noon, and a couple of weeks ago we had a service at 11.30pm. All of these would have proved very difficult with a Blandford Road parking restriction of 11.00am-1.00pm.</p> <p>Please could I ask you to reconsider changing the parking restriction for Blandford Road and instead, allow it to remain as 1.30pm-3.30pm. Such a change will affect very many people across every day, Monday-Friday, and I fear that a building intended for use by the community will instead become an empty building most of the week and really only see use one or two days a week. It would be a huge loss of a well used community facility.</p>
32	Salisbury Avenue	<p>I feel that many of the proposed changes, such as splitting Zone P into 4 separate zones, are very sensible.</p> <p>We live in Salisbury Avenue which, under the proposed changes, along with Eaton Road will become the first road outside the extended parking zone.</p> <p>I refer to paragraph 7 which deals with traffic (including emergency vehicles) not being able to pass in areas to the east of the Ladder Roads scheme boundary. I presume that this refers primarily to Woodstock Road North where I have experienced the problems referred to. My concern is that the problem may simply be displaced to the neighbouring roads, including Salisbury Avenue. The road here is narrower than Woodstock Road and already there is the occasional incident where lorries are not able to pass due to parked cars.</p> <p>I suspect that including Salisbury Avenue in the restricted parking zone may simply result in cars parking even further out, eg in Beaumont Avenue. However, I also feel that limited parking restrictions in Salisbury Avenue may be necessary to ensure the free movement of vehicles and also to ensure access to driveways. This could be achieved by allowing parking only on one side of the street and, of course, using road markings to ensure access to driveways.</p>
33	Charmouth Road	<p>We would suggest that the reinstatement of parking in the original CPZ scheme ie Clarence Road etc is carried out in accordance with the new proposals to see if this solves the problem. If not after say 6 months the second phase could be implemented ie Charmouth/ Gurney ct etc In this way the council would potentially save half the costs and have less running costs in policing it. We don't feel this blanket approach is necessary.</p> <p>We are currently concerned that there are no proposals to stop parking in Sandpit Lane. The area adjacent to St Saviours church is particularly hazardous.</p>
34	Charmouth Road	<p>If the council is intent on extending parking regulation along the lines proposed rather than reversing the ill-conceived and unnecessary controls that were put in place in December 2018, then please note my comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new arrangements would perhaps best be phased in (and monitored phase by phase), extending outward from the direction of the station. The negative impact on our local environment of road marking and sign posting must not be overlooked: it will be very considerable. As it is we seemed destined to be living in one giant car park.</li> <li>2. I do not believe it is, or will be, necessary to include the upper (north) end of new zone P3 within the plans. Indeed, given P3 runs quite a long way north to south, it is entirely possible that residents at the northern end will take to parking at the southern end (e.g. the bottom of Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road) thus squeezing residents at the bottom out of parking space and adding to congestion near key junctions.</li> <li>3. If the new controls are to run up as far north as the current plans suggest, despite the concerns identified in my previous paragraph, then those same concerns could instead be addressed by sub-dividing P3 into, say, P3 and P4 in much the same way that it is proposed to protect the Ladder roads south of Verulam School from parking by residents from north of the school. I appreciate demarcation lines might be a little more awkward, and excess regulation and complexity is to be deplored, but a problem may well arise if one of the options is not taken.</li> <li>4. At the bottom of Charmouth Road, in the section running into the roundabout junction with Sandpit Lane, the single yellows and shared parking bays should be switched (i.e. so that the single yellows run down the east side of Charmouth Road). This is in better keeping with the speed and volumes of traffic respectively entering and exiting from the roundabout.</li> <li>5. Why the special treatment for roads south of Verulam School and indeed west of Clarence Road, which are to avoid shared parking bays? I appreciate they may be shorter on parking availability, but the council's own survey undertaken on 13 September 2018 showed that parking availability across the area, including the most affected roads, was between 18 and 91 percent.</li> </ol>
35	Churchill Road	My wife and I are resident at Churchill Road St Albans and are writing in support of the consensus view of our fellow residents of the road in regard to the above.
36	Fontmall Close	<p>When the CPZ was introduced covering Archers' Fields, Boundary Road and Sandridge Road in around January 2018, we knew that it would affect Fontmell Close. But our friends in Archers' Fields had been assured that there would be a consultation after six months to evaluate the effects of the new controls [although that never happened] so that is why we did not immediately complain to our local councillors when the commuters' cars all moved into the close and parked on the right-angled bend.</p> <p>The reason that they park around here is that you can walk to the London station in 20 minutes, or cycle there even faster, and that situation is not going to change.</p> <p>As soon as the CPZ was implemented, it immediately became very dangerous to drive out of the close because the commuter cars parked on the bend obstruct any view of traffic coming in from Seymour Close. Drivers are compelled to move across into the opposite carriageway where they meet oncoming traffic head-on. It is very fortunate that there has not already been an accident.</p> <p>So when Janet spoke to you about this, you surprised her by saying that the new proposals were primarily designed to make access easier for refuse lorries and emergency vehicles. They were not designed to be a priority.</p> <p>However, the proposal to put double yellow lines on the bend and also at the junction with Seymour Road might help. But it is likely to move the parking further into the close which would cause new problems.</p> <p>We both feel that the best approach would be to ban parking for one hour a day because that would be enough to deter all-day commuter parking. Or two hours as in the Archers' Fields CPZ in which the hours are chosen not to interfere with school parking. We realise that some residents would have to buy permits, which would be an unwelcome new expense, but safety is important and the fees are not exorbitant. This scheme would be just as helpful to the refuse lorries and emergency vehicles as the double yellow line proposal is.</p> <p>We realise it is difficult for you to arrive at a decision where there is no unanimity in residents' views, but we do feel that you should take some action. The consequences could then be looked at six months later.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
37	Lancaster Road	<p>Ladders Roads Consultation, Parking Development Counter propose The issues in P3 Area 2 only started when additional parking restrictions were introduced in the Clarence Road area P2 - pushing the problem into a new area- P3. I suggest that the council introduces easing in P1 and P2 , as proposed, alongside dialogue with the station car park owners- to create some additional parking spaces and therefore countering the need to introduce the scheme into P3 area 2</p> <p>The scheme proposed for P3 Area 2 could be phased later after evaluating the effects of changes to P1 and P2 Further consultation should be given on the ‘street furniture’ and visual impact of additional lines, bays and signs.</p> <p>ProposeThe council undertakes an audit of where resident bays can be placed. The proposal has not been done with any particular consideration for actual spaces available after driveways are considered. They have been modelled around junctions only.</p> <p>The council undertakes an audit of how many spaces are available in ladder roads after driveways are considered, and benchmarks this against the 350 spaces that are regularly empty at the station car park. How many spaces are actually needed?</p> <p>Driveway spaces should be honoured where there is a clear driveway use and not just where the kerb is dropped. Driveways are a material aspect of a house value.The council enters into meaningful dialogue with the station car park owners who have empty spaces while residents have to go through consultations and incur traffic safety issues. Could the council subsidise some station parking spaces?</p> <p>ObjectProposed Pay by Phone parking of £2.90 is too low in comparison to the station or town centre parking. To avoid making the area even more attractive owing to low parking charges, these charges should be higher- to be proportionate with other parking in the area.</p> <p>Proposed parking bays run across driveways with driveways marked within the parking zones. The proposal is that bays will not ‘cut in’ where there are driveways. This increases the likelihood of parking close to driveway exits reducing road visibility and narrowing driveways where they are not dropped the full length. Proposed Zone P2 Area 3 roads: York Road, Gainsborough Ave, Jennings Rd and Blenheim Rd are all exempt from proposed non resident parking. Why? If more spaces are made available in this area it could reduce the need to extend the control zone.</p> <p>Agree Battlefield Road needs consideration at the lower end where the road narrows Parking charges for residents are proportionate</p> <p>Resident permit charges are proportionate</p>
38	Churchill Road	<p>Firstly I confirm I agree with the consensus view submitted by Churchill Road. I would, however, like to add a few additional comments.</p> <p>The ladder road scheme as originally introduced (and currently in place) for Churchill Road and the immediate surrounding roads has actually achieved exactly what it was promised and supposed to do - to prevent all day parking by commuters. What the scheme in general does not appear to have achieved is greater usage of the station car parks, partly because it has pushed parking further out to other residential roads. In this respect the revised proposals surely risk the same happening again, this time to Homewood Road and Marshals Drive for example. I trust serious consideration has been given to this very likely consequence.</p> <p>Surely the approach in any revised proposals must be to achieve proper utilisation of the station car parks as a first priority. Ensuring any roadside charges are the same as those at these car parks should help but I would suggest that as a first step it might be better to remain with the current permit and visitor parking only until such time as the usage of the station car parks reaches a point where overflow roadside parking is required and the payment element of the proposal is required. In other words have the ability to introduce without further consultation but delay until it is actually needed. This would also save some money initially by not having to change current signs or road markings.</p>
39	Charmouth Road	<p>1) With regards to the above we live at Charmouth Road and the proposed plan is showing as having a yellow line in front of our house. Obviously the proposed introduction of the above scheme is to alleviate the current situation, therefore in light of this we would prefer to have the yellow line across the other side of the road. The reason for this is that the even numbered houses on Charmouth Road are large detached houses and therefore have ample drives and they never have to park on the road. Whereas our (odd numbered) side are semi detached houses and our drives are not as big. Therefore, it makes more sense for the current plan to be flipped with yellow lines being placed on the opposite side.</p> <p>2) It seems like the council are proposing that the public only have to spend £2.90 per day to be able to park the whole day. Is this correct? If so, this defeats the whole object of not allowing commuter parking from the early hours to very late at night every day. This will still cost people considerably less than parking in the station/town car parks for the day. Surely, the objective is to get the cars off the roads and into car parks?! This option should not be made an attractive offer and should cost the public more.</p> <p>3) Also, following on from the above point are people going to be able to pay for this parking at whatever time or only from the allocated time of 11-1? Because if they are able to park, for example; at 7am and pay at 7am for the allocated time slot of 11-1 then all the parking bays could potentially still be filled up by commuter parking and none left for either the residents or any visitors that they may have, which if obviously unacceptable!</p> <p>4) We don’t agree that residents should have to pay for their parking permits and visitors permits either. These should be free. I know this suggestion will be scoffed at but where my mother lives the residents are given free permits and allowed one free parking permit for any visitors. So it can be done!</p> <p>5) Finally, it’s all very well wanting to introduce these parking proposals but are they going to be adequately and frequently patrolled by traffic wardens and tickets issued where necessary. As this has to be key to making sure people understand that there will be consequences if they don’t pay or park on yellow lines etc!</p>
40	Charmouth Road	<p>Thank you for circulating the results of the parking review of Zone P and the proposals for changes to the current ladder scheme and its extension to the roads North of Sandpit Lane. While we are not happy that the Ladder scheme has not been rolled back further, nor that there is a residents parking scheme introduced to Charmouth Rd, we accept that the proposals may ease the situation in Charmouth Rd and other roads to the North of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>We note that shared parking is allowed the full length of Harptree Way. Approximately half way along the road there is a small drive to the South. This provides access to rear private parking for houses down to number 53. It also provides access to a small electricity sub-station, and perhaps most significantly, for emergency vehicles that otherwise cannot reach the rear of numbers 53-61 Charmouth Road (none of which have any significant side access). Only a few years ago a fire engine had to use the track to reach the rear of no 55. We think it extremely important that this access be protected with a double yellow line.</p>
41	Not Provided	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> One further point of detail on the scheme proposed for the P3 Area (if it has to be proceeded with): Why should Harptree way not be available for general (free) parking? It has no residents, and no driveways. What purpose does parking restriction serve?</p> <p>In summary therefore:</p> <p>In relation to the northern part of the Ladder Roads the parking scheme introduced was badly conceived and/or implemented resulting in unnecessary displacement of parking from an area of low passing traffic, low density housing and little local need for kerbside parking to an area with greater traffic, higher density housing and higher local parking need. Similar criticisms could be levelled in respect of the implementation for parts of Clarence Road and York Road.</p> <p>This has led to severe under-utilisation in those areas, and congestion in Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road where the parking was displaced to.</p> <p>The new proposed scheme to address that congestion is an unnecessary sledgehammer to crack a nut and the under-utilisation should be tackled first/instead.</p> <p>The proposals to address the under-utilisation do not go far enough to provide targeted use of the available resource and further liberation should be considered. This would be much preferable to the blunderbuss of the new proposed scheme and I urge the Council not to introduce another costly and inconvenient scheme without first giving greater thought to such a targeted approach and/or giving the proposals to address under-utilisation a chance to ameliorate the problem first</p> <p>If the new scheme is to be introduced it simply cannot go ahead without the inclusion of Marshal’s Drive and Homewood Road or it will create greater problems than it solves</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
42	Glenferrie Road	<p>1.The strategy - The overall concept of trying to distribute the parking capacity more evenly across the area is to be supported subject to the comments below.</p> <p>2.Parking Charges - The proposed parking charges are inadequate and are too low. Effectively the proposing is providing all-day parking in the designated zones for just £2.90 per day. While the charge equates to the 2-Hour Parking Rate in the city centre car parks, the proposal is in effect granting commuters a full day rate of just £2.90. This compares to £7.60 per day at the Govia Thameslink Car Parks at Ridgmont Road and Station Way. It also compares to £7.40 per day at the Victoria Street Car Park and £5.40 at Drovers Way for 6 hours parking. By allocating such a low parking rate for the new street parking proposal, the Council risks the fact that commuters will leave the station car parks and move to the streets thereby increasing pressure on capacity. What evidential research has been undertaken by the Council to demonstrate that this would not happen ??</p> <p>3. Zone P1 parking in Park Avenue - As part of the ladder roads of Sandfield Road, Glenferrie Road and west end of Brampton Road, we would request that consideration is given to the allocation of say 6 - 8 parking spaces at the south end of Park Avenue where it meets Brampton Road to Zone P1 parking. These roads are affected by the parking from the two Mosques on Hatfield Road and particularly on Fridays and at Muslim festivals ( which are fully respected) there is often not rom to park in these roads ( indeed today, on returning home to Glenferrie Road I had to park in Park Avenue). Allocation of limited Zone P1 spaces in this end of Park Avenue provides a very welcome but not disruptive parking over spill for these roads when religious centres in the areas are active. We would request that this is given serious consideration.</p> <p>4.York Road remains heavily under utilised for parking and we would suggest that 50% of this road length is allocated to Phone Charge Parking to use some of its capacity, while the other half remains as you have indicated in your strategy.</p> <p>5. The strategy document still does not address any proposal to persuade or agree with Govia Thameslink means to more fully utilise the parking capacities at the City Station car parks. As the controlling authority giving recent planning permission for the building extensions currently underway at the Station, one would expect that influence is exerted on Govia Thamelink to modify their parking charges to attract more cars to these car parks ( which are demonstrably under utilised) and to investigate conceptual studies to add two more parking decks to the Station Way Car Park ( which is structurally feasible even with the insertion of new structure). This really must form part of the Council's overall strategy.</p>
43	Gurney Court Road	<p>I have lived in Gurney Court Road since 1987. There has never been a problem with nuisance parking until the imposition of the Clarence Ladder Controlled Parking Zone that pointlessly displaced parking for the Station from the North end of Clarence, York and Jennings Roads. These areas have totally unused, pointlessly provided, residents parking bays.</p> <p>I fully support the use of double yellow lines at junctions since it appears that so many drivers fail to observe the obligation not to park within 10 metres of junctions, at the South end of Gurney Court Road in particular, which is especially dangerous due to the curved entry into Gurney Court Road from Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>The problem created by the ladder has been to cause “tunnelling” from approximately number 36 along the rest of the Southern end of the road. This is replicated in Charmouth and Lancaster Roads.</p> <p>Contrary to the issues raised in your letter the only one and only problem is noted above and your proposals do not address it in a fair and fiscal manner but apparently seek to further monetise roads already paid for by the license fees paid by most motorists.</p> <p>The issue can be simply addressed by the use of alternate single yellow lines on one side of the road and then the other, or indeed entirely on one side, up to Harptree Way. Leave the rest as is. Do not fix what is not broken. This is not Carlisle Avenue.</p> <p>Most residents of GCR have off-street parking for at least two vehicles. The proposal for GCR will cause unnecessary and additional expense for residents that have three vehicles, such as those with teenage children and makes it impossible for domestic service suppliers such as plumbers, window cleaners, builders etc to park throughout the working day. There seems to have been no thought for this aspect of normal life. This reply has been copied to my ward councillors.</p>
44	96 Clarence Road	<p>I would like to submit our comments regarding the revised proposals for parking in Clarence Road and surrounding area.</p> <p>Since the implementation of the current restrictions there has been significantly less traffic in the area which leads us to conclude that a substantial amount of traffic was generated by commuters looking for parking spaces.</p> <p>Our concern regarding the proposed new scheme is that the parking on Clarence Road between York Road and Sandpit Lane would yet again be taken up by commuters. The proposals allow for commuters to park all day and simply call in pay the £2.90 between 11-1pm. A small price compared to the cost of parking at the station.</p> <p>The new proposals are of concern as they will leave residents in a worse position than before the current scheme was introduced.</p>
45	Salisbury Avenue	<p>We live on Salisbury Avenue.</p> <p>Our key concern with the proposal is that weekday parking will now be displaced to Salisbury Avenue, at the edge of the new restricted parking zone. Our recent experience with additional parked vehicles, as a result of neighbours building works, is that it becomes increasingly difficult to access driveways when cars are parked on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Recommendation: Extend the parking restrictions to include Salisbury Avenue and Beaumont Avenue, as Beechwood Avenue forms a natural zone break as it is a more major thoroughfare.</p> <p>We are also concerned that parking is becoming more restricted, without sufficient provision for alternative options.</p> <p>Recommendation: Increase cycle parking available at St Albans City station. We are both cyclists and we know that it is very difficult to park our bikes at the station on weekdays. Better provisions would assist in encouraging more people to leave their cars at home.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing the outcome of the consultation.</p>
46	Not Provided	<p>I have read with interest your recent letter and maps detailing the Council's proposed response to the initial consultation. The analysis was very clear and I agree with much of your proposed action points. (For the record I live in a road in the consultation area but one not directly affected by the proposals, although I have family nearby, who do live in an affected road).</p> <p>However I fundamentally disagree with concept of the "shared use parking". This is an arrangement that would primarily (if not solely) be of benefit to two classes of road users -</p> <p>A: Rail commuters driving to the City Station.</p> <p>B: Staff and certain sixth-form students attending Verulam School.</p> <p>For the first group it is well known that some commuters do park in the unrestricted roads as much as a mile or more away from the station, no doubt reflecting the relatively high cost of station parking. To the best of my knowledge the Charrington Place station parking is never full, although the others can be full. It seem to me we do not have a responsibility to offer commuters a low cost parking option (in fact just for the benefit of very early morning travellers). We would simply be perpetuating the existing all day parking in those affected streets under review, albeit for a relatively modest charge in future. Extending the area covered by existing resident permit parking arrangements, whilst causing some inconvenience, would eliminate the commuter parking problem now being seen in certain roads.</p> <p>Regarding Verulam School related parking, I would have expected the School to make appropriate arrangements for their staff parking. A number of older students certainly appear to drive to school and park in nearby roads. I certainly do not believe it is the role of the Council to facilitate the travel to school of older pupils in their own private cars. In the small number of cases where that might be a real need, the school has parking available at its sports ground, some 15 minutes walk away, which could be used, although not as convenient of course. Again the current problems could be better solved by extending the area covered by the resident permits/vouchers restrictions.</p>
47	York Rd	<p>I support the subdivision of Zone P to reduce displacement parking.</p> <p>I object to the ‘pay by phone’ proposal as its introduction to Clarence Road will have a detrimental effect on traffic safety due to reduced visibility and increased traffic at the Clarence Rd/York Rd/Brampton Road junction. It would re-introduce the problem of railway commuters hunting for parking spaces in the mornings.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
48	Not provided	<p>Clearly, the current regime in Clarence Road has made it safer, but on the other hand, simply moving all the commuter parking into someone else's road is inequitable and presumably reduces their safety. Commuters have to park somewhere, so the real issue is to spread it more fairly. With this in mind, there really ought to be some commuter parking allowed, perhaps spread over a larger area than now. As previously, I still think that differential charging may have some effect, but please think very carefully about where it makes sense to allow parking. Clarence Road has two bends in it and with parked cars obscuring the view, visibility when exiting some drives is extremely restricted and dangerous. White lines are not legally enforceable, but well thought out marked bays should deter the more selfish parking practices.</p> <p>To add a couple of more general points:          -It is not clear to me why we need any restrictions at all on a Saturday          -If there are to be restrictions, why not have them from 9:30-10:30. This ought to have a similar effect on commuters as 11:00-13:00 but will allow much better access to Clarence park for parents with children.</p>
49	Charmouth Road	<p>Further to our response to the parking review survey emailed on 9/2/2020, it has come to our attention that the shared parking zone proposed in Harptree Way appears to be unbroken at the entrance to the private track on the Southern side. This is a private road owned by our house and that of our neighbours. We would therefore like to add to our response a request not to allow parking across the entrance to this track because: our land registry leases stipulate a "right of way" to houses that back onto the track fire engines require access to this track in the event of a fire there is an electricity substation that is accessed off the track - the relevant electricity company also has a right of way along the track This is a response to the Parking Review proposals for the Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South. The joint "residents parking" and "paid parking" for the ladder roads scheme is an excellent compromise solution The price to pay for parking can be used as a lever to regulate the amount of parking in the ladder roads. If it's too congested, increase the price. If it's empty and under utilised (as currently is the case), lower, the price. An initial price of £2.90 seems exactly right as a starting price. It should attract some people to stop parking north of Sandpit lane and park in the ladder roads instead.If too many people migrate from the station or Marshalswick South, then you have the leeway to raise the price. If you start too high, it's harder to lower the price.Regarding enlarging the CPZ to encompass areas North of Sandpit Lane, this seems premature. The fundamental mistake with the ladder CPZ, was changing too much in one go. We fear that nothing was learnt from this and it is about to happen again. Our main response to the council will be to plead to do this in phases. Phase 1, change as much as possible of the existing CPZ to paid public parking CPZ. And perhaps Woodstock Road North. That change should not cost the council too much extra. Then see if and how much the pressure on surrounding areas eases. Perhaps the extension to all the new areas will not be needed at all or will not need to be so big. Phase 2, only if it still seems necessary, extend to the lower parts of Marshalswick North (Harptree and half of Faircross for instance). Phase 3, Finally, only if problems are still being seen, extend fully to Marshals Drive etc. Parking costs a lot of tax-payer's money to implement and to maintain. It's an inconvenience and extra cost for 100s of residents. Why waste all that money/effort and inflict new pain on 100s of your constituents until it's proven necessary? If you and we learnt anything from the Ladder Roads CPZ, it's that it's incredibly difficult to predict all the ramifications of a change to parking restrictions. No-one thinks the planning department should be able to predict exactly how the public will respond to any new parking initiative. But as the paid-parking in Clarence Ward may possibly be enough to fix most of the issues by itself, surely it is irresponsible to spend a significant amount of tax-payer's money extending the parking scheme significantly until you know for sure it is required. If there is a chance of avoiding yet more CPZ in the long term, it must be worth waiting a few months to see. By adopting a phased approach, we are hopeful that both Clarence and Marshalswick South wards can be satisfied without the entire new plan being necessary.</p>
50	Not Provided	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> 1.Our principle concern with these proposals is their damaging effect on public safety in Woodstock Road North, where we feel that the current combination of single yellow lines opposite purple parking zones should be abandoned in favour of vastly more parking spaces. 2. If shared-use parking is to be introduced, it must be priced to discourage those who would abuse it order to avoid paying the true economic cost of their journey. The £2.90 charge grossly cross-subsidises commuters, visitors etc who have ample access to Station and City parking facilities. By charging pay-by-phone parkers the equivalent of Station/City Centre car parks, the Council would simultaneously: a)Encourage commuters and other visitors to utilise parking facilities which have been specifically provided for this purpose, and which are currently under-occupied; b) Encourage more bus use; and c) Significantly ease the unnecessary burden of non-local parkers on residential roads. 3. Until the above parking/pricing issues are resolved, the currently-proposed pricing of residents' parking permits seems hard to understand. It can only be explained by reference to a coherent overall pricing strategy which – as demonstrated above – seems not to exist within the current proposals. This issue therefore needs to be revisited as part of the overall pricing strategy. 4.In formulating this strategy it is important that planners avoid an outcome where residents feel they are being forced to pay for permits which they may frequently be unable to use within reasonable proximity to their houses, as they are crowded out by non-residents. 5.Importantly from a safety perspective, we would also observe that WRN is a very long road with dissimilar traffic and parking features, broadly divided at the Jennings Rd junction. The stretch of WRN between Jennings and WRS/Brampton Rd is far more congested than the stretch north of Jennings. This is because the former is the final run-in to Morrisons as well as the three schools, local businesses etc. As a nexus this part of WRN therefore suffers huge volumes of aggregated traffic. Viewed purely in traffic terms, therefore, it shares far more in common with WRS than it does with WRN as a whole. It follows that, in any final parking scheme, this section of WRN - lying immediately north of WRS up to Jennings Rd – should share the same parking restrictions, currently resident-only parking during defined periods. 6.This alone would significantly ameliorate the specific traffic hazards facing this intensively-used stretch of WRN. 7. We also note that the proposals are quite complicated and, as such, it is difficult to foresee their dynamic outcomes, exposing it to unintended consequences and costly reverse-engineering. Whatever revised parking scheme emerges from this consultation, therefore, it surely makes sense to adopt a step-wise approach, with a phased introduction, the results of which can be monitored, and future roll-out adjusted to reflect outcomes. 8 As a starting point, such phased introduction might begin, for example, with re-opening Jennings Rd, since this has the potential to significantly and beneficially affect the pattern of traffic and parking across a large swathe of Zone 2. The Council can then see how traffic/parking responds, and – if appropriate – introduce further parking measures according to the evidence. 9.Finally, it is perhaps a statement of the obvious that the Council's whole approach to the City's traffic and parking problem is unsustainable. By simply smearing the issue around, the Council is failing to grasp the nettle. The core of which is that Station parking is demonstrably too expensive. The Council has considerable influence to bring to bear to cause Govia to reduce prices, thus stimulating usage of their under-occupied car parks. If this is successful, and occupancy rises, the same influence can be brought to bear to add further parking capacity by constructing at higher levels.</p>
51	Clarence Road	<p>We wish to comment on the proposal to permit Pay by Phone parking in parts of Clarence Road north of York Road.</p> <p>Given the closeness of these parking bays to the station, it is very likely that they would all be occupied by commuters just as they were before the present restrictions were introduced. The proposed fee is too low to deter many people from using Clarence Road for a day's parking. Clarence Road is now a bus route and, if vehicles were once again parked almost continuously on one side of the road while there is intermittent parking on the other side, there could be difficulties for traffic. It would be much safer to keep the present restrictions, which generally lead to a few vehicles parked on either side of the road in a way that allows free movement of free traffic and safe access to driveways.</p> <p>If there is a wish to provide some Pay by Phone parking in the area, a much safer alternative would be to permit such parking on one side of Gainsborough Avenue.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
52	Homewood Road	<p>I have read all the information provided and am pleased that the proposals will deal more effectively with the bottleneck situation in Charmouth Road.</p> <p>However, I think the proposals have a very negative impact on Homewood Road. We will become the only place with ‘free parking’ and I think this will be utilised by many of the people displaced by the parking restrictions. I anticipate that commuters/school students would find parking on Homewood much more attractive than parking, for example, on The Park, both from a perspective that it is closer and will be free. This will be particularly so at the lower end of Homewood road. I feel that a more natural boundary would be Marshal’s Drive.</p> <p>I also have concerns for the impact on all the people who regularly use Homewood Road church for any of the activities that are offered there during the week. The car park is definitely not big enough to accommodate all the people that attend the events, and I think it will have a detrimental effect if people cannot park reasonably close by when they want to attend, particularly the elderly or parents with small children. Our road will become jammed with people using it as an all day car park, prohibiting those who wish to attend a community activity from parking.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above I would request that we are included in the category that has a 2 hr charge for parking as per Faircross Way and The Park.</p>
53	Homewood Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> Your letter dated 17th January 2020 is the first communication to includes details that would significantly impact Homewood Road. Previous communications asked for views on prior restrictions that at the time did not have a significant impact on Homewood Road. The areas affected were further away with roads between showing no restrictions on them (eg Woodstock Road, Charmouth Road and Faircross Way). However, your most recent proposals would bring further issues of car parking to our doors (and often unsafe drives). So this is our first real opportunity to raise objections.The points 1-8 on pages 1 to 3 of your 17th January 2020 letter are also true for the south-end of Homewood Road and as such, need to be applied here as well. This end of Homewood Road suffers regularly from cars blocking the road on both sides, inconsiderate parking with the inability to safely exit drives if at all, and considerably reduced visibility at the road junction, which is well known as an accident hotspot. The road has become a short-cut (or express way) for those seeking to avoid the traffic light at Sandpit Lane and Beechwood Drive. This has worsened considerably in recent years with increased car volumes heading up Sandpit Lane from the town, and will no doubt deteriorate further with the opening of 200+ new homes in the Oakland Grange community on Sandpit Lane.Significant Safety Issues, The junction at the south-end of Homewood Road (the intersection of Sandpit Lane and Homewood Road / Woodstock Road) already has an appalling safety record, and this proposal will make matters worse because Homewood Road would be blocked up further by displaced cars from Woodstock Road. Sensibly, there are already parking restrictions (double yellow lines) on Woodstock Road North on both sides as you approach the junction. The same should be implemented on Homewood Road. The road design is the same and, as such, so are the safety concerns. I have seen many cars damaged at this junction and personally know one of the poor drivers whose car was badly damaged entering Sandpit Lane at this junction. Point 3 on page 2 states that a double yellow line review is in progress - can you ensure that this is captured for both consultations.You propose to add restrictions on all the roads leading up to Homewood Road, but no restrictions on Homewood Road itself. This will of course result in cars parking on Homewood Road, particularly the south-end (up to the Faircross Way junction) as it is nearest to the school and railway station. Rather than solve the parking issue you seek to address, you will simply be pushing it to another neighbourhood (ours). My wife &amp; I, along with other residents of this street) regularly walk to/from the railway station, and we expect that those living further afield will dump their cars on our road and walk as we do. Indeed, the south-end of Homewood Road is closer to the railway station than other roads in your proposal such as The Park, the east end of Faircross Way, most of both the North ends of Charmouth Road and Gurney Ct Road on which you are proposing to put restrictions. The residents of the south-end of Homewood Road, if not the whole road, should have the same protection granted to them – see map below. Homewood Road is not wide enough to have parking on both sides without significantly impacting traffic flow and visibility when exiting drives, and it is not unusual for residents to find their driveways obstructed by cars attending functions at the local church (for non-church functions). Please amend your proposal to protect the residents at the south-end of Homewood Road and those who use the already busy and dangerous junction at the end of this road.</p>
54	Charmouth Road	<p>1) With regards to the above we live at Charmouth Road and the proposed plan is showing as having a yellow line in front of our house. Obviously the proposed introduction of the above scheme is to alleviate the current situation, therefore in light of this we would prefer to have the yellow line across the other side of the road. The reason for this is that the even numbered houses on Charmouth Road are large detached houses and therefore have ample drives and they never have to park on the road. Whereas our (odd numbered) side are semi detached houses and our drives are not as big. Therefore, it makes more sense for the current plan to be flipped with yellow lines being placed on the opposite side.</p> <p>2) It seems like the council are proposing that the public only have to spend £2.90 per day to be able to park the whole day. Is this correct? If so, this defeats the whole object of not allowing commuter parking from the early hours to very late at night every day. This will still cost people considerably less than parking in the station/town car parks for the day. Surely, the objective is to get the cars off the roads and into car parks?! This option should not be made an attractive offer and should cost the public more.</p> <p>3) Also, following on from the above point are people going to be able to pay for this parking at whatever time or only from the allocated time of 11-1? Because if they are able to park, for example; at 7am and pay at 7am for the allocated time slot of 11-1 then all the parking bays could potentially still be filled up by commuter parking and none left for either the residents or any visitors that they may have, which if obviously unacceptable!</p> <p>4) We don’t agree that residents should have to pay for their parking permits and visitors permits either. These should be free. I know this suggestion will be scoffed at but where my mother lives the residents are given free permits and allowed one free parking permit for any visitors. So it can be done!</p> <p>5) It’s all very well wanting to introduce these parking proposals but are they going to be adequately and frequently patrolled by traffic wardens and tickets issued where necessary. As this has to be key to making sure people understand that there will be consequences if they don’t pay or park on yellow lines etc!</p>
55	Homewood Road	<p>My comments are:</p> <p>1.I expect that a large number of Verulam students will choose to park in Homewood Road (seemingly the closest road to the school that is not included in the proposed scheme) and walk circa 5 minutes rather than pay £2.90 for a shorter walk. I say that given the fact that a large number of commuters are currently willing to walk for15 minutes to avoid a circa £8.00 daily charge.</p> <p>2.I expect that some of the commuters currently parking in Faircross Way, Charmouth Road, Gurney Court Road, Lancaster Road et al will be prepared to undertake a walk of an additional 5 minutes to park for free in Homewood Road. As they are currently undertaking a circa 15 minute walk to save circa £8 a day, it is probable that some will complete a circa 20 minute walk.</p> <p>3.There is a church in Homewood that will be heavily impacted if it (Homewood Road) is flooded with commuters and students parking for free. For example, there is a weekly parent and toddler group, and I cannot imagine parents being prepared to make a significant journey on foot in order to attend (assuming all the parking spaces nearby are taken). There are other events held at the United Reform Church for which its small car park is insufficient. Some people may well be encouraged to no longer visit the church if the proposals as drafted are adopted.</p> <p>4.Surely (under the current proposals) no commuter will pay to park in The Park or the far end of Charmouth Road/Gurney Court Road given that (under the current plan) they can park in Homewood road which is as close/closer to the station. Similarly, no Verulam student can be expected to pay to park in these roads if Homewood Road offers free parking and is closer to the school.</p> <p>I suggest that Homewood Road be included in the Ladder parking scheme if it (the scheme) proceeds.</p> <p>However, I also suggest the Council fundamentally rethinks its parking strategy. Each time parking restrictions are amended, the main impact seems to be move the (parking) problem on to another area/road(s).</p> <p>I appreciate the council cannot influence the cost of parking at the station, but that is the main issue as far as the commuters are concerned. If the council had the resources to offer a much cheaper alternative close to the station and town then that maybe the most elegant solution. I do though accept the cost of building another car park (at lower cost per day) in opposition to the station would likely be prohibitively expensive.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
56	Charmouth Road	<p>We live at at the north end of Charmouth Road opposite Charmouth Court. We agree in principle with the introduction of a parking zone in the area north of Sandpit Lane. However, we have specific objections to the proposed changes on Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court, as we believe that they will make the situation worse rather than better in this very specific area.</p> <p>We strongly object to the introduction of double yellow lines opposite junctions. This will leave us unable to park outside our house on Charmouth Road opposite Charmouth Court. This introduction seems unnecessary. We agree that there should be double lines around the junction, because cars do currently park dangerously on the junction, but not opposite. Charmouth Road is a wide road, buses pass down the road easily even when there are cars parked either side and, apart from the odd dangerously parked car on the corner, there is easy access in and out of Charmouth Court. We note that double yellow lines opposite junctions are not proposed in the new ladder roads zone scheme; why introduce it on Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road?</p> <p>I would also like to raise the issue of parking in Charmouth Court. There is already insufficient parking there and this scheme will exacerbate the situation. When the flats were built, they were aimed at retired people; now they mainly accommodate families, who often have two cars. This is what has led to the dangerous parking on the junction and also has significant overflow into Charmouth Road. This scheme will drastically cut down the available parking spaces, particularly with the introduction of both double and single yellow lines. Where are all the cars that currently park there going to go? Given that Charmouth Court is private with significant unused open areas, it seems reasonable that more parking should be provided for residents on that private land.</p>
57	Sandridge Road	<p>I am writing in response to the consultation on ladder roads North of Sandpit Lane. I live in Sandridge Road, and commute daily by bicycle along Battlefield Road or Lancaster Road. Both of these streets now have cars parked along the entire length, up to the junctions, and blocking the bend in Battlefield Road. Cars are unable to pass bicycles, and as a result squeeze past when it's unsafe, particularly on the bend and at the junctions.</p> <p>I would be in favour of any limitations to parking on these roads, and similar ladder roads across Marshallswick. This should include double yellow lines on all corners and junctions, and permit parking in the middle of the day to prevent car commuters using the streets as free parking. There also needs to be enough parking attendants to enforce the restrictions.</p> <p>I would be happy to provide more details if required.</p>
58	Salisbury Avenue	<p>We recognise that your proposal goes some way towards controlling inconsiderate parking in the area. As residents of Salisbury Avenue, outside the scheme, we have already seen instances of this and it is clear that the proposed changes will make it considerably worse for this road and Beaumont Avenue.</p> <p>1.Introduction of yellow lines and driveway white lines, This will ease issues in the parking zone areas but the problems you are addressing will shift to just outside the zone where the limited free parking will be ever more sought after. The inconsiderate parking reported will worsen in these areas as a result. Salisbury Avenue is narrow and is already suffering from increased parking. If cars park on both sides of the road, even in a staggered pattern, then access issues quickly arise, with the risk that emergency vehicles cannot get through. Cars parked close to driveway exits make manoeuvring into and out of drives very difficult if not impossible.</p> <p>In addition Beaumont Avenue has seen increased parking since the introduction of the scheme, particularly at the top end near to Sandpit Lane, causing holdups and traffic issues when vehicles are unable to turn into Beaumont Avenue due to queuing traffic waiting to turn onto Sandpit Lane. As this is in close proximity to a zebra crossing there is some risk to pedestrians caught up in this.</p> <p>Our request: Introduce lines to restrict parking to a single side of the road in Salisbury Avenue and add white lines over driveways on both sides of the road. Introduce lines to restrict parking to a single side of the road at the north end of Beaumont Avenue to ease access for Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>2.Shared use parking, Before implementing the ladder parking you acknowledged that many of the cars parked on these roads were from school parking as well as station users. We do not believe that your proposal for shared use parking will encourage school users to return to these roads to park. Instead they will simply move to the next road outside the scheme. The cost of parking for £2.90 a day is £14.50 a week, and the 39 weeks of school in a year amounts to £565.50. We believe this is also likely to be true of station users, who might well be parking for more than 39 weeks in a year. Many car users who are already searching out free parking will usually walk a few extra minutes to save so much money. The areas that are allocated for shared parking are mainly made up of houses with driveways and very limited resident parking on the roads. The homeowners are not likely to be impacted by all day parking as long as the yellow lines and driveway white lines are present. This is especially true of Jennings Road north of Verulam School.</p> <p>Our recommendation: release areas of the existing roads out of the parking scheme to allow free parking bounded by clearly demarcated areas of no parking. Allow some areas of resident-only parking in these roads.</p>
59	Beaumont Avenue	<p>I am writing in response to your letter to residents setting out proposed changes to the ladder roads parking in Fleetville. I am a resident on Beaumont Avenue which I note will not have any parking restrictions. This will inevitably lead to much more parking shifting from the parking restricted roads.</p> <p>I recognise that some hard decisions need to be made to resolve parking issues for residents on the other ladder roads and that parking is not a particular challenge on Beaumont Avenue as most houses have driveways. However, we do get lots of traffic using the road as a rat run between Hatfield Rd and Sandpit Lane, to avoid the lights on Beechwood Avenue. Often these cars travel at speeds above the speed limit and this is a frequent concern for Beaumont Avenue residents.</p> <p>So, my response to the consultation is to request that the increased parking on Beaumont Avenue is staggered so as to calm traffic while not causing cars travelling in opposite directions to have to stop completely. This is to avoid the current situation at Woodstock Road South / Eaton / Burnham roads where 2 cars travelling in opposite directions cannot pass resulting in stoppages, dangerous manoeuvres and increased air pollution.</p> <p>I would like to see parking staggered on either side of Beaumont Avenue as it currently is on Clarence Road. This slows traffic but does not stop it. If the increased parking could be arranged so as to deliver the beneficial outcome of slowed through traffic, then this would help offset the disadvantages associated with reduced manoeuvrability from on-street parking as we exit our drives.</p>
60	Salisbury Avenue	<p>I live outside the current parking restriction zones, but am part of the consultation as I live on Salisbury Avenue.</p> <p>Since the implementation of the parking restrictions, our road, along with others on the periphery of the roads with restrictions, have been affected with the overspill of cars parking for the day for the station or parking as they access businesses and schools off Hatfield road.</p> <p>In light of the recent consultation I have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to keep in mind what the original purpose of the exercise was : to stop dangerous parking up to and on corners, to ensure emergency and delivery vehicles access, reduce parking by driveways limiting access to property. This has been in great part achieved by the use of yellow and white lines.</li> <li>- to consider effect of changes.</li> </ul> <p>There is now a clear pattern of where the restrictions have helped local residents and where there are ‘empty’ roads during the day, eg Jennings Road. The parking demand has not gone away, but spilled out and especially makes Woodstock, Charmouth and Beaumont Road by Sandpit Lane end difficult to negotiate by car.</p> <p>Do the new proposals address this imbalance, of freed space and crowded areas. Could Jennings road have only one side of restrictions for example?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further proposed changes</li> </ul> <p>Do these changes address the parking demand, especially by Verulum School students and the staff of Hatfield Road shops? Will it serve the community better to offer parking permits or the £2.90 parking to these groups.</p> <p>Also can you reintroduce some free places or stagger times of when not to park so not all same timing to introduce flexibility for these groups of users?. I understand you cannot accommodate for commuters driving to the station and not wishing to pay to park. My questions are :</p> <p>How do these new changes take into account the numbers involved and the effect of more restrictions been introduced?</p> <p>Can you find a solution that addresses the issue of empty roads within the restricted parking areas along with heavily crowded roads all around the edge, including Salisbury Avenue?</p> <p>Finally, I do not support the introduction of paid parking restrictions on Salisbury Avenue and would welcome continued studies to see how the parking situation changes and adaptations are affecting area before such a suggestion is proposed.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
61	Not Provided	<p>With regards to the proposed changes we believe it will adversely affect Beaumont Avenue. The parking restrictions will mean that those who park on the roads for work purposes are going to move their car to the next unrestricted zone . This will cause access and safety issues for residents of Beaumont Avenue. Cars already go fast along Beaumont Avenue and there is considerable traffic using it as a rat run from the roundabouts at Hatfield road end to sandpit lane. In addition the lighting is inadequate and makes exiting driveways more hazardous.</p> <p>Personally we are already seeing the effects of the new parking restrictions that were imposed in the ladder roads. This has affected our ability to safely negotiate exiting our driveway. Cars now park adjacent to our house and We have noticed the occupants are either heading to the station or work in fleetville, where there is little or no longer period parking available.</p> <p>We feel therefore that some time staggered parking restrictions should be extended to include Beaumont Avenue which would ensure that cars are not left all day long. Currently work vans are left all day and overnight at the sandpit lane end and hatfield road end of beaumont avenue causing dangerous access onto the roads.</p>
62	Churchill Road	<p>We object to the proposed changes to the parking arrangements on Churchill Road and ask that the existing arrangement continues. If the proposed changes are made the commuter/ school parking will cause major problems, particularly with regard to safety. The road is a main through route for traffic including school buses to and from Verulam School. This means that there is considerable traffic between 7.30 and 9 am and from mid to late afternoon. Removal of parking solely for residents (and visitors) whether on one side or both will significantly reduce the availability of passing places and we will have a problem similar to the one that Lancaster Rd has now. It appears that Churchill Rd and some of the other roads will bear the brunt of non resident parking whereas some (or sections of) roads which are not through roads will be for residents only even though the houses have drives.</p> <p>Commuters and school traffic will be able to park from early in the morning till evening each day for less than £15 a week. I understand that there is plenty of room in the station car parks which charge substantially more per day than £2.90. There appears to be nothing to stop vehicles being left for days at a time for a very small cost. There are serious implications for the safety for schoolchildren, school traffic, residents and others using the road.</p> <p>terraced houses at the Sandpit Rd end of Churchill Rd, as these houses do not have individual drives and there is limited off street parking this means that some of occupants have to park on the road. Allowing commuters/school traffic to park all day will cause congestion and residents with permits being unable to park on the road at any stage during the day. It will also cause difficulty when work vans need to have access to particular houses.</p> <p>We have no objection to the split of zone P into smaller zones if this assists.</p>
63	Clarence Road	<p>As residents at Clarence Road, our concern is the increased speed, volume, weight, noise and pollution levels of traffic using the road since the new parking schemes have been introduced.</p> <p>We are especially concerned that heavier traffic seems to be using the road, including some large trucks and buses.</p> <p>We would strongly welcome some form of traffic calming on Clarence Road, especially on the stretch of the road between the York Road / Brampton Road junction and the Hatfield Road traffic lights (along the park boundary). The previous alternate parking bays on each side of the road (which have now been removed) achieved a degree of traffic calming before the latest parking schemes were introduced.</p> <p>We would strongly support any scheme to REDUCE the volume and SLOW DOWN the speed of traffic along the road. The current parking scheme as now implemented (though beneficial in other ways) is having the opposite effect and is increasing the flow, volume, size and weight of traffic using the road. The revised proposals appear to do nothing to improve the situation.</p> <p>S6 Bus</p> <p>In particular, we have noticed that the S6 bus appears to have been re-routed along Clarence Road (although there are no bus stops on the road). Are you able to let me know the reasons why this bus route apparently now runs along Clarence Road. We are not aware of any consultation that was undertaken before the change in the bus route was made.</p>
64	Not Provided	<p>I am writing to confirm that I support the proposals put forward by Churchill Road.</p> <p>I live at the top of Churchill Road and Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>I would like to stress that the parking problem in this area is due to the inadequate parking provided at the station, so the Council is focusing on the wrong issue.</p> <p>None of the local residences with in a 20 minuet walking radius of the station, use cars, we all walk, or cycle, or moped.</p> <p>The cost of monthly parking is at Charrington Way is £144 per month so any charge to park in the local streets needs to be more if it is to deter regular commuters.</p> <p>If you put an exclusion time and made sure that you couldn't pay by phone the that would curb commuter parking.</p>
65	Lancaster Road	<p>I have reviewed the parking proposals for the roads north of Sandpit lane. I agree that something needs to be done to address the problems being caused by commuters leaving their cars on these roads all day long.</p> <p>However, I have some concerns with the proposal to make parts of the road no stopping at all between 11am and 1pm. I do not feel that it is necessary to go as far as this, as by making these parts of the road permit only instead, you would no doubt produce the same result, ie the commuters would not be able to park there and so there would be no problem with passing points. The vast majority of cars parked on Lancaster road, for example, are commuters.</p> <p>My worry about introducing no stopping at all is that residents themselves will be adversely affected. Their guests would not be able to park near their house over lunchtime (not all houses have a big enough drive for several cars), even if they had a permit. If commuters were to take up all the spaces on the parts of the road where you can pay, residents would have real problems in finding space for their guests to park, especially if anyone on the road were having building works and lived on a “no stopping” part.</p> <p>It feels to me that residents would be prepared to accept having to obtain a permit to park outside their own home, but being prevented from doing so at all would be a step too far. And an unnecessary step.</p>
66	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> . I feel the proposal has gone too far and hasn't taken into account the very real lack of parking spaces we have available in the area. I do not feel that the proposal is in the interests of the residents, and will have an adverse effect.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
67	Homewood Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b>The points 1-8 on pages 1 to 3 of your 17th January 2020 letter are also true for the south-end of Homewood Road and as such, need to be applied here as well. This end of Homewood Road suffers regularly from cars blocking the road on both sides, inconsiderate parking with the inability to safely exit drives if at all, and considerably reduced visibility at the road junction, which is well known as an accident hotspot. The road has become a short-cut (or express way) for those seeking to avoid the traffic light at Sandpit Lane and Beechwood Drive. This has worsened considerably in recent years with increased car volumes heading up Sandpit Lane from the town, and will no doubt deteriorate further with the opening of 200+ new homes in the Oakland Grange community on Sandpit Lane. Significant Safety Issues</p> <p>The junction at the south-end of Homewood Road (the intersection of Sandpit Lane and Homewood Road / Woodstock Road) already has an appalling safety record, and this proposal will make matters worse because Homewood Road would be blocked up further by displaced cars from Woodstock Road. Sensibly, there are already parking restrictions (double yellow lines) on Woodstock Road North on both sides as you approach the junction. The same should be implemented on Homewood Road. The road design is the same and, as such, so are the safety concerns. I have seen many cars damaged at this junction and personally know one of the poor drivers whose car was badly damaged entering Sandpit Lane at this junction. Point 3 on page 2 states that a double yellow line review is in progress - can you ensure that this is captured for both consultations.</p> <p>You propose to add restrictions on all the roads leading up to Homewood Road, but no restrictions on Homewood Road itself. This will of course result in cars parking on Homewood Road, particularly the south-end (up to the Faircross Way junction) as it is nearest to the school and railway station. Rather than solve the parking issue you seek to address, you will simply be pushing it to another neighbourhood (ours). My wife &amp; I, along with other residents of this street) regularly walk to/from the railway station, and we expect that those living further afield will dump their cars on our road and walk as we do. Indeed, the south-end of Homewood Road is closer to the railway station than other roads in your proposal such as The Park, the east end of Faircross Way, most of both the North ends of Charmouth Road and Gurney Ct Road on which you are proposing to put restrictions. The residents of the south-end of Homewood Road, if not the whole road, should have the same protection granted to them – see map below.</p> <p>Homewood Road is not wide enough to have parking on both sides without significantly impacting traffic flow and visibility when exiting drives, and it is not unusual for residents to find their driveways obstructed by cars attending functions at the local church (for non-church functions).</p> <p>Please amend your proposal to protect the residents at the south-end of Homewood Road and those who use the already busy and dangerous junction at the end of this road.</p>
68	Charmouth Road	<p>our door opens until Harp Tree Way.</p> <p>This has since become a parking space for industrial / business vehicles therefore obstruction smooth flow of traffic.</p>
69	Churchill Road	I currently live at Churchill Road, St Albans and would like to express my agreement with the consensus view which is being submitted for Churchill Road. That said, I would like to make one point: whilst a number of houses on this road have their own driveways, plenty of houses at the Sandpit Lane end do not and residents may struggle to park close to their homes if parking space is filled with station users. Especially when parking is so relatively cheap when compared to the cost of parking at the station.
70	Churchill Road	<p>As a resident of Churchill Road (North end) I write to add my full support and name to the consensus proposal that I am aware has been submitted on behalf of residents of Churchill Road.</p> <p>I agree with all points raised in the consensus proposal and the alternative suggestions it proposes, which I believe offer a fairer deal to residents of the road, whilst accommodating a more realistic share of the public/station parking.</p> <p>My main concern around the current council proposal is the notable danger posed to residents and pedestrians (especially nearby school children) who use Churchill Road and Jennings Road throughout the day. I do not believe it is logical to strive to maximise parking on what you term 'under-utilised' roads that are so close to a school. Surely it is sensible to strive to keep roads near schools as clear as possible, with minimal traffic and increased visibility for pedestrians crossing and cars navigating driveways.</p> <p>Churchill Road is actually an extremely busy cut through during the morning and mid afternoon (school drop off and pick up hours). Traffic only just about manages to flow owing to the available intermittent spaces on both sides of the road. With solid, parked traffic on both sides owing to early station commuters, this would surely result in gridlock and increased likelihood of accidents.</p> <p>The proposed £2.90 daily charge suggests a move to proactively attract station commuters at the complete expense of residents. I question the ethics of this. If you are unable to charge more than £2.90 for the 2 hour restricted period 11-1 then might I suggest you extend those hours to which charges apply in order to bring required daily charges more fairly in line with station parking charges. I am aware that the station car park is typically under utilised. I do not believe our road should become a 'bargain' alternative when physical availability of station parking is not in fact any key issue here. If cheaper station parking must be available on ladder roads then I believe it should at least be competitive to station car park prices and only nominally lower.</p> <p>Furthermore I would add that if you do consider the proposed compromise option of assigning one side of the road to mixed parking (visitors and residents) and one side to residents only, it would be logical that the 'residents only' side be the West side of the road, owing to the 12 or so houses at this end with no driveways/formal off street parking. This is in the interests of residents in those end houses who need to safely transport children between house and car. All houses on the East side of the road have the option of a driveway.</p> <p>I hope you will consider the balanced consensus proposal provided by Churchill Road, which I believe would provide a fairer and indeed more sustainable option than the current proposal.</p>
71	6 Woodstock Road North	<p>I am writing to respond to your consultation letter about parking proposals on Woodstock Road North.</p> <p>At the moment, the road has poor visibility due to parked cars on both sides of the road. I often find it difficult to get out of my drive as I cannot easily see cars approaching until they are very close. As a pedestrian, it is very difficult to cross the road safely. This is of particular concern as I have a baby and am not comfortable with the current state of the road.</p> <p>If possible, I would prefer that the parking on the road be limited so that only one side of the road offers parking. For example, if there is a parking spot on one part of the road, the space across the road is clear and offers no parking.</p> <p>This will make it easier to see approaching traffic and reduce risks of accidents as there will be better passing places as cars have enough space to pass each other. It will also make it easier for pedestrians to cross safely.</p>
72	Woodstock Road South	<p>I live on Woodstock Road South and wished to respond to the consultation on the parking for the road.</p> <p>I welcome the introduction of some restrictions but do not think it goes far enough given just how difficult and limited parking is on the road given the number of people parking on the road to go to the shops.</p> <p>My view is that full resident parking is the only solution covering all of every day. Having just moved from Bardwell Road, the parking situation, whilst not perfect, was a lot better than Woodstock Road South as a result of the parking permits.</p>
73	Lancaster Road	<p>I have reviewed the parking restrictions outside my house on 100 Lancaster road which is for permit holders and would like to suggest a simple yellow line instead. The problem is that my turning and sight access getting in and out of my drive will be severely restricted if a car bay is allowed outside. At the moment we can fit two cars onto our drive, however if a permit parking space is put outside this will make it extremely difficult. Please see picture attached as we have opened our driveway to get cars off the road, which I know is in the interest of everyone on the street. This street is extremely busy as a cut through and I have witnessed accidents with other cars as people are constantly pulling in and out to let cars pass. Our car has previously been damaged because it's very difficult to get in and out of our driveway due to parked cars.</p> <p>I would also like to suggest a 'traffic calming' speed bump solution be implemented at the same time for the reasons above.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
74	Gurney Court Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> At the consultation open day, it was suggested that an alternative to the single yellow lines would be “residents only parking” between 11am and 1pm (e.g. as per roads like Blenheim Road) for half the available spaces. We strongly support this option for Gurney Court Road, as otherwise all the available spaces at our end of the road could be taken up with commuters etc, forcing visitors between 11am and 1pm to park a long way away. As most houses have their own off-street parking, this should leave plenty of passing places even if all the “free for all” spaces are fully occupied. 2 The argument for this becomes even stronger if (as was being suggested at the consultation open day) the roads north of Brampton Road become “residents only parking” for half the spaces (rather than being 100% “free for all”), as this would increase the parking pressure on the roads north of Sandpit Lane such as ours. In this context, we understand why “Ladder Roads” where there is little or no off street parking are resident permit parking only on both sides of the road, but are unclear why roads such as Gainsborough Avenue, where many houses have their own driveways, require this treatment. For the scheme to achieve the widest acceptance, it is important that the criteria are consistently applied.Restrictions around the Gurney Court Road “triangle”, The triangle at the bottom of Gurney Court Road is becoming increasingly dangerous due to the high levels of parking there. Only yesterday, on preparing to turn left into Sandpit Lane, we had to contend with two cars parked on the “inside” of the triangle. These were in addition to cars already parked right along the road-side on the other side of the road, thus reducing this already dangerous junction to single file traffic and zero visibility. We understand that it may be some months before the full scheme can be implemented. However, it is crucial from a safety perspective to eliminate parking on the inside, and on most of the outside, of the green triangle itself. We urge the council to put double yellow lines in place around both the inside and outside of the triangle (other than on the outside of the north eastern side, where there are houses – see below) as soon as possible. We would also like to suggest that the short stretch shown in purple (“free for all”) on the north eastern side of the triangle should instead be blue (i.e. resident permit parking only between 11am and 1pm). At present there are regularly 6 – 7 cars parked along here, doubtless mostly commuters. Bank holidays, We are appalled at the prospect of traffic wardens ticketing at Christmas, Easter or other bank holidays. As the scheme is aimed primarily at commuters using the St Albans City Station, it should not need to operate on bank holidays. This is also a time when residents may well be entertaining extra visitors.Please would the Council agree and resolve as a matter of policy that parking restrictions in these areas will not be enforced on Bank Holidays. 3 Pricing for the “Pay by Phone” option,There was extensive discussion at the consultation open day as to where to pitch the “Pay by phone” price, currently proposed at £2.90. We think this is too low. The majority of people parking between 11am and 1pm on a “pay by phone” basis will be commuters, and for them the primary alternative is the station car park which charges upwards of £8.50 for the whole day or £3.65 if arriving after 10am. We think the “after 10am” station car park price of £3.65 is the absolute minimum that should be charged, and would prefer to see a figure nearer to £5.</p>
75	Jennings Road	<p>Firstly I am somewhat surprised that local householders find themselves being asked to consider 'new' parking proposals such a short period (~6 months) after the previous process concluded. Notwithstanding this, we have given the recent correspondence (dated 17 January 2020) (the Proposals) the due consideration that is requested.</p> <p>Our summary observations are as follows:</p> <p>The wonderful community that exists in Fleetville and the immediate surrounding areas has been created by its abundance of shops, churches, schools and other amenities. With this community comes a high volume of pedestrian traffic around the area. The suggestion to implement the Proposals gives us cause for concern. The Proposals as set out will lead to roads being saturated with parked cars and visual blind spots for the high density of foot traffic looking to cross the roads</p> <p>Woodstock Road, Jennings Road and Clarence Road are all main thoroughfares for the local area and the Proposals present an increased danger of cars seeking to navigate these roads and local householders entering or exiting their properties. Prior to the implementation of the recent restrictions, we found that driving in or out of our drive would in effect be turning into a 'blind spot'</p> <p>It is recognised the Proposals arise due to the challenges faced by Charmouth, Gurney Court and Battlefield Roads and as a resident of Jennings Road we are very much supportive of their request to implement parking restrictions. The points raised in this email are equally as relevant for the residents of those roads</p> <p>It should be noted that the points raised (1 to 8) in the Proposals remain equally relevant for the local roads not referenced but negatively impacted by the Proposals. The Proposals impact the whole of Fleetville and surrounding roads</p> <p>The simple solution remains that should people wish to use the local roads for parking, our suggestion would be that they make use of the main parking facilities at the station or find alternative means by which to travel to the station (e.g. foot, cycle or local bus network). The de minimis rate of £2.90 per day that is included in the Proposals does not even warrant consideration - it is in effect subsidised train station and city centre parking. The rate and more generally the Proposals are not acceptable.</p> <p>In summary, I ask the question of the decision makers - do we really need a serious accident in the local area for people to take stock of what is really being proposed here? It is the obligation of the local parking services to ensure our roads remain safe and free from the high density of daytime parking proposed.</p>
76	Gurney Court Road	<p>As a resident of Gurney Court Road I would prefer not to have parking permit restrictions, they cause problems for home owners and those working on the property such as gas engineers decorators etc. They can also negatively affect property prices. However proper marked bays would surely make parking safer especially in the roads currently affected by the residence parking, such as Sunderland and Park Road.</p> <p>I think however to charge for parking will only push the problem further back, and free parking in marked bays would be a more practicable solution. The no parking restriction between 11- 1 have caused and will continue to cause difficulties for those attending local church outreach activities and also the Fleetville Community Centre.</p> <p>These include Babies and Toddler groups, cafes ,and day care for the elderly, plus many classes etc at the Fleetville Centre many of which take place in the morning between 10 -12. Difficulties occur when the numbers attending exceed the car parking availability at the venue. Given the</p> <p>new proposals where are those attending supposed to park. In some cases they have small children or are elderly and do not live close enough to walk, especially, if they have to carry equipment etc. The parking issues are mainly caused by a lack of inexpensive parking at the station and this will not go away. Continually pushing parking, further back will not help or solve the problem. Are you proposing to have such restrictions over the whole of St. Albans. Given the amount</p> <p>of new homes being built in the area it can only get worse. St Albans is an attractive place to live and one of the plus points is the quick train service into London. If we consistently make this a difficult proposition it will eventually have the same negative impact as that seen on the High Street.</p>
77	Blandford Road	<p>Having looked at the Council's Proposals in the letter of January 17th I would ask that consideration be given to the following:-</p> <p>1. The basic unfairness in the cost of visitor parking permits - a two hour restriction period costs the same as an all day restriction. We would love to have an all day restriction period in Blandford Road.</p> <p>We are within walking distance of the largest commuter station on the Bedpan line. We are a residential road first and foremost - paying cumulatively a huge amount of council tax. Whilst being mindful of community cohesion we are not a free car park for local religious venues. These seem to generate a great number of activities and no doubt a large amount of income, They are well capable of affording and should be required to provide their own parking arrangements. Although the current restricted period 1.30 -3.30pm seems to work reasonably well changing it to an earlier period will cause disruption to everyone.</p> <p>2. The council should urgently consider creating a twenty miles per hour speed limit with signage etc. in the Fleetville ladder roads. This is particularly relevant to Blandford Road which is used all the time as a "cut through/ rat run"between Hatfield Road and Clarence Road.</p> <p>Blandford Road is an extremely busy road with a church and a funeral parlour. These create huge traffic flows with large numbers of adults, infants and babies entering and exiting parked vehicles.</p> <p>Activities for all ages take place every day throughout the day from 9am to 11pm.</p> <p>As cars park on both sides of the road it is in effect a one way road and caution is required at all times. There are currently regularly instances of drivers travelling at forty miles per hour plus to exit the road quickly before someone enters from the other end or just as a quick cut through to avoid the lights and the right turn at Hatfield and Clarence.</p> <p>3. Long term residents of Blandford Road have had to become adept at parking in small spaces as there is pressure on parking space all the time. This situation may not be helped by creating parking bays.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
78	Gleave Close	<p>1. Your proposal to allow Pay by Phone for public parking will be counter-productive in relation to many of the issues you have highlighted including access to private driveways and emergency vehicle access. The proposal will inconvenience the residents in the affected roads. It will in effect mean the public can pay £2.90 to cover the restricted time and also leave their cars all day. Commuters would do so and also those using St Albans City Station / 724 bus to go away on holiday will do so and continue daily to pay by phone when leaving their cars for extended periods thus severely inconveniencing the affected residents who would not be able to park their own vehicles nor those of their visitors for whom they will have paid for a permit to park outside their homes. The public would do so because it is nearly 3 times more expensive to park at the station car parks.</p> <p>2. The current scheme has resulted in commuters and others leaving their vehicles for longer periods to park in Woodstock Road North and also all day in Gleave Close, in the approach section of the Close, up to 9 cars have been parked there each day. This has meant our own visitors have been unable to park there because there is limited parking space further down around the corner outside the houses. Some Gleave Close residents own more than one vehicle. If parking permits are to be introduced in Woodstock Road North, permits should also be introduced in Gleave Close.</p> <p>These 2 amendments to your proposals are important, the inclusion of Gleave Close in the scheme and the removal of your proposal to introduce public parking (shared use parking).</p>
79	Woodstock Road South	<p>I am writing my concerns regarding the current version of plans for residents parking. I am sure you have received many emails, so below are the points I would like to be considered as we are already severely impacted by the current scheme and it will only be made worse.</p> <p>The proposal is set to remove 8 parking spaces for Woodstock Road South due to the implementation or extension of double yellow lines. Yet we do not have 8 less cars!, These areas are not a concern currently so there is no reason to add double yellow lines. Of particular interest to me are the ones outside 74/76 and opposite Brampton Road (on Woodstock Road North) which are continually used by residents who cannot park near their own homes at the moment. There are approximately 51 homes from Hatfield Road to Brampton Road on WSRS yet we only have approximately 46 spaces currently and you want to remove another 8?! And that number of spaces assumes people are considerate and capable at parking which they are not. You are stopping us parking on WSRNorth as it will be in a different zone. However for us residents in the section adjoining WSRNorth we rely on those spaces every day. You have made the north section of Brampton Road between Hamilton Road and WSRNorth a different zone to the south side - that makes no sense and again limits our parking spaces. Particularly as the houses on that side have driveways!. By offering public parking at £2.90 per day - and by phone which means they don't even need to be there - you are giving commuters a really cheap easy option to leave their cars there all week. Hardly fair on residents that pay council tax?</p> <p>I have resigned myself to the fact that I will have to pay for a parking permit. But the restrictions you are imposing mean I am paying for a permit that still won't allow me to park outside my house!. I really question if anyone has actually bothered so speak to residents, observe current parking? . The roads that currently have parking permits (Jennings, Churchill etc) are like ghost towns during the day - hardly a problem in the first place?. Allow Verulam School a number of permits for teachers/sixth form</p> <p>It is now virtually impossible for my elderly mother to visit during the day as she cannot park close enough to my house without a long walk</p> <p>Reduce the cost of daily parking at the station so it is used properly at an affordable rate so people are not trying to park on our roads</p> <p>I have had my car hit twice in the past month because cars are driving too fast or too carelessly down what has now become a one lane road. Our road in particular is used as a through road from Sandpit Lane to Hatfield Road - we have lorries, buses constantly driving fast.</p> <p>Increase the size of the speed humps outside our houses so they are actually effective and slow people down</p> <p>Can someone please advise if we can turn our front into a drive way? That would help with parking!</p>
80	Gleave Close	<p>I am a resident at Gleave Close St Albans AL1 4QG. I am very concerned that the above mentioned consultation doesn't include the cul de sac where I live, but the roads immediately around it are included.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that this needs to be addressed through a residents only parking scheme and am very disappointed that this street has been excluded from the consultation. Where do you think those wanting free parking will place their cars? What, we don't pay council taxes? We aren't suffering in the same way as the residents in Woodstock Road North? Should nothing but done to include Gleave Close I can assure you, the road will continue to be a hazzard to its residents. I will also add, we already have a great deal of congestion, and through this, the display of antisocial behaviours on our road. Thus far this year we've seen a significant increase in cars parked here, close to corners, on a road with a narrow entrance, disposing of their litter in the pavements/street/verge and urinating on our property for the quiet cul de sac that it is.</p> <p>I object to my road not being included in this consultation and ask of the council to immediately address this oversight.</p>
81	Homewood Road	<p>I welcome the additional traffic safety through double yellow lines at junctions and an end to the Charmouth Road bottleneck. I am not unhappy about more parking in Homewood Road because it will make the road safer by slowing the traffic. However the proposed restrictions in other roads will increase traffic speed, as seen in Clarence Road. Although not within the scope of your consultation I would like to see 20 mph limits on all residential roads.</p>
82	Brampton Road	<p>We would like to respond and give comments on the revised proposals as set out in your letter as residents of Brampton Road</p> <p>The current system of parking restrictions is working well. It is now possible to park near our house. The system prevents daily commuters from leaving their cars in our roads as well as preventing people using the roads around the station as long term car parks (for example for the airport)</p> <p>Splitting Zone P. We have not seen evidence of people driving from Sandpit lane and parking in roads near the station. Whilst this is theoretically possible, the number of spaces on, for instance Stanhope Road, is so limited that it seems unlikely that people would find an empty parking space. Whilst the current system works well, it is not always possible for residents of Brampton Road to park on Brampton Road and so it has been the case for many years that they have parked on Park Avenue. Splitting zone P into multiple zones with Brampton Road in Zone P1 and Park Avenue in Zone P2 would mean that residents of Brampton Road would not have enough spaces to be able to park. Please can you change the proposed scheme and put Park Avenue in Zone P1.</p> <p>Blandford Road currently has restrictions between 1:30 and 3:30 but the map shows the times as being changed to 11:00 to 1:00pm. It would be preferable if the timings on Blandford Road were to stay unchanged as this difference mitigates the congestion which can develop around lunch times and early afternoons, particularly on Fridays. With the variation in timings, residents who have difficulty in parking on Brampton Road, Park Avenue and the ladder roads at busy times on a Friday, can find spaces on Blandford Road. This is a valuable feature of the current restrictions.</p> <p>The introduction of shared use parking will not work unless the charge is set at the same level as the station car park. Non-residents will park in these areas and walk to the station to save even a very modest compared to the station car park charges</p> <p>Please can you modify the proposed scheme to take account of these points.</p>
83	Blenheim Road	<p>I am writing on behalf of the 5 adult residents at Blenheim Road in response to the parking review set out in your letter of 17th January 2020. Firstly, I wanted to comment on the positive benefits that Zone P has brought to the southern end of Blenheim Road in particular. This was one of the worst areas for all-day commuter parking and in particular inconsiderate/illegal parking prior to the introduction of the residents parking scheme. Zone P and the accompanying double yellow lines have completely resolved both of these issues and whilst the southern end of the road remains somewhat congested, it is with residents cars (most properties do not have off street parking) and within a volume that rarely causes an issue. I acknowledge gratefully that Blenheim Road is to be left untouched in the proposal and am fully supportive of this. However, I want to register my concern and my objection to any potential for scope creep in relation to the pay by phone solution being proposed for nearby roads. This is especially in the event that this particular proposal gains a sufficient level of objection from residents of those roads, causing the proposal to be adjusted. I am sure I speak for all households at this end of Blenheim road in saying that we do not want a return in any form to the issues we experienced previously. With the proximity to the footbridge, the Western end of Jennings Road and the southern end of Blenheim Road will be disproportionately hit if the pay by phone scope is allowed to creep to include us.</p> <p>When it comes to the cost of the pay by phone option, for anybody who has to currently pay £10 for a full days parking in the city centre or £8.70 at the city station, paying £2.90 to park on a residential street nearby is going to be a very attractive alternative. This will doubtless bring the blight of bad parking back to our streets, which was only solved just over a year ago. Whilst I understand this price level is set to cover the 2 hour window in which the zone operates, it is fundamentally flawed and completely misses the reality of how the zone will be used – namely all day on street parking for a fraction of the cost of the formal parking facilities at the station and in the city centre. Whilst I applaud the council for its innovative thinking on how to solve the issue, in my opinion this solution needs a complete re-think and at minimum a higher price point.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
84	Lancaster Road	<p>We live at Lancaster Road. I attended a meeting in the Council Offices some time ago and visited the exhibits recently.</p> <p>I object to the proposed parking restrictions in our road because they are unnecessary.</p> <p>The parking pressure first experienced in the ladder roads area and now on Battlefield and Lancaster Roads, and perhaps other roads too, are primarily caused by the intensification of rail services.</p> <p>All of this; the planning and design of traffic management measures, the meetings, exhibition and consultation you are now undertaking, further refinements and any eventual implementation will cost both the Council and residents, let alone the commuters who can't or won't park at the station and so park near us and walk the mile instead.</p> <p>Network Rail (NR) and Thameslink (operated by GTR) have longer and increased frequency trains and more are planned. The station is being remodelled to cater for the increased numbers of people who are using these services. All this is good, and benefits us all. However they are not catering for all of this in a holistic way; feeder bus services, necessary highway access and parking. The car parks at the station are never full and probably over priced. The one on Station Way was designed expecting more floors to be added.</p> <p>The Council would usually expect new developers in the district to pay for the full effects of their development on the surrounding areas. Network Rail and GTR should do likewise.</p> <p>I understand that the Council is unwilling or unable to address this directly with the NR and GTR but I do not accept that we and other residents will have to experience complex, unnecessary and inconvenient traffic management measures because they are not dealing with the full impact on communities of the increased service.</p> <p>If there is no legal recourse to force NR and GTR to cater for their passengers adequately, then I would be happy to assist Council leaders and Members to raise this at higher levels.</p>
85	Blandford Road	<p>We are residents of Blandford Road. We have read your letter of 17th January and its attachments. We have the following comments to make about the proposals -</p> <p>Split of existing zone P</p> <p>We do not agree with the proposal to split the existing zone P into zone P1 and P2. It will cause considerable difficulty to residents of Blandford Road, the other ladder roads and Brampton Road, most of whom have no off street parking. These roads are always full and certainly we have found that we are often forced to park in other roads (for Blandford Road it is normally on Park Avenue or Sunderland Avenue). That means that we can find ourselves parked over night in the proposed zone P2 and unable to move the car back into the proposed zone P1 before the parking restrictions come into force.</p> <p>We understand that residents of other roads may have complained about non permit holder residents of Blandford Road moving into Park Avenue and Sunderland Avenue when the afternoon restriction in Blandford Road comes into operation. Changing Blandford Road's restriction timing to be consistent with the other roads resolves that issue. We note the comment made about vehicles from the north of the zone putting pressure on roads nearer to the station. We do not consider that to be an issue around the ladder roads and Park Avenue and Sunderland Avenue. If it was we would expect York Road to be heavily congested: it is not.</p> <p>We therefore consider that the existing zone P (ie south of Sandpit Road) should remain in one zone We agree with the proposal that the extension of parking restrictions to the roads north of Sandpit Road should be in another zone.</p> <p>St Paul's Church parking issues</p> <p>We are aware that it has been suggested that more two hour parking spaces should be provided at the St Paul's (south) end of Blandford Road in order to accommodate church users. Blandford Road is the most congested of all the roads in zone P and it would be inappropriate to reduce residents' parking spaces even more.</p> <p>We strongly object to the introduction of more 2 hour spaces.</p> <p>Existing zone P parking vouchers</p> <p>We have a number of parking permits for zone P. How is it proposed that these will be dealt with?</p> <p>Conclusion, We are very concerned about the proposals. We consider them to be detrimental to Blandford Road's residents as they could result in residents finding themselves unable to park anywhere their own homes.</p>
86	Park Avenue	<p>In addition to signing the Park Avenue Residents' Association response, I would also like to add my personal request for you to reconsider the introduction of shared use parking in Park Avenue.</p> <p>When I gave my support to the idea of introducing Residents' Parking on my road (Park Avenue) it was in order to address my safety concerns caused by daily commuter parking, which often made pulling out of my driveway very challenging from a visibility perspective, particularly given the number of school children in the area. Park Avenue is a narrow road with very steep camber so there isn't a lot of room for manoeuvre. I chose the small 11am-1pm residents window in order to prevent commuters leaving their cars in the road all day, but to allow locals to come and go, including school traffic at Verulam School.</p> <p>Whilst I fully support the proposals to split Zone P into 4 separate zones, I have serious concerns about the introduction of the shared use parking in Park Avenue as this will put things right back to where they were before the Residents' Parking scheme was introduced in our road and i would not have voted for Residents Parking had I known this was a possibility.</p>
87	Clarence Road	<p>I am a resident of Clarence Road, which is one of the busiest streets in St Albans for commuter traffic. Traffic flow has greatly improved following the implementation of the Ladder Road parking restrictions, the street is safer and easier to navigate, especially for buses.</p> <p>Conversion of Clarence Road to Shared use parking bays – as this would allow commuters to park all day at a cost of £2.90, significantly lower than the station car parks, every available space will be taken by commuters from early in the morning. If these areas are truly intended to be shared between commuters and residents, they should be split between i) pay by phone between 11am – 1pm sections; and ii) clearly marked resident permit holders only between 11am-1pm sections.</p>
88	Salisbury Avenue	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> Firstly, may I commend you on your attempt to improve the congestion and inconsiderate parking issues that the most recent changes have brought. Current problems I see are: Traffic flow is very poor at peak times, and freeing up through routes is essential. This is particularly bad (for my journey to work) in Salisbury Avenue at the Eaton Road end, Eaton Road (dreadful!), and of the roads between Hatfield Road and Brampton Road, Woodstock Road South, Battlefield / Lancaster Roads,– the road is quite narrow and when cars are parked on both sides, even staggered from each other, it makes passing very difficult. Double-roadside parking right up to junctions and corners is making driving and manoeuvring quite difficult at times. Particular areas of concern for me are: Salisbury Avenue turning right onto Eaton Road – very difficult to see, particularly with cars parked around this corner. This is of particular concern to me as many schoolchildren cross at this junction. Sandpit Lane turning into Beaumont Avenue, particularly in the evening – cars parked on both sides make this a one car in or out junction which causes congestion and anger for waiting drivers</p> <p>All the roads mentioned in the traffic flow comment above. Introducing more payment to ladder roads and others on your map will simply result in cars being parked in the next free roads – you will simply move the problem to Salisbury and Beaumont Avenues. Residents should be able to park outside, or very near, their properties – without having to pay extra! Why should we have to pay so that others can park outside our houses because our town does not support them?. If you go through with your proposed changes, you will need to also make changes to Salisbury, Beaumont and other surrounding roads at the same time. Otherwise you will have achieved nothing but a translation of the problem! Therefore, please consider the following: In addition to any changes you make in your plan, restrict parking on Salisbury Avenue (and Beaumont Avenue and the equivalent roads at all the edges of the restricted scheme) to a single side of the road at any time. I do not believe you need to make these residents only / shared – residents cars would be in place before commuters arrive to go to the station / schools anyway, and most commuters / students would have left by the time residents return. Parking should self-regulate (particularly if you allow sensible parking back into the ladder roads) negating the need for any permits or payment. Also please “white-line” access to the numerous driveways along this charming, tree-lined historic avenue – this should prevent inconsiderate parking. For larger / wider roads in the Zone P current scheme, particularly where houses have a number of parking spaces on their driveways, release some of the restrictions currently on the road to allow parking there – a prime example being Jennings Road which is generally empty all day long, while Woodstock Road is double-parked towards the Hatfield Road end, causing significant interruptions to the traffic flow. Reduce the cost of parking at the station! Considering how much money will need to be spent in making your proposed changes and then employing traffic wardens to patrol the area – couldn't that money be used to subsidise parking at the station, or even to build further stories in the car park to pull car parking back to the place where it's needed, and off our residential streets!.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
89	Not Provided	<p>With regard to the parking review of zone P, we would like to feed back some concern on the proposed purple zone of shared parking on Woodstock road north, north of Jennings road.</p> <p>Given the extended no waiting/ no parking zones on either side of the road, this very small section will now need to accommodate residents from both sides of the street, as well as non-residents, whose numbers will inevitably increase due to displacement from Woodstock road south which is now being made a blue resident-only zone from 11am to 1pm.</p> <p>This will result in fierce competition for a few spaces, with inevitable nose to tail parking on either side of the road, increasing traffic hazard.</p> <p>Woodstock road north is already taken as a cut through road with many motorists exceeding the speed limits in spite of the chicane and tightly parked cars on both sides throughout most of the day will make matters worse.</p> <p>We would therefore ask for the zones currently designated as purple on both sides of woodstock road North to be changed to blue i.e. resident only, and ideally with some allocation for relevant side of the road.</p>
90	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> The proposal will remove 8 car parking spaces in Woodstock Road South, We are some 51 homes in Woodstock Road South from Hatfield Road to Brampton Road cut off. The scheme also impacts our ability to park in Woodstock Road North a natural over-flow for those in homes between Eaton Road and Woodstock Road North as well as those homes from Burnham Road to Brampton Road. It should be considered reasonable that we can park as close to our homes as possible to facilitate the loading and unloading of our vehicles. This proposed scheme is going to make this near impossible. You make no effort to afford us the much needed convenience to park outside or as near as possible to our homes. Many residents have young families and it can be very stressful having to park far from your front door. Capacity in our neighbouring roads is at its limit as can be seen in Burnham Road and Eaton Road where those residents clearly need to park their vehicles. There is no excess road space on Eaton or Burnham Road for our vehicles and it seems unfair that those residents not be able to park outside their home if Woodstock Road South residents are to park there as well. The proposed zones show Brampton Road at the junction with Woodstock Road South having the South side in Zone 1 and the North side in Zone 2. How can this be reasonable?. The offering of pay per parking in Zone 2 will now encourage commuter parking to seek out our area for all day parking. We have always argued that the parking issues felt in Fleetville area are, by and large, not commuters looking to park this far out. You. I believe this to be a very ill-conceived idea that will have ramifications not entirely thought through with this proposal and moreover will impact those residents on the edges of the Zone 2 to create a further issue in Zone 1 of lack of capacity. Much of the displaced parking on Woodstock Road South and North since the introduction of ladder roads Zone P was from Verulam school sixth form. In addition staff working at Fleetville Infant school have limited access to onsite parking and lunch time assistants frequently have to park on Woodstock Road South. It feels like the parking scheme is intended to hamper those who serve our community and come here to further their education. What provision are you offering for these vehicles? They will simply push out further past your zone and create congestion in the immediate roads outside the proposed zone. Since the introduction of Zone P in the ladder roads we have seen Jennings Road, Hamilton Road, Churchill Road, Sunderland Road and Park Avenue to be devoid of cars all day. Primarily the housing in these ladder roads have driveways and it became evident very quickly that the cars which previously parked there moved to Woodstock Road South and North as the restrictions started. The council is ignoring the fact that there is a requirement for people to park their cars in this area and again I argue this is by and large not station parking and is those serving and using our schools and community who clearly may not have the means to pay for daily parking or will find the added cost (£62.83 per month).</p>
91	Clarence Road	<p>Thank you for your letter of 17th January 2020 with enclosures.</p> <p>I apologise for the delay in replying but I have been seeking to ascertain clarification on the proposal to allow non residents to pay to park during the restricted period. As I now understand it, you will permit people to park in Zone P all day provided they pay £2.90 to park during the restricted period. This can only be seen as a regression to the bad old days when residents and their visitors were unable to park in front of their own houses as the spaces had filled by 7:30 am with commuters anxious to avoid the cost of parking at the station. It now costs over £8 to park at the station for the day so I am certain many commuters will wish to save over £5 per day by parking Zone P.</p> <p>On many occasions I felt extremely unsafe trying to reverse into my own drive as commuter cars were tightly packed in the spaces on Clarence Road, As the road is also now a bus route I feel that the proposed parking changes are an added risk to pedestrians, drivers and bus users.</p> <p>When we first moved to Clarence Road, there were no parking restrictions and commuters parked on both sides of the road in a truly unsafe manner, often parking so far onto the pavement that mothers with pushchairs could not pass. Various parking restrictions have been introduced and the current set are entirely suitable for the built up area in which we live, very close to a large secondary school, on the walking route to two local primary schools and adjacent to a recently expanded day nursery where the parents used to “park” on double yellow lines to drop their babies and small children.</p> <p>I appreciate that residents north of Sandpit Lane have not found the latest restrictions to their satisfaction but I don’t see this as a reason to revert to the “bad old days” south of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>I urge you to apply common sense and a sense of safety to this problem and leave things as they are in the current Zone P.</p>
92	Churchill Road	<p>As residents of Churchill Road, St Albans, we are writing to confirm that we are in agreement with the Churchill Road consensus view.</p> <p>Furthermore, we would like to reiterate our concerns regarding the parking proposal as it currently stands. It is clear to us that the available parking on Churchill Road would be fully utilised for Station commuter parking given the significant volumes of cars that choose to park on the the local roads rather than using the Station car park. We feel Churchill Road will be particularly busy given, under the new proposals, it will be one of the closest roads to the Station that would not have Residents Only parking.</p> <p>We agree the high volume of commuter based traffic that would likely park on the road under the new proposals would - as identified in your letter dated 17 January 2020 - effectively create a single track road with few real passing places; limit visibility from driveways; potentially block access to driveways; and be particularly dangerous given Verulam school is located at the end of the road. It does not strike us as particularly safe to have commuters parking en-masse on an otherwise quiet residential road at the same time as school buses and parents are dropping of hundreds of school children, particularly when other roads a few hundred yards away would have entirely residents only parking. It would also limit access for Emergency Vehicles. Churchill Road also has a number of houses that do not have off-street parking.</p> <p>In addition, it seems to us bizarre that the cost of parking on the road would stand at such a material discount to the current cost of parking at the Station, maintaining the incentive for commuters to avoid using the Station car park. We would also like to highlight that, in our view, the crux of all these parking problems lies in the pricing structure of the Station car park and the resultant under utilisation of spaces there. Having lived in St Albans for almost 15 years and commuted daily from the Station throughout that period, we believe a long term solution will ultimately have to resolve this issue (eg ownership of the car park addressed; pricing; available spaces etc). Given the significant increase in Thameslink capacity expected on a 5 to 10 year view, a more comprehensive solution will be needed.</p> <p>We believe a compromise solution would potentially include one side of the road being exclusively reserved for residents with permits (as it currently stands) and the other side being Pay-by-Phone, probably at a price point closer to that of the Station car park.</p> <p>We also think it would be fairer to have similar restrictions in all adjacent and local roads so as to spread the impact of commuter traffic around the area, as well as widening the “do not park” lines on residents drive ways to prevent encroachment.</p> <p>We would hope that any future changes to the parking rules are again put out for Consultation with a wide range of roads given the impact it has.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
93	Not Provided	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> Problems for cycling – Jennings Road</p> <p>The main problem is that parking on both sides of the roads creates a traffic lane width that falls into the ‘critical’ width band. At this width, there is a tendency for drivers to squeeze past cyclists rather than wait and overtake when it is safe to do so. STACC therefore objects to the proposals for Jennings Road. STACC suggests intermittent yellow line markings along both sides of the road. This is a 30mph road – STACC would prefer that all on-road sections of the Green Ring are 20mph. Double yellow lines at junctions – this may be a matter of scale on the drawing, but the double yellow lines on Jennings Road east of Clarence Road appear to be shorter than the current provision. Problems for cycling – Woodstock Road</p> <p>The current situation is very difficult for cycling, being a combination of ‘critical width’ conditions between parked cars on both sides and poor sightlines at junctions and on the hill between the road narrowing build-out and the Brampton Road junction. STACC supports the proposals. The double yellow lines at the Brampton Road junction are particularly welcome on the approach to the ‘choke’ between Brampton Road and Burnham Road. There needs to be space for road users to give way and let each other through the choke.</p> <p>Some other points – not part of the consultation, but relevant: Reducing demand for parking, Car clubs, Large SUV type cars, Speed limits – we hope that a blanket 20mph zone will be created for St Albans soon, Enforcement, Pavement parking, Parking on pedestrian crossing zig zags, Provision for van deliveries / uplifts. Conclusions:</p> <p>STACC mostly welcomes these measures that aim to balance needs of residents and alleviating parking pressures that are causing road safety problems, but we do have concerns. STACC requests that the creation of long stretches of parking on both sides of the road be designed out. STACC requests that double yellow marking at junctions be lengthy. STACC supports walking and cycling and requests that they be given priority in accordance with LTP4, and that the existence of the Green Ring be recognised in this scheme.</p>
94	Gleave Close	<p>I’m writing with regards to the consultation and parking review listed above. I am a resident at GLEAVE Close, St Albans AL1 4QG, just off Woodstock Road North.</p> <p>I, along with several of my neighbours in our close are concerned about the parking along GLEAVE CLOSE.</p> <p>The result of the previous parking updates along many of the surrounding roads (including Jennings Road) is now very obvious - we have cars permanently parked along the full length of Gleave Close, turning what was once a safe haven for our children into a dangerous car park scenario. On a side note, the amount of litter in our road has increased also - a direct result of the many cars now parked - we have witnessed those people parking regularly emptying their car litter onto the grass verge along Gleave Close. In short, the parking situation is no longer acceptable in our road.</p> <p>We have been sent the proposals for parking in the surrounding roads and notice that Gleave Close is NOT part of the new scheme. In short, If Gleave Close is left with no restrictions, then the current parking situation will absolutely get even worse - we are no longer prepared to live in a car park.</p> <p>So here is what we suggest:</p> <p>Collectively, we would like Gleave Close to become a Residents Permit Parking road.</p> <p>Many of the residents I have spoken to are very happy to pay for new parking permits for visitors.</p> <p>However, we would NOT like to include the Public Parking scheme for £2.90 a day. We are already experiencing people parking here and walking to St Albans station for free, and I think this would surely continue if they only have to pay £2.90.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing your response.</p>
95	Jennings Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> 1.The proposals will result in a return of all the parking issues in Zone P2. The proposed pay by phone (11-13:00) area in Zone P2 will simply result in a return of all the parking issues that existed before the current scheme was introduced. This is because rail commuters will be able to park all day simply by paying £2.90 for the 2h period. This is considerably cheaper than the station parking (£8.10/day) and will result in a considerable saving (£25 per week). This will be a particular issue in Park Avenue and Jennings Road (between Clarence Road and Woodstock Road) as these are closest to the station and just north of Zone P1 (Residents only 11-13:00). 2.The proposals will adversely affect the safety of the Verulam School entrance on Jennings Road.</p> <p>One unexpected benefit of the existing scheme was fewer parked cars on Jennings Road improved visibility and road safety around the Verulam School gate. The Jennings Road entrance is not the ‘back gate’ but is de-facto the school main entrance as it is used by the majority of pupils + staff. Its layout is totally inadequate for this purpose. The proposed residents’ parking 11-13:00 will result in Jennings Road being full of commuters’ cars (see point 1) with parking on both sides of the road all day turning a wide thoroughfare into a narrow one. It is difficult to understand why no single yellow lines (11:00-13:00) were proposed in Jennings Road particularly around the main school (vehicle) gate or along the school field kerbside. Single lines would prevent commuters from parking all day and result in some space for school drop-offs. 3.The proposals will adversely affect Community use of St Paul’s Church facilities. (Zone P1) and was surprised to see the proposal to switch the ‘residents only’ period from 13:30-15:30 to 11-13:00. proposed 11-13:00 restriction will seriously disrupt the use of the church hall facilities by the wider community five days a week while affecting the lettings income. I submitted a number of written comments including predicting that ‘Zone P’ restrictions would simply push the parking issue north of Sandpit Lane which is exactly what happened. Your current proposals for ‘Zone P2’ (Jennings Road/Park Avenue) will simply create a discounted station car park which will lead to a return to the previous parking issues (or actually worse) and will increase the hazards at the Verulam School entrance while the proposals for Blandford Road will adversely affect the community use of St Paul’s Church facilities. To add ‘insult to injury’ local residents will be paying to park in our own roads.</p>
96	Woodstock Road South	<p>Thank you for your parking review letter 17/01/20.</p> <p>I am a long standing resident of Woodstock Road South since 1990 and I will be hugely impacted by the proposed parking scheme.</p> <p>I have a number of concerns.</p> <p>The proposal will remove 8 car parking spaces in Woodstock Road South due to double yellow lines being implemented in 3 areas. 3 or 4 parking spaces at the T junction of Brampton Road/Woodstock Road opposite Brampton Road. This is frequently used by Woodstock Road South cars overspill. I have never been inconvenienced by people parking here and don’t consider it a danger as the traffic is either stopped or going slow prior to entering the Woodstock Road South junction between Brampton and Burnham Road where it is a single car section. May I point out that in the identical junction Jennings Road/Woodstock Road North you haven't given it double yellow lines. From Burnham Road to Hatfield Road we are losing parking which we presently utilise Sundays and bank holidays as well as in the evenings up to 8am. The small section that we were able to park is frequently utilised without causing in my experience any inconvenience to traffic flow.</p> <p>Prior to the ladder scheme Woodstock Road North was mainly utilised when Woodstock Road South, the first sections of Burnham Road, Eaton Road , and Brampton Road were fully occupied. I don't consider the parking of cars in Woodstock Road North needs to be out of bounds for Woodstock Road South residents. Could the section up to Jennings Road be included in the parking permit P1 scheme?</p> <p>May any of the parking restrictions be lifted on bank holidays and school holidays?</p>
97	Woodstock Road south.	<p>I’m writing to express my objections regarding the proposed change from single yellow lines to double yellow lines on Woodstock road south.</p> <p>We frequently use the single yellow line directly outside our house between the hours of 6.30pm and 8.30am.</p> <p>A while back when the road was resurfaced double yellow lines were put in instead of a single by error by the road workers. A few residents were in contact with Chris White to get the mistake corrected. It took a few weeks and in that time after 5 pm it was incredibly difficult to park - often having to go to Brampton road to find the nearest space. Then having the inconvenience of having to move it the following day before the permit restrictions kick in.</p> <p>I have concerns that this will be an even bigger problem for local residents if you continue with your plans to change all of the single yellow lines to double on Woodstock road.</p> <p>These single yellow line cause no risk or safely concerns.</p> <p>I would also like to highlight that we are very much in support of the permit parking - finally!</p> <p>It’s just the conversion from single to double yellow lines that we strictly oppose.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
98	Lancaster Road	<p>We are residents of Lancaster Road and are concerned about the proposed scheme as per your 17 January letter.</p> <p>We feel sure that the sections of parking that are for "Residents or pay by phone" will rapidly fill up in the morning as commuters park for the day at the low fee of £2:90 (parking at the station would be £8:70 before 10am).</p> <p>We expect therefore that by 1100 there will be no spaces left for residents to use when they have (say) carers, visitors, or builders requiring parking.</p> <p>We feel access protection lines should be provided to all properties free of charge. If the "pay by phone" charge was higher it could pay for this.</p> <p>We feel there should be some areas where parking is reserved for residents only.</p>
99	Jennings Road,	<p>Jennings Road is currently devoid of parked vehicles- apart from the odd residents vehicle- whereas surrounding roads (Woodstock Road North, Charmouth Road) are dangerously chocabloc with commuter parking.</p> <p>Introducing some parking on Jennings Road for commuters/Verulam Sixth-Formers seems sensible, just to alleviate the pressure on other roads. There are large sections of Jennings Road which could be parked without inconveniencing residents, f.e. the section along the hedge by Verulam School, and at the Woodstock Road end of Jennings Road. I believe that up to 20/30 cars could be parked in these areas. This would leave plenty of road for residents parking.</p> <p>£2.90 a day is a bit of a bargain though and is going to encourage people not to park at the station! I'd make it more like £4/£5.</p> <p>I am a resident of Jennings Road and feel badly for other roads that are now suffering heavy parking. But safety must be the key issue here.</p>
100	Eaton Road	<p>Please see the attached petition from the residents of Eaton Road, who based on the new proposals issued by yourselves in the most recent ladder parking consultation, would like to be included as a permitted road. There are 23 residents on our road, of which 19 have signed in agreement, making 83% in favour of parking permits.</p> <p>If you also require a hard copy of this petition, please let myself know and we will drop this round to the parking offices.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this email, as many of my neighbours have asked to ensure this petition is included in the consultation.</p>
101	Woodstock Road North	<p>I think that with regards to Woodstock Road North there is not an issue with parking, all houses have off street parking, and in a few cases the cars parked on the road do not cause any obstruction, they belong to the students at Verulam School, and they park from 9 am to 3 pm, only in term time, they are A level students and their term is shorter than the normal school term, during the holidays there are no student cars parked here; please also consider that every year there is a new intake of students and not all drive cars to school.</p> <p>It is also worth pointing out that there are no commuter parkers here, the station is over 30 minutes' walk away. Many commuters cycle to the station and pass along this road.</p> <p>In my opinion having some cars parked along the road helps to slow down the traffic, as they must sometimes give way to other road users.</p> <p>I will also say that when my children return form university for the summer break, they would have to park on the road, and if I have to pay £90 a year for them to park, I will just take down the Cherry tree in my garden, and pave my front lawn for their cars so that I do not have to pay this charge.</p> <p>In my opinion you should not be charging residents to park their cars, after all, it is obvious that the scheme is to push the commuters away, and I can't justify your charge.</p>
102	Woodstock Road South	<p>I am a long standing resident of Woodstock Road South since 1990 and I will be hugely impacted by the proposed parking scheme.</p> <p>I have a number of concerns.</p> <p>The proposal will remove 8 car parking spaces in Woodstock Road South due to double yellow lines being implemented in 3 areas. 3 or 4 parking spaces at the T junction of Brampton Road/Woodstock Road opposite Brampton Road. This is frequently used by Woodstock Road South cars overspill. I have never been inconvenienced by people parking here and don't consider it a danger as the traffic is either stopped or going slow prior to entering the Woodstock Road South junction between Brampton and Burnham Road where it is a single car section. May I point out that in the identical junction Jennings Road/Woodstock Road North you haven't given it double yellow lines. From Burnham Road to Hatfield Road we are losing parking which we presently utilise Sundays and bank holidays as well as in the evenings up to 8am. The small section that we were able to park is frequently utilised without causing in my experience any inconvenience to traffic flow.</p> <p>Prior to the ladder scheme Woodstock Road North was mainly utilised when Woodstock Road South, the first sections of Burnham Road, Eaton Road, and Brampton Road were fully occupied. I don't consider the parking of cars in Woodstock Road North needs to be out of bounds for Woodstock Road South residents. Could the section up to Jennings Road be included in the parking permit P1 scheme?</p> <p>May any of the parking restrictions be lifted on bank holidays and school holidays?</p>
103	The Park	<p>We are emailing with our commentary/objections with regards to the new ladder roads parking scheme which has been proposed.</p> <p>We live at The Park so whilst we are not currently directly affected by the original parking restrictions imposed on the ladder roads, we do find that the commuter cars now parking at the bottom of Charmouth Road are an issue – mainly because it is close to the roundabout and therefore dangerous, plus it's a bus route and naturally causes issues for the buses.</p> <p>With regards to the new proposals – we are pleased to see that you will be amending the restrictions on the ladder roads to allow commuters to pay to cover the 2 restricted hours. We think this is a sensible change, and believe that this alone will have a positive impact and would alleviate the current congestion at the bottom of Charmouth Road.</p> <p>Our key concern is why you have suggested the above changes as well as pushing the parking restrictions out so far north of the ladder scheme to cover the whole of Charmouth Road, Faircross Way and The Park (amongst other roads). As mentioned, we can imagine that your changes to the restrictions on the ladder roads will alleviate the issues somewhat anyway. So it seems a very costly exercise (mainly for the council!), a highly inconvenient as well as a permanent one, to also introduce the extended parking restrictions too to north of the ladder roads. In our opinion, this should be a phased project. Phase A should be to amend your original restrictions to the ladder roads which caused this problem (which you are already planning on doing), and see if that alleviates the problem. You could then have a review period after 6 months to see whether the proposal of pushing the parking restrictions a lot further out is in fact needed after all anyway. You could save yourselves a lot of time, money and effort by doing this in phases. It would be a highly inconvenient and costly project if it turns out that the restrictions were never actually needed on our road in the first place.</p> <p>We do hope that our comments are taken on board.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
104	Woodstock Road South	<b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> 1. There seems to be little difference between the proposals for P1 and the other zones affected by the overall scheme which translates into a belief that the Council is taking a 'one size fits all' approach to its remedy which though convenient, fails to respond to the demographic nuances that exist between zones/streets. I suggest the times when non-residents can park should reflect this to protect access to parking for peak times which I consider to be 5pm – 9pm when residents return from work and before they go to work in addition to the morning restriction proposed. 2. The proximity of Fleetville Nursery and Infant School generates another significant impact on parking. The school harbours a 3.15 club (business) which generates income and provides support to working parents from far out. It's my observation that parents are insensitive to where they park when collecting their children. They regularly park badly and in bays outside residents' homes instead of in the car park provided by the school. The employees of the 3.15 club similarly park outside residents' homes and not in the car park provided by the school. Parents frequently park illegally on the school side on the single yellow line before 6.30pm or on the double yellow line, which is what causes traffic congestion and heightened risk. This supports the need for an afternoon / early evening restriction and a conversation with the school to better manage their relationship and responsibilities to neighbours. 3. Removal of the single yellow lines seems counter-intuitive to the outcome we are seeking. This would remove 9 possible parking spaces when parking is inadequate. I notice no real impact on congestion during the times when parking is permitted (6.30pm to 8.30 am) when traffic is less than peak times. It is the illegal parking mentioned above during times when parking is restricted, that congestion primarily occurs. I believe one of the reasons removal of the single yellow line at the south end of WRS is being considered is because entry and exiting of the school car park is made difficult when cars are parked on the single yellow. I am confused by this because it does not add up as a rationale, reasons being that parking is not permitted during the times when the school and after school are accessing the car park. 4. I understand that there is a proposal to allow public parking at a charge of £2.90 per day. It appears again counter-intuitive if the outcome being sought is to ease the parking crisis and in so doing improve the quality of life for residents. It is likely to be cheap and attractive as an option for commuters. Should public parking be allowed I understand that it would generate income for either the council or its commissioned parking management service. On this matter, if residents pay the annual subscription to park and are unable to do so because of a public parking element to the scheme, would residents be rebated? 5. Streets in the vicinity of Jennings Road have parking restrictions as they are fortunate enough to have properties that have off-street parking and garages. I can't see what the necessity for this scheme was as parking for residents in these areas wasn't an issue. I strongly suggest that a public meeting be organised for residents affected by the P1 proposals to help fully inform plans through engaging with the experience of those living with the issue – I know a meeting was held a while back, but this was not at that time specifically relevant to those of us now engaged with this.
105	Clarence Road	I have read the proposed changes to the existing scheme from York Road to Sandpit Lane section and feel that the restrictions currently in place should remain unchanged. The proposed new scheme would see a return to all/day wall to wall parking from very early in the day (most people park for the station at around 6am) until into the evening. It would mean no parking again for local residents, visitors and tradesmen. But would be a great source of revenue for the council. Most commuters would be happy to pay £2.90 a day to park so close to the station. Is this just a way to make revenue for the council? I can't see any other reason to introduce paid parking allowing people to park all day? If the Scheme is to go ahead then it is important that some residents only parking bays are kept in all roads to allow residents, visitors and trades people to park.
106	Salisbury Avenue	<b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised</b> 1. Introduction of yellow lines and driveway white lines This will ease issues in the parking zone areas but the problems you are addressing will shift to just outside the zone where the limited free parking will be ever more sought after. The inconsiderate parking reported will worsen in these areas as a result. Salisbury Avenue is narrow and is already suffering from increased parking. If cars park on both sides of the road, even in a staggered pattern, then access issues quickly arise, with the risk that emergency vehicles cannot get through. Cars parked close to driveway exits make manoeuvring into and out of drives very difficult if not impossible. Our request: Introduce lines to restrict parking to a single side of the road along Salisbury Avenue and add white lines over driveways on both sides of the road. The width of the driveway lines should take into account the narrow carriage width and turning circle required to manoeuvre into driveways at right angles to the road - i.e. extend beyond the width of the dropped kerbs which are narrow, providing a clear visibility splay to cars entering and exiting driveways. I would expect swept path analysis to be carried out in order for the correct width of driveway lines to be determined, given the unusually narrow carriageway present. Consider staggering the double yellow lines in sections - one side and the other, in order to slow traffic. 2. Shared use parking Before implementing the ladder parking you acknowledged that many of the cars parked on these roads were from school parking as well as station users. We do not believe that your proposal for shared use parking will encourage school users to return to these roads to park. Instead they will simply move to the next road outside the scheme. If free parking were re-introduced, instead of having large residential areas completely devoid of parking during the day, and moving the congestion ever further out, there would be an even distribution of parking throughout the ladder roads scheme, without impacting on residents either within or outside of the scheme. Our recommendation: release areas of the existing roads out of the parking scheme altogether to allow free parking bounded by clearly demarcated areas of no parking. Allow some areas of resident-only parking in these roads. This free parking should extend to all roads incorporated within the existing and proposed restricted parking scheme where there is a good provision for off-street parking present. The only roads where no free parking should be allocated are those where no off-street parking is present such as Harlesden Road, Brampton Road, Burnham Road and so on. These roads should be limited to resident permit holders only, supporting those residents who are most impacted by commuter and school parking. In addition to this, where the provision of on-street parking is allowed on both sides of the street, an assessment of carriage width, visibility splays, passing points and so on needs to be made to all roads to ensure safe access by all road users. Where road widths are restricted, whether inside or outside the parking scheme, on-road parking should be limited to one side of the road only. An example of this is Woodstock Road south - parking is allowed on both sides of the road in the evenings (with single yellow lines on one side of the road). This currently results in cars parking over the badly lit and narrow pavement - obstructing and endangering pedestrians.
107	Lancaster Road	We have lived on Lancaster Road since the summer of 2011, There were no problems with traffic flow and safety prior to the introduction of the Ladder Roads Scheme because there was very little or no commuter parking. However, with the introduction of the Ladder Roads Scheme, I appreciate that there is now an issue that needs to be addressed. Whilst the problems are currently limited to the southern section of Lancaster Road I agree that, if restrictions are only imposed on the southern section, then the commuter parking will simply be displaced to the northern section. However, any restrictions that are imposed should be kept to a minimum so as to reduce the risk of adversely affecting residents who have, until now, been able to park on the road without any restriction. Whilst all of the houses on Lancaster Road have off-street parking for at least one vehicle (many having off-street parking for two), on-street parking remains important for visitors and tradespeople etc. My suggestion would be to replace the single yellow line no waiting restrictions with resident only parking bays (during the restricted times). I understand from my conversation with Gary that you are unable to simply replace the proposed no waiting restrictions with resident only bays because this could lead to challenges against enforcement action that are likely to be upheld on grounds of confusion. However, Gary did say that it would be possible for one side of the road to be subject to resident only restrictions and for the other to be shared use. This would be the best solution. Adopting this approach would spread the commuter parking along the length of Lancaster Road, but would retain some on-street parking for residents at all times. If a resident was expecting a visitor or tradesperson during the restricted times, they would be able to park their own car (assuming they have a resident's permit) on the street so that the visitor could park on their driveway, or they could give the visitor a permit to allow them to park on the street. The attached photographs and screenshot show how little resident parking takes place on the northern section of Lancaster Road. Allowing parking on both sides under such an arrangement is unlikely to cause any disruption to traffic flow or safety issues as there will still be plenty of passing spaces on the resident only side of the road. There would, however, still be a handful of cars parked on the resident only side of the road, requiring traffic to stop to allow vehicles to pass, which would help prevent excessive speeding (which is a problem, given that Lancaster Road is a wide, straight cut-through from Sandpit Lane to the King William IV junction). Even if you consider that such a solution would not work along the whole length of Lancaster Road, I suggest that it would be an appropriate solution on the northern section between the junction with Battlefield Road and Sandridge Road. There should be no concerns about challenges against enforcement action based on confusion because the double yellow lines around the Battlefield Road junction would give a clear break between the different regimes. I would also encourage you to reduce the length of the restricted period.. Finally, I note that you are still deciding whether to undertake any further informal consultation before making a final decision as to how to proceed with the implementation of the scheme.

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
108	Charmouth Road	<p>SAFETY WHEN ENTERING AND EXITING OUR DRIVEWAY (Charmouth Rd)</p> <p>This has been our main concern since the increase in parking on our road. We have had near misses and had to brake suddenly due to the lack of visibility of cars emerging from Faircross Way, the congestion of cars parked outside and opposite our house (including being parked too close to our driveway), and the speed at which some cars drive down Charmouth Road. The situation of our house and its proximity to Faircross Way mean that being able to reverse onto our driveway safely when cars are parked both in front of and opposite our house is very difficult. We have to reverse onto our driveway because reversing out onto Charmouth Road during rush hour periods is too dangerous. However, even pulling off the driveway forwards with cars parked to the left of our driveway and opposite makes it both slow and difficult to turn left due to the narrow angle and space and our vision is often obscured to any cars coming out of Faircross Way.</p> <p>The proposed markings on the plan outside our house are unclear. Our driveway is on the left as you face the house from the road and there is space to park one car between our driveway and the boundary which also has its driveway on the left. The double yellow lines appear to go beyond the boundary so would not allow proper space for a car to park outside our property, tempting drivers to park partway across our driveway. Our preference is that the double yellow lines continue up to our driveway, and for the permit parking to start from outside number. This would resolve all the issues of reduced visibility of the junction, blocked access to our driveway, and reduced visibility entering and exiting our driveway. I attach annotated pictures showing this, with both your plans and a snapshot from Googlemaps.</p> <p>PROPOSED COST FOR PARKING</p> <p>We feel that the proposed cost of £2.90 will not be sufficient to encourage more commuters to park at the railway station. £4 would be more suitable as most would be leaving their cars on the road for the whole day and well into the evening.</p> <p>SIGHTLINES AT T-JUNCTIONS</p> <p>It is worth considering for a moment the ease for cars to emerge from a T-junction and whether it would be safer for the no-waiting 11am-1pm zones (marked orange) to be on either side of the junction so that looking left and right for oncoming traffic when emerging from a junction is made easier. The plans currently indicate a mix of arrangements at junctions.</p> <p>GRASS VERGES Many commuters have parked their cars very inconsiderately, not only partly across driveways but also on the grass verges which make many of the St Albans roads so attractive. These verges are deteriorating as a result. It is acknowledged that construction vehicles are also partly to blame. Is it possible to address this?</p> <p>Otherwise on the whole we feel that the proposal is an improvement on the current situation and are pleased to see the effort and consideration that has gone into the consultation.</p>
109	Blenheim Road	<p>We are strongly opposed to the proposals as outlined which amount to a money-raising project for the Council, to be funded by the dismantling of the present residents parking scheme and the return of all-day commuter parking. The Council proposes a charge of £2.90 to cover the two-hour chargeable period. Given that the daily parking charge for St Albans City Station is £8.15, it seems overwhelmingly probable that commuter parking in Area P will very quickly return to previous levels.</p> <p>The basis for the extension of Zone P to its present form was that it was desirable to remove all-day commuter parking from a residential area where it was raising safety concerns as well as presenting problems to residents including obstructed driveways. It is hard to see why all-day commuter parking in a residential area should now be regarded as compatible with traffic safety concerns etc, provided that drivers pay for it.</p> <p>There is a case for extending the present Zone P to the roads outlined in the consultation, but only on the basis of the existing Zone P scheme. The Council was very remiss in failing to anticipate (as was pointed out at the time) that the extension of Zone P would shift all-day commuter parking to north of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>We oppose the proposal to split Zone P into sub-zones (P1, P2 etc). We do not believe that there is any significant use within Zone P by residents to drive to other parts of the zone for a--day commuter parking, and note that the Council has not provided any evidence to suggest that there is.</p> <p>Should the changes to Zone P go ahead, we would support the proposed exclusions, including of Blenheim Road on the basis of a) its proximity (via the footbridge) to Lemsford Road for the City Station; b) the significant number of houses in the road with no off-street parking; c) the narrowness of the road in places, and d) the previous saturation levels of all-day commuter parking.</p>
110	Homewood Road	<p>I have significant concerns about the safety of the junction/ intersection between Homewood Road, Sandpit Lane and Woodstock Road North 'as is'. As you will be aware, there have already been several accidents at this junction. What you may not be aware of is the much larger number of near misses. I have 2 young children who I walk to school each morning. I frequently witness the backed-up traffic, drivers failing to stop for pedestrians at the Sandpit Lane crossing, and drivers whizzing across this junction when not safe to do so.</p> <p>In addition, when there is an event on at the Homewood Road Church, both sides of Homewood Road get clogged up with parked cars. Residents find that their drives are often blocked by inconsiderate parkers. The impact is that it makes it harder to approach the junction there being few passing places and it is difficult and dangerous to exit the Church premises and residential properties as a result of reduced visibility due to the parked cars. This is currently a problem on certain days at certain times.</p> <p>There are already parking restrictions/ double yellow lines on Woodstock Road North on both sides of the road as you approach the junction with Sandpit Lane. As a minimum, I feel the same should be implemented on Homewood Road</p> <p>Concerns about the impact of the proposals</p> <p>I am concerned that the proposal as drafted appears to omit Homewood Road from the restrictions. The inconsistent treatment of Homewood Road compared to other neighbouring streets, I believe will result in a significant amount of displaced cars choosing to park on the south end of Homewood Road (as closer to the school and railway line). This will exasperate the parking issues by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-increasing the volume of parked cars on Homewood Road</li> <li>-increasing instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking as they are fewer/ no other free parking options close by</li> <li>-increasing congestion and reducing the number of places to pass</li> <li>-reducing visibility at road junctions and property entrances;</li> </ul> <p>which will further diminish safety at this already dangerous junction, and, I believe, significantly increase the chances of a fatality at this junction.</p> <p>Request</p> <p>No indication has been given of the reason for deciding to treat Homewood Road differently to neighbouring roads. All the points 1-8 on pages 1 to 3 of the 17th January 2020 letter apply equally to Homewood Road.</p> <p>Please amend the proposal so as to treat Homewood Road consistently with other neighbouring roads. Please mirror the proposed plans wrt double yellow lines and restrictions for Woodstock Road North onto Homewood Road.</p> <p>Alternatively, please set out clearly the reasons for the decision to treat this road differently to the others with which it forms a natural local group.</p>
111	Woodstock Road North	<p>I am a resident at 61 Woodstock Road North and received your parking consultation document and I have the following feedback.</p> <p>Generally I am opposed to the new scheme.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The new purple zones outside my house mean I would have to have a paid shared parking permit to park outside my own house the same as any visitor. And anyone can now park for £2.90 all day. This appears to sponsor parking in our road not deter it. Firmly against this measure.</li> <li>- You also plan to introduce single yellow restrictions in Woodstock Road North (WRN) further increasing the demand for spaces, displacing current usage. This does not appear to benefit anyone.</li> <li>- Since the recent parking restrictions were introduced (already a poorly implemented scheme) which displaced all the school parking in Jennings Road right into WRN. What should have happened is to allow school parking outside Verulam school (there are no houses on that side of the road obviously). The proposed scheme just makes things even worse, where will the 6th formers now park?</li> <li>- from the maps it appears the 2 parking spaces directly opposite my house will be replaced by double yellow lines removing these spaces. There are precious few spaces at this end of WRN so this does not seem a useful step - they are used all the time. Along with the new single yellow line introduction this just reduces available parking dramatically.</li> </ul> <p>I was not in favour of the last set of parking restrictions - I think it has made the parking situation in WRN and the surrounding roads worse. This further encroachment of restrictions increases competition for spaces, seems to sponsor visitor parking over residents and doesn't seem to improve anything.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
112	Homewood Road	<p>We are writing in response to your consultation, dated 17th January 2020, on the parking zone issues in this area. We agree that there is a need to do something as the current situation, particularly on Charmouth Road, is dangerous for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>We broadly support your proposals, which seem well thought-through and fair to both commuters and residents. Hopefully many of the people who are currently parking on these roads because, understandably, they do not want to or cannot afford to pay the high, monopolistic parking charges at St Albans City station, will use the 'pay by phone' parking spaces and, given those are spread throughout the area in your proposals, there should be less build-up of parked cars in any one area.</p> <p>We live on Homewood Road and are concerned that some commuters will still decide that they do not want to pay any parking costs, and there will therefore be a spill-over of some parked cars onto Homewood Road, which is still within walking distance of the station. There are already traffic problems on Homewood Road, with cars and vans using the road as a cut-through, driving at speed, and visibility down the road and at the junction with Faircross Way, can be limited when there are a lot of cars parked (typically when there is one of the regular events on at the Homewood Road church). For example, turning into or out of drives near this junction (particularly if reversing), can be challenging, with cars turning out of Faircross Way at speed, or otherwise speeding along the road.</p> <p>In that regard, we are concerned that cars being parked by commuters on a regular basis near the Homewood Road junction with Faircross Way, and with Sandpit Lane, will exacerbate the existing concerns outlined above. While we believe extending the parking scheme to the whole of Homewood Road at this time is not necessary (or could be re-assessed in the future once the proposed framework has been in place), we would ask that you consider extending the yellow lines 'no waiting at any time' along the west side of Homewood Road from the junction with Faircross Way, for further than indicated on the consultation diagram, given the concerns outlined above.</p>
113	Gurney Court Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised</b> we live at Gurney Court Road (Zone P 3 Area 2). My wife has an S M I (severe mental impairment) which is permanent and has been registered with St Albans City Council. I am her 24/7 carer and have been taking care of her for over 10 years. We have a blue badge and receive the full attendance allowance. In these circumstances we both have 'protected characteristics' under the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>How our residential road has been ruined by parking for commuters When the first parking proposals were introduced our road was transformed for the worse for some residents. Only about 25% of the southern end of Gurney Court Road was severely affected; the remaining 75% at the northern end was left virtually unchanged. Why was this? This has changed our lives and left us miserable and frustrated. Our friends, often elderly or disabled, cannot visit us; no one drops in to see us, because there is nowhere to park. We hoped that the review would improve the situation, but for us the new proposals will make this grim situation even worse. We have been selected on our side of the road as a long passing place which means that we will never be able to park in front of our house, whilst our neighbours on the other side of the road will have residents parking. There will be intolerable consequences for us. Every week we have health professionals who come to treat my wife to support her health and well-being. They need but do not have anywhere to park: a physiotherapist and a personal trainer who are invaluable to help her maintain her physical and mental health. There are others who also need to visit us from time to time: friends and family, our cleaner, a chiropodist, a hairdresser, tradesmen and a gardener. We are worried that we may lose these people because it is impossible to park. We feel cut off, isolated and victimised. None of our needs as people who share 'protected characteristics' are being met in these proposals. Every day it takes me several hours to get my wife up, showered and dressed, take her to the toilet, to give her her breakfast and daily medication. Our regular visits take place at about 10.30 onwards and may last until 1.00. People cannot park outside our house and, if they do, they are likely to receive parking fines. This is not acceptable and will have financial and other consequences for us. We feel trapped in our house and denied the satisfaction of all our basic needs. We are imprisoned by these proposals. The effect of the proposals on me and my wife's physical and mental health. My wife had a life threatening stroke on 23rd December 2009. She was unable to walk unaided and she has problems which affect her perception of the world around her. Until the implementation of the first parking proposals she was able to walk in the house with help and she enjoyed going out in the car to have a change of scene and get some fresh air. Since the first implementation of parking plans her condition has deteriorated. Her walking has got worse. She cannot go out of the house. She suffers from increasing anxiety, panic attacks, depression, stress, fear of falling and mental deterioration. She is now at serious risk of falling with potentially serious injury. The changes you have implemented and your new proposals have been devastating for both of us. Formal protest and complaint. We have no idea how you may intend to make our lives better, but things need to change. Whatever you decide, it seems to me that we need to have a protected area for two cars to park outside our house for disabled parking and where regular visitors who are necessary for our health and welfare can also park without unfair financial costs and penalties. If nothing acceptable is offered, I shall use the provisions of the Equality Act 2010 to support a formal complaint.</p>
114	Gurney Court Road	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am a house owner at Gurney Court Road - zone P3 (Area 1)</p> <p>We have lived her now for nearly 30 years , and parking on the road has never been a problem until the displacement of station car parking came into real focus over the last 6 months.</p> <p>The problems are well understood , and the issues arising are self evident.</p> <p>The proposals are I suppose , a case of just having to do something to counter a problem (as far as Gurney Court Road is concerned) , did not exist until very recently.</p> <p>(a) The "double yellow" proposals at the bottom of the road , (Sandpit Lane) ,are welcomed - as this has been a source of some concern due to some very poor parking by station bound commuters , leading to incursion onto the grass verges and serious reduction in sight lines. I am surprised there has been no action by local Police officers as I thought there was some ruling about parking right onto dotted "give" way lines.</p> <p>(b) In terms of GCR itself , the concept of "pay parking" in itself will presumably move the problem further down the road from the junctions - (by and large it tends to be up to about no 36 or so) , but on both sides. Your proposals will almost certainly cause "Parking drift" - but on one side. Walking distance to the station is around 20 mins at a steady pace , prospective station users will have to make a judgement about further extending their walk - and paying in effect £2.90 for all day parking. (as opposed to paying nothing !)</p> <p>(c) Putting in a total "resident only" policy - with no £2.90 option north of Sandpit Lane would prevent this issue.</p> <p>(d) What plans do you have for enforcement of your proposals ? (I assume the recruitment of more parking wardens)</p> <p>(e) There are certain areas - the section of Gainsborough from Clarence Road on the south side - for example - could accommodate about 10 cars to no detriment (in my opinion) - as there are no affected houses on that side of the road.</p> <p>There may be other sections where some compromise may be possible. There have been some censuses carried out by various groups.</p> <p>I hope that you take these comments on board.</p>
115	Charmouth Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised</b> The council has proposed a combination of no-waiting and residents/paid-for parking on Charmouth Road. While we believe this an appropriate solution for the section of Charmouth Road south of Faircross Way, where there are safety issues due to commuter parking on both sides of the road, the middle and north parts of Charmouth Road would be better served by residents parking on one side and residents/paid-for parking on the other side. No-waiting restrictions are not required on Charmouth Rd north of Faircross Way, as there are no safety issues. We live at Charmouth Road, on the corner of Harptree Way, and have no access to off-street parking. There are 4 houses at the corners of Harptree Way, Therefore the occupiers of the 3 other houses have to park on Harptree Way. The council has proposed residents/paid-for parking on both sides of Harptree Way. We believe that this parking should be a combination of residents only parking and residents/paid-for parking, with the residents/paid-for parking preferably being in the middle part of the road and the ends for residents only. We would also like to bring to attention the following issues: 1. The introduction of no-waiting parking on Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road would likely cause an increase in parking by residents of those roads on Harptree Way. This may affect our ability to find a space on Harptree Way, especially in the evening when we do not want to be forced to park in the middle section of Harptree Way, where there are no houses and it is dark and quiet late in the evening. Removal of the no-waiting stretches on the middle and northern parts of Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road would reduce this risk that we will be unable to park or will have to park in an unsafe area late at night. 2. The introduction of residents/paid-for parking on Harptree Way is likely to help this situation. We believe that the charge of £2.90 for a 2 hour parking window is too low. The vehicles paying the 2 hour parking will be commuters who are parking for the whole day and commercial companies who leave vehicles that they are not using for days at a time. We believe that charge should be at least £3.50, which is still significantly cheaper than the railway parking, but is more likely to deter long term parking of commercial vehicles. Visitors to residents or commercial vehicles doing work on residents houses will be able to use the residents visitors parking permits. The council has proposed a residents parking permit is £20.17 for one vehicle £70.04 for a second , although a single permit can be rotated between two vehicles. We do not have off-street parking to the front of our house as we are on the corner and also there is a post-box to the front. We have to park both of our cars on the street and sometimes we have to park both vehicles during paid-for parking times. As we cannot have off-street parking, we believe the council should provide us with a second residents parking permit for the same cost as the first and certainly no more than £40 for the second permit. £152.82 is also excessive for a third permit for households with no off-street parking at this distance from the city centre. These are family homes with 4-5 bedrooms and multiple occupants including teenage children. Residents should not have their parking impeded by commuters to that extent, especially when the designated parking at the station is underused. We understand that areas south of Sandpit Lane will have parking regulations changed from Residents only to Residents/Paid-for parking under this proposal. Whilst this will bring commuters back into these areas, we would like to point out that there are a significant number of houses on these roads with off-street parking. Having paid-for parking in areas with off-street parking will have less impact than in areas where there is little or no off-street parking such as Brampton Road. We believe that the introduction of paid-for parking across all the areas will share the burden of commuter parking more widely and is therefore appropriate.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
116	Monks Horton Way	<p>I am very concerned that Monks Horton Way has been left out of the planned restrictions while roads all around are included. That would, inevitably, divert more parking into what is a narrow street with many driveway access points. There is already very limited safe and non-obstructing parking space. I very much hope that the final proposals can be amended to include appropriate safeguards for the roads currently not included.</p> <p>In addition to these comments, I would draw your attention specifically to the junction of Monks Horton Way and Sandpit Lane. Sightlines here are very restricted at the best of times and it is potentially dangerous if there are vehicles parked at the head of Monks Horton Way close to the existing yellow line restriction. This section of road becomes only wide enough for one car and, especially coming from the west, it is impossible to see if it is clear to turn until the last minute. In 2015, I was involved in an accident on Sandpit Lane when a following car expected me to turn into Monks Horton Way but I had to stop because another car was coming up Monks Horton Way on the wrong side of the road to pass parked vehicles. If, as I fear, additional parking is moved into Monks Horton Way this will become significantly more of a problem. I would suggest that, as an absolute minimum, the existing double yellow line restriction at the north end of Monks Horton Way be extended, on both sides, for approx. 50 metres – as far as the first house on the right (number 34).</p>
117	Gurney Court Road	<p>At the present time, the South end of Gurney Court Road is often congested as a result of commuters having been displaced from the other side of Sandpit Lane, where there are often almost empty roads due to the recently introduced Parking scheme. However, the current congestion only extends as far as about the first 30 houses in Gurney Court Road and it is my impression that, in actual fact, the number of cars parked there has reduced since the initial migration from the other side of Sandpit Lane. There is currently very little commuter parking beyond that point as it is a good 20 minute walk from there to the station. I would suggest that there would be very little call for commuters to add 40 minutes onto their working day.</p> <p>Parking for the rest of Gurney Court Road is largely confined to casual visitors and trade visitors such as building contractors working at particular addresses. Most of the houses in Gurney Court Road have off-road parking for 2 and, often, 3 cars.</p> <p>I can see no justification at present, therefore, for parking restrictions in Gurney Court Road apart, possibly, from the extreme South end, and I would suggest that a better arrangement for the Zone on the other side of Sandpit Lane would solve most of those problems.</p> <p>The only immediate need that I see, relates to the safety issues resulting from cars parked around the triangle at the South end of Gurney Court Road, which do present a danger for other cars entering and exiting from Gurney Court Road into Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>On a more general issue I fail to see the logic of the proposed charging system for the restricted bays for a limited period in the middle of the day. If Pay by Phone is permitted, under the proposed restrictions this would enable cars, in fact, to be parked all day for a charge of £2.90. As I understand it, this charge can be paid from any remote phone and does not require the presence of the driver to get a ticket and install it in his/her car. The proposed charge of £2.90, therefore, will certainly not be sufficient to deter all-day commuter parking but will merely create a nuisance for casual visitors in the middle of the day. It would be better to have all day restrictions at a smaller hourly rate (say £1 per hour), which would allow casual visitors to park for a short time but deter all-day parking.</p> <p>Consequently I would suggest that:</p> <p>a)PARKING SHOULD BE PROHIBITED around the triangle at the junction between Gurney Court Road and Sandpit Lane – FOR SAFETY REASONS.</p> <p>b)Adoption of any scheme for the rest of Gurney Court Road should be DELAYED pending assessment of the effects of the new arrangements to the South of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>c)Any subsequent scheme should only apply to areas WITHIN 15 MINUTES COMFORTABLE WALK FROM ST. ALBANS CITY STATION, which, in the case of Gurney Court Road would only include the extreme South end.</p> <p>d)It would be better for the restrictions to cover a WIDER DAILY TIME PERIOD but at a LOWER HOURLY RATE resulting in all-day parkers paying a total approaching the Station Car Park charge of £10 per day to park all day on the street but allowing casual visitors to park at a cheaper rate for short periods</p>
118	Faircross Way	<p>In principle, we broadly support your proposed parking changes for our road, Faircross Way, and adjacent roads in Zone P3. However, this is on the basis that you implement the proposed changes in Zone P1 and P2, where you are proposing to relax the current arrangement of “resident parking only”, and to change parts of these zones to “shared use parking”. This will allow the public to park in designated bays as long as they pay a fee for the 2 hour restricted period and thus will provide a more reasonable distribution of parking through the area.</p> <p>Our view is that the proposed parking fee of £2.90 for the 2 hour restricted period per day is much too low. There needs to be a reasonable balance between road parking and station parking. We believe that £2.90 is too heavily biased towards road parking. There is a strong likelihood that it will cause a large amount of extra road parking as current station parkers will be encouraged to park on the roads due to the significant saving parking fee (8.70 – 2.90 = £4.80). We would suggest a 2 hour parking fee of £5.99 to achieve a more reasonable balance.</p> <p>Our only other comment on the parking proposals for Faircross Way is that there is a short section of overlapping (double) parking outside No. 15 (approx.). This is the only section of double parking I can see on any of the roads and so assume you will correct this.</p>
119	Hamilton Road	<p>Further to your letter of 17th January 2020 please find my comments / suggestions on the Ladder Road Consultation.</p> <p>We live at Hamilton Road and before that in Brampton Road , so have been residents in the area for nearly 25 years so have first hand knowledge of the issues .</p> <p>We attended the open forum and raised the following concerns and were asked to communicate these to you via email.</p> <p>One of the main reasons for the introduction of the parking restrictions was to remove the commuter parking from the residential roads and force them to use the under utilised station car parking facilities.</p> <p>The introduction of the current parking restrictions has alleviated this problem in the ladder roads but appears to have caused an issue in the roads to the north of Sandpit Lane . The proposal to introduce “pay by phone” on the majority of the ladder roads will have an immediate reversal of the use of the following roads for commuters Clarence Road , Park Avenue , Hamilton Road , Jennings Road , Sunderland Avenue and Churchill Road. This is a massive step backwards and only benefits the commuters . All these roads are through roads and will have the same issues of traffic build up , including emergency vehicles not being able to pass safely, that you say is now an issue to the north of Sandpit Lane .</p> <p>Also , why aren't all roads being treated the same ? Why should York Road , Gainsborough Avenue ( both no through roads and benefit from adequate off street parking for residents ) , Jennings Road (west of Clarence Road ) and Blenheim Road not have pay by phone ? Why are these roads receiving preferential treatment ahead of the ladder roads mentioned above they should have pay by phone as well ? All of the previous issues of commuter parking are now being pushed onto the ladder roads east of Clarence which will now become the commuter car park of choice for those people currently not using the station facility and this will encourage further commuters to join them as the walk to the station has been reduced along with a reduced cost implication . This is a win for the commuters and those roads with no pay by phone.</p> <p>With regards to the proposed charge of £2.90 , this is totally inappropriate and will not act as a deterrent to park but will actually have the opposite effect of encouraging more commuters to leave the station car parks and return to use the ladder road. This will lead to added congestion , unsafe driving conditions in an area with school children and make the usage of these roads more difficult for emergency vehicles. This charge needs to be similar to the station charging.</p> <p>Have you discussed with the car park operators a reduced tariff for their facility which would increase usage and encourage commuters to park away from the residential street.</p>
120	Homewood Road	<p>Having read your Documents dated 17th January 2020 and attended the forum in the Council Offices I would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>Problem analysis appears to be there are insufficient car parking facilities close to St. Albans station.</p> <p>Solution, build a Multi-Story car park on the land close to the station. This appears to have been mooted before perhaps it should have happened.</p> <p>Solution, lower charges at current station car park as this car park is rarely full.</p> <p>Regarding the current proposal, it would appear to me that we will only be pushing the current problem further away from the station which doesn't solve it but imprisons more and more of the St. Albans residents in a complex mix of yellow and white lines. The proposed charge of £ 2.90 to cover the two hour restricted period does seem rather cheap. If it was similar to the charge administered in the station car park then that would seem fairer or alternatively, lower the charges at the station to attract maximum use there.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
121	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> You propose double yellow lines in front of my house, where admittedly I can rarely park. Traffic at Woodstock Road South is sometimes slowed down at the narrowing in front of my house. It is the purpose of the narrowing to slow traffic down, so that's not surprising. I have very, very little experience of traffic being unable to get through – I find that the narrowing brings out the best manners in drivers generally - and I have never been aware of an emergency vehicle not being able to get through ( and given that my husband and I are home a lot, you'd think I would have noticed that, what with the sirens, if there were a problem). I really don't see why someone has come up with the idea of putting double yellow lines here. If you want the traffic to stop slowing here, then remove the narrowing and reduce the speed limit to 20 miles per hour. That reduced speed limit would be compatible with our street being part of St Albans' Green Ring. In fact, why not reduce the speed limit everywhere in St Albans? It's something that lots of people want, unlike your new proposal. If you are genuinely worried about emergency vehicles being able to travel easily in St Albans, I would have thought the bottleneck close to the cemetery on the main thoroughfare that is Hatfield Road is much more important. And although I can see the point of making parking opposite our houses during school hours illegal (though there doesn't seem to be any penalty for those who park there during the day), I don't see the point of restricting it further during the evenings. There is not a problem driving along Woodstock Road South in the evenings. There is no need to restrict our parking further. And how will those in the Fleetville Swing Band get their bulky instruments to their evening rehearsals at Fleetville Infants School if you put double yellow lines across the road from me? You propose introducing difficulties to residents and disincentives to healthy activity without good reason. I have considerable difficulty parking near my house, it's most likely residents from my street and nearby who are taking up the parking spaces. The houses here are of a width that approximately one car can park for each house, except where there's a lowered curb. If residents had only one car per household (not the case) it would only take one skip or one extra car to make parking difficult. I am not convinced that residents-only parking here will address my parking difficulty. I accept that you may want to introduce residents-only parking as a means of raising funds for the council or to create a disincentive to households to have more than one car, and actually can't get heated about whether you make me pay for parking my car near home. However, your proposal to remove parking spaces on Woodstock Road South is of considerable concern to me as it would exacerbate our difficulty parking enormously, such that I think I will often not be able to park within 5 minutes walk of my house. I suspect that even the bay system you propose is likely to make things worse. If you want to do something helpful, why not encourage people not to drive at all (a reliable bus service after 6.30pm would help so that people know they can get home if they don't drive to work), do more to encourage people to share cars on the way to the station, encourage people to cycle rather than drive (that 20 mile per hour limit would help) and encourage and support the setting up of car pools. That's the sort of thing I'd like our council to do. Your plan to reduce parking spaces on my street doesn't make any sense but does create a headache for me and my neighbours. Please don't persecute people without off street parking as an over-reaction to the concerns of people with it. I hope you abandon your proposal. I have not heard anyone speak in support of it but have heard several speak against it. If you insist on persevering with it, I request that you call a public meeting</p>
122	BLANDFORD ROAD	<p>Although we live outside the part of parking zone P directly addressed by your letter of 17 January, we feel it cannot go without comment. Personally I have always been critical of this means of controlling parking, as it leads to the extraordinary degree of complication we now see, fails to provide a single new space for a growing population of cars, continually displaces the problem outwards, as your letter tacitly admits, and infests us with wardens and the unduly cumbersome bureaucracy of gaining permits to park where the local authority searches carried out at the time of house purchase assumed we would be able to park freely. I note too that your analysis appears to ignore the extent to which off-street parking is possible in individual streets/roads. The deficiencies of the scheme are seen in Point 6 where it is suggested that residents of Sandpit Lane could park in Stanhope Road. The benefits are no doubt income accruing to St Albans District Council, which is not alone in running such a scheme, but I think it might be better to invest in a car park near the station, and charge for it, thus providing further parking space and revenue, while allowing the Council to release parts of its constituency from the controlled parking zone.</p> <p>However, I do not expect to see such an outcome, and comment on the existing proposals.</p> <p>At points 2 and 8, your solution seems most unlikely to address the problem of blocked driveways, and you need a better, perhaps more Draconian one, such as removal of the offending vehicles.</p> <p>The net effect of your proposals would appear to be a reduction in freedom to park as zone P is to be subdivided, i.e. the area of parking available to a permit holder will be reduced. If so, it is not frankly addressed by your letter as it would be unlikely to be approved by recipients. A letter should be sent, with the for subzones clearly marked on a single map of smaller scale.</p> <p>However by the mechanism of 'shared use' it appears that parking may be re-displaced from the newly affected areas back to the original Zone P, including Blandford Road. But parking has now become difficult in this Road, and I would protest against any scheme making the situation worse.</p> <p>There are apparently proposals to provide extra two -hour free parking close to St Paul's Church, for pilates classes etc. This would disastrously affect our ability to park in this Road. In fact St Paul's Church is a considerable nuisance as regards parking as churchgoers monopolise the Road on Sunday mornings and residents have to park outside the road – elsewhere in Zone P. This, more than anything else, requires Council control.</p> <p>Finally, I must comment on a matter not raised in your letter, re parking on Hatfield Road close to the junction with Blandford Road. Parked cars to the east (in front of St Paul's Church) are a considerable danger as they effectively block visibility in both directions. An accident will, not may occur here unless parking is forbidden.</p>
123	Not Provided	<p>We write to express our opposition to the proposed changes in parking arrangements set out in Parking Review (Zone P), 17th January 2019. In particular, we oppose the suggestion of introducing shared parking in the proposed Zone P2. We believe this would result in unreasonable pressures on the residential roads in Zone P2, pressures which are avoidable given that there are better alternatives to address the apparent shortage of parking spaces for commuters.</p> <p>The case for the proposed new controls is based on the problems faced by residents of the Proposed Zone P3. These problems stem from the combination of a) the parking controls introduced by the Council and currently in place in Zone P b) the absence of disincentives to parking in Zone P3, stemming from the lack of parking controls there c) the reluctance of commuters to use the purpose built car parks at the station, stemming from the level of charges currently in place. We believe the problem faced by Zone P3 can be solved more simply and more effectively than the proposed changes by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• disincentivising parking in Zone P3, through a mix of controls and charges</li> <li>• at the same time, working with the car park operators to encourage use of the full capacity of station car parks through reduction of the daily charge.</li> </ul> <p>We were shocked to learn at the recent consultation event that typically 300 places are vacant each day at car parks at the station when commuters are choosing to park in Zone P3.</p> <p>We do not understand why it has not been possible for the Council to convince the car park operators to drop their charges in their own financial interests. We are puzzled that it appears the car park operators cannot see the logic in reducing their charges so as to fill the large numbers of currently vacant places, and so significantly increase their turnover.</p> <p>We are concerned at this seemingly inexplicable failure of the car parking market to function in the city in everyone's interests. We can't help but wonder if there are other factors at play. Does the Council have grounds to envisage a reduction in the availability of car park spaces at the station in the foreseeable future, perhaps a plan for some form of alternative use of the car park land that is undermining the obvious case for the operators to reduce their prices? Even if these concerns are unfounded, the problem in Zone P3 could surely be addressed simply by introducing controls there, while leaving the existing controls in place and unchanged.</p>
124	Faircross Way	<p>I am writing in response to your recent letter outlining proposals to revise and extend the parking restrictions in Zone P and Marshalswick South.</p> <p>My family and I reside at Faircross Way and have been adversely affected by the current Zone P restrictions. While the proposals appear to be an improvement on the current situation, reducing commuter and other public parking on our road in return for some added restrictions on residents, we are concerned that there will in fact be no change to the level of cars parked on our road.</p> <p>The proposed cost for members of the public to use the parking bays is £2.90. We do not feel this will be a sufficient deterrent for commuters when the alternative at the station is £8.70, still offering a saving of £5.80. We and other residents feel a minimum cost of at least £5 is necessary to have an impact. Otherwise the new proposals will fail to solve our issue while still imposing restrictions on residents.</p> <p>By the way, we do not believe that the £1.30 for visitor parking should be increased as well.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
125	Not Provided	<p>Whilst I agree that some change is needed simply moving the problem from Lancaster Rd/Gurney Court Rd/Charmouth etc to our street is not a fix and not a net benefit to residents. It simply repeats the mistake of the last scheme but by paralysing alternative streets. Churchill rd is also parallel with a secondary school exit and already congested enough at school drop off and pick up. You will bring the area to a complete halt with this plan. I will cease using my drive as I will be 'boxed in' by station parkers. You will then be flooded with a new wave of requests for change.</p> <p>We also do not understand the criteria being applied whereby comparable (in fact much quieter safer) streets near us such as Gainsborough and York get complete protection (along with others closer to town such as Cunningham Ave) meanwhile our street is seen as an appropriate target to become the new problem area. Why? It feels discriminatory particularly in light of the fact we are a busy cut through and have houses with no drives on our street. What purpose does being in a residents zone serve when literally nothing has been left for residents or local use? If the problem is going to be solved you need to take a larger number of streets (including those named above) and allow station parking on limited sections of each eg as suggested in the Churchill consensus proposal. Ideally this would not equate to more than 1/4 of the spaces on each street. That way no individual street becomes paralysed, traffic can flow and the problem is solved by being spread widely enough around the area rather than forever just being moved a few streets further on.</p>
126	Churchill Road	This email is to confirm that we agree with the consensus view being submitted by Churchill Road.
127	Not Provided	I just had a resident call from Guerny Road to complain that there is a huge traffic jam on both Guerny Court Road and Charmouth Road due to the new Clarence Road Scheme. He said that there were lots of people who could not get out of their drive and there were lots of cars trying that were stuck on those roads. Clarence Road was free with no cars. He tried to call the parking dept to report this but could not get through to anyone.
128	Gurney Court Road	<p>We write as residents of Gurney Court Road and wish to register our strong objections to the Zone P Parking review scheme as it is currently proposed for Marshalswick South (north of Sandpit Lane).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic not being able to pass.</li> </ol> <p>There is no such problem in Gurney Court Road. The road is never fully parked and passing places are always easily available.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Blocked Access and 4. Reduced Visibility.</li> </ol> <p>Allowing pay by phone parking effectively circumvents any restricted period, making a nonsense of it. Anyone can park all day and pay by phone from wherever they happen to be at 11am for a mere £2.90 per day. This plan seems to have no discernible purpose and also removes any benefit which residents might gain from having residents permits.</p> <p>The result will be that parking bays with pay-by-phone parking will fill up with public commuter parking and cars parked from the other side of the road where there are yellow lines.</p> <p>The proposed scheme therefore greatly increases the likelihood of blocked driveways and reduced visibility to residents pulling out of their driveways. This will make any existing problems (which are minimal) considerably worse.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Under-utilisation of Ladder Roads.</li> </ol> <p>The introduction of shared use parking to the roads north of Verulum School will obviously reduce pressure on the roads north of Sandpit Lane, thereby likely obviating the need for a parking scheme there. It would therefore make more sense to review the proposal again when it is possible to consider the impact of this change, before introducing an unnecessary scheme north of Sandpit Lane.</p>
129	Glenferrie Road	<p>My comments on parking Review (Zone P) as a resident of Glenferrie Rd are as follows:</p> <p>I welcome that the parking restrictions on our road are being kept. These have made a huge difference to the ability of residents to park their car. Many of us have small children so this improvement has meant a lot to us.</p> <p>However the road is still pretty much at capacity even for residents and so the change to the spaces between the Methodist church and Hatfield road are disappointing. We appreciate the need to have some parking for local businesses but the fact residents cannot park in these spaces except on Sundays will make the rest of the road pretty squeezed.</p> <p>It would also be good to look at the lines that were painted following the restrictions. There is a 'disabled' bay outside number 12 Glenferrie road which is not needed/required as far as I know. And the lines around the Methodist church are very conservative in terms of space needed here, meaning another one or two spaces are lost here. Every space counts on our road!</p> <p>Many thanks for your continued efforts. Overall we welcome the restrictions that were introduced last year.</p>
130	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> I am not happy with many of the proposals set out in your current consultation and set out my objections below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The plans to place double yellow lines outside my house and that of my neighbours at number</li> </ol> <p>This is entirely unnecessary. At the moment there are double yellow lines on the other side of the street (which are justified as they are on a corner) and this allows for motorists to pause in the space to allow oncoming cars to come through. I have lived here for more than 20 years and this is not a safety issue. By removing these spaces you are removing two/three much needed parking spaces in an already crowded street. You are also proposing to remove an amenity from my house and that of my neighbours without justification. Some years ago (about 22 years) the council proposed placing double yellow lines here and there was wide scale objection to that proposal and it was discontinued. <li>2. The plans to place double yellow lines outside 24 and 26 Woodstock Road South This is unnecessary.</li> <li>3.The plans to place double yellow lines outside 7 and 9 Woodstock Road South instead of the current single yellow lines. This is unnecessary.</li> <li>4.The plans to place double yellow lines outside numbers 2 and 4 Woodstock Road North. This is also unnecessary</li> <li>5. The plans to place double and single yellow lines in Woodstock Road North</li> <p>This will lead to a huge reduction in parking in an already high demand area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Splitting Zone P into zones P1 and P2 I object generally to this proposal, as the split in zones is arbitrary and does not take into account the scarcity of parking in Woodstock Road South, Arthur Road and Burnham Road which are closer to most parts of the proposed zone P2 than most of P1. It will also lead to more pressure on Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue</li> <li>7. Bargain basement prices for commuter parking in Zone P2</li> </ol> <p>The proposal appears to be (the consultation document is very unclear) that members of the public can park in zone P2 for a daily rate of £2.90 (which will cover the restricted part of the day). This is significantly cheaper than parking at the station and will have commuters flocking to our streets in large numbers. That, together with the double and single yellow lines you propose, will increase the issues rather than reduce them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Public holidays It seems the scheme still applies on public holidays.</li> <li>9. Marked parking bays I feel that this may help alleviate the issues as I have seen many park inconsiderately but given that it will be expensive, I suggest that you trial this plan in several streets first to see if it is worth the additional cost.</li> <li>10.Knock on effects of Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue</li> </ol> <p>As with the previous scheme, this scheme will kick the can down the road and cause parking problems for residents of these streets. It is still a reasonably easy walk to the station and parking costs at the station are exorbitant.</p> <p>Conclusion The proposals go too far. The removal of safe parking spaces is unnecessary and will have an adverse effect on residents, the splitting of the parking zones is likely to lead to further difficulties (particularly placing Woodstock Roads North and South in different zones), as will the cheap parking spaces. Please think again.</p> </p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
131	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> I am not happy with many of the proposals set out in your current consultation and set out my objections below:1.The plans to place double yellow lines outside my house and that of my neighbours at number</p> <p>This is entirely unnecessary. At the moment there are double yellow lines on the other side of the street (which are justified as they are on a corner) and this allows for motorists to pause in the space to allow oncoming cars to come through. I have lived here for more than 20 years and this is not a safety issue. By removing these spaces you are removing two/three much needed parking spaces in an already crowded street. You are also proposing to remove an amenity from my house and that of my neighbours without justification. Some years ago (about 22 years) the council proposed placing double yellow lines here and there was wide scale objection to that proposal and it was discontinued. 2. The plans to place double yellow lines outside 24 and 26 Woodstock Road South This is unnecessary. 3.The plans to place double yellow lines outside 7 and 9 Woodstock Road South instead of the current single yellow lines. This is unnecessary. 4.The plans to place double yellow lines outside numbers 2 and 4 Woodstock Road North. This is also unnecessary 5. The plans to place double and single yellow lines in Woodstock Road North</p> <p>This will lead to a huge reduction in parking in an already high demand area</p> <p>6.Splitting Zone P into zones P1 and P2 I object generally to this proposal, as the split in zones is arbitrary and does not take into account the scarcity of parking in Woodstock Road South, Arthur Road and Burnham Road which are closer to most parts of the proposed zone P2 than most of P1. It will also lead to more pressure on Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue 7. Bargain basement prices for commuter parking in Zone P2</p> <p>The proposal appears to be (the consultation document is very unclear) that members of the public can park in zone P2 for a daily rate of £2.90 (which will cover the restricted part of the day). This is significantly cheaper than parking at the station and will have commuters flocking to our streets in large numbers. That, together with the double and single yellow lines you propose, will increase the issues rather than reduce them.</p> <p>8. Public holidays It seems the scheme still applies on public holidays.</p> <p>9. Marked parking bays I feel that this may help alleviate the issues as I have seen many park inconsiderately but given that it will be expensive, I suggest that you trial this plan in several streets first to see if it is worth the additional cost.</p> <p>10.Knock on effects of Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue</p> <p>As with the previous scheme, this scheme will kick the can down the road and cause parking problems for residents of these streets. It is still a reasonably easy walk to the station and parking costs at the station are exorbitant.</p> <p>Conclusion The proposals go too far. The removal of safe parking spaces is unnecessary and will have an adverse effect on residents, the splitting of the parking zones is likely to lead to further difficulties (particularly placing Woodstock Roads North and South in different zones), as will the cheap parking spaces. Please think again.</p>
132	Not Provided	<p>I don't like what has been proposed. I would like the same restrictions as my neighbouring roads - Brampton and Jennings i.e. residents only over lunchtime. That cleared their roads of parking very nicely. Unfortunately that was at our expense because people moved their cars to Woodstock Road North. Your proposal won't solve that, people will simply pay to park over the lunchtime period.</p>
133	Woodstock Road North	<p>My main comment concerns the proposed designated Purple Zones along Woodstock Road North.</p> <p>I believe that this will result in significant problems for residents, road users including pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•As a result of the current Ladder Road regulations there has been a significant increase in the number of cars parked in Woodstock Road North (WRN), mainly cars used by Verulam School pupils and commuters;</li><li>•The introduction of “Pay to Park” for non-residents and “Shared” parking for residents with the extension of the proposed parking restrictions for the Ladder Roads South of Sandpit Lane and the introduction of parking restrictions to the roads North of Sandpit Lane will lead to an increase in both part-time and all-day car parking in WRN;</li><li>•School pupils with cars can easily circumvent the parking restriction 11.00 -13.00 by moving their cars to Homewood Road or pay for all-day parking;</li><li>•in addition to the above the introduction of parking restrictions – parking for Residents Only in Woodstock Road South will lead to a significant increase in all-day parking in WRN by owners, employees and customers of the shops restaurants and businesses in Fleetville;</li><li>•WRN is a busy throughout route for Schools, the Morrisons Supermarket and local shops in the Fleetville area. At School starting and closing times there are queues of cars throughout the length of WRN from the Jennings Road intersection to the major junction of WRN, Sandpit Lane and Homewood Road.</li></ul> <p>The consequences of the Purple Zone Proposal for WRN will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•An increase in nose-to-tail parking either side of house drives making it dangerous for exiting/entering;</li><li>•Parking on both sides of WRN road will make it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists;</li><li>•Reduction in available spaces to allow passage for cars travelling in opposite directions;</li><li>•Delays as a result of cars queuing to exit WRN will cause motorists extreme frustration and impatience with the danger of accidents at the Junction of WRN, Sandpit Lane and Homewood Road: because of its configuration and lack of visibility this must be one of the most dangerous junction in St Albans District.</li></ul> <p>I recommend the extension of Double Yellow Lines in place of the proposed “Pay to Park” for non-residents or, at the very least, the removal of the “Pay to Park” Purple Zones and the introduction of Single Yellow Lines.</p>
134	14 Churchill Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> We ask that the needs of local users are balanced against the demand for affordable station parking.Safety• Safety is a particular concern for Churchill Road because of the close proximity of the secondary school (specifically its rear exit) and the heavy use of the road by pupils, staff, parents, school buses. We feel that the implementation of the 'as is' proposal would be an accident waiting to happen for a school child and other pedestrians. It would become a single track 'rat run' with residents having to pull out 'blind'. Access for emergency vehicles will also be restricted. Residents' access• A move to double sided station parking will leave no room on our street for residents, their visitors or local use. This is of particular concern for the 20ish houses on our street with no drive. There is little value being part of a residents zone when nothing is reserved for residents.• Solid parking both sides also creates practical and visibility issues manoeuvring in and out of driveways. Some residents will park their cars on the road to avoid getting 'boxed in', thereby reducing spaces available.</p> <p>Pricing point • We feel that a charge of £2.90 per day would mean that this became very cheap parking when commuters would be using it for potentially 12 or more hours per day. Sharing the load In keeping with the ask that the parking is shared around more evenly, York Road, Gainsborough Avenue and the West end of Jennings seem to be underused and should take some fair share of the station parking. These streets are just as wide as ours but unlike ours are not busy through roads. They also have drives for every single address (unlike Churchill Rd). York Road doesn't even have houses on one side so the double yellows are particularly illogical. There is confusion as to why these streets have been allocated 'P1' which elsewhere has been reserved only for streets with few or no drives. We would ask you look again at this seemingly preferential treatment. We would also suggest that other roads, especially around the school are reviewed. For example, under the current proposal Jennings Road would become an extended single-track road and virtually impassable at school drop off and pick up times. There is also scope for 'school only' zone along Jennings Road alongside the school frontage. Churchill Road Consensus Proposal. The Council proposal will have the effect that Churchill Road will become single lane for an extended period and create significant safety and access issues for pedestrians, cyclists, drivers and residents. Our preference would be to keep the parking controls on our street as they are now, which is what we agreed with after extensive previous consultation periods. If this is not possible, we would suggest that the parking controls at least reflect a balance to address the above concerns.</p> <p>Our suggestions are: 1. there should be one side for residents only (and visitors using a day permit) and the other side for shared use parking (paid parking/residents/visitors) with some sections on this side being no parking at any time to facilitate the free flow of traffic. Restricted hours to continue 11-1pm. 2. this two-sided regime be adopted in other roads in this zone, particularly those around Verulam School, 3. the parking charge be increased to a level much closer to the station car park full daily charge (about £8) particularly given we know there is plenty of available space in the station carpark; and 4. the white lines at the front of drives are extended to improve ability of residents to use their drives and avoid residents having to pull out 'blind'. Again, failure to do this may well result in an accident. See attached for details of those who have confirmed this view</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
135	Sunderland Ave	<p>As a resident of Sunderland Avenue, we have signed up to the road's response with regard to the Sunderland Ave proposals. I write now as it has just been brought to my attention that it is proposed to bring the parking restrictions on Blandford Road in line with the rest of the area ie 11 am to 1 pm.</p> <p>Obviously prime concern to you will be the views of the residents of Blandford Road. However, I would like to express my concern about this change. For many years I have attended a Tuesday morning class at St Paul's class followed by coffee at Fleetville Larder. The group is all over 60 years, some over 70 years and some over 80 years old, with varying health and mobility issues. The Tuesday routine where the exercise and the social interaction are of equal importance is key to the wellbeing of this group of a dozen or so people. It also provides regular and valued custom at a relatively new local business (Fleetville Larder). I am most concerned that this very important part of the week for all the group is going to be compromised by the proposed parking restrictions in Blandford Road from 11 am. The group comes from different parts of the district so the ability to park and to park relatively close to the church/Fleetville Larder are essential to continuing these key health and wellbeing activities.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would take this view into account and, if you do decide to go ahead and make Blandford Rd parking restrictions compatible with the other ladder roads, ensure that there are additional free parking bays made available – more than is currently proposed.</p>
136	Woodstock Road North	<p>Thank you for your letter of 17th January proposing solutions to various parking problems that have been raised with you.</p> <p>These are the major difficulties we continually face.</p> <p>Loss of Visibility driving out of our driveway, especially with vans parked outside our home. Attempting to reverse our mobility car back into our driveway, with cars parked right opposite us. Safety for all concerned from speeding vehicles.</p> <p>The Density of homes (flats) at the North end of WRN increasing our neighbourhood parking requirements. Ease of parking for visitors.</p> <p>Stage 1: The earlier introduction of chicanes only exacerbated the above problems in our busy road!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Some parking spaces for the flats were re-located outside our property.</li> <li>•A good number of drivers were challenged to drive even faster.</li> <li>•The chicanes were not well lit!</li> <li>•As a result a car parked outside our home was damaged, and our own was written off.</li> </ul> <p>Stage 2: The more recent introduction of major parking restrictions in Jennings Road,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•has multiplied the number of cars parking – on both sides of WRN – leaving a single lane for moving vehicles.</li> <li>•It has greatly exacerbated the problems mentioned above most of the time.</li> <li>•In fact cars are now parked even closer to our driveway,</li> <li>•and even at times partially obscuring our exit/entrance.</li> </ul> <p>Stage 3: I notice that you are now proposing “purple” controls on the far side of the road opposite our driveway, and “orange” controls on the near side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Your new scheme does not really help us (or our neighbours).</li> <li>•In fact it is legitimising continuous dense parking outside our property.</li> <li>•Multiple regular paid parking on the far side of the road would continue the above problems.</li> <li>•Banned parking on the near side would continue the difficulties outside of 11am to 1pm.</li> </ul> <p>We are heavily involved with the local activities of Parkinson's UK, and we also (as do our neighbours) provide regular hospitable social activities for other friends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Many of these visitors are elderly and disabled.</li> <li>•Restrictions in parking nearby will make our property more difficult to access.</li> <li>•There appears to be no provision for DISABLED parking.</li> </ul> <p>It would be greatly appreciated if you would take these comments into consideration.</p>
137	Blenheim Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b>I'm writing in response to your letter of the 17th January 2020 entitled, 'Parking Review (Zone P) Ladder Roads...' . We have summarised the views of the four adult residents (John, Caroline, Lottie and Amy McAlister) in Blenheim Road below. Please acknowledge receipt of this response.</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to make a comment on the the consultation in general. The proposals attempt to resolve the problems caused by the introduction of the Ladder road scheme and the foreseeable - in our view - displacement parking to the boundaries of the scheme. The proposed solutions are broadly:</p> <p>To introduce single and yellow lines to prevent parking that may restrict emergency vehicle access, To break up Zone P into smaller zone, To allow non-resident parking into zone P, To introduce residence parking scheme around the boundaries of the scheme.</p> <p>Taken together, our view is that these proposals: fail to address the main issue which drove the need and implementation for/of the Zone P; are poorly designed; and, run counter to the opinion of the residents of Zone P. Taking these points in turn:</p> <p>Failing to address the main issue - extended non-resident parking</p> <p>Poorly designed proposals, The proposal run counter to the residents views</p> <p>On each of the specific proposals we would like the following detailed comments considered.</p> <p>With reference to parking issues in Mashalwick South - North of Sandpit Lane, Marhsall's Drive,Battlefield and Homewood:</p> <p>Proposal 1: Yellow lines - we support the introduction of single yellow lines only in the areas where you have proposed double yellow lines; and we do not support the introduction of double yellow lines until the idea of extending Zone P has been trialed</p> <p>Proposal 2: Share parking with residents and public - we strongly object to the non-resident parking element of this because it will simply reintroduce the problem that the introduction of Zone P has resolved, Proposal 3: Double yellow lines at junctions - we support this issue</p> <p>Proposal 4: Shared use parking - we strongly object to the introduction of the non-resident parking element of this because it will simply reintroduce the problem that the introduction of Zone P has resolved. With reference to existing Ladder Road area and original Zone P:</p> <p>Proposal 5: Shared parking use North of Veralum school - we strongly object to this proposal because it will simply reintroduce the problem that the introduction of Zone P has resolved</p> <p>Proposal 6: Splitting Zone P - we strongly object to this proposal because no evidence is presented to identify cross zone resident parking as an issue, Proposal 7: Yellow and double yellow lines east of Zone P. Strongly opposed. There is no clarity or specification for this proposal and we object until it is made clear what the impact might be.</p> <p>Proposal 8: Blocked access - the proposal refers to Item 2 which is not relevant to the issue. Again we strongly oppose this issue.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
138	Battlefield Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> Present situation</p> <p>As the Council acknowledges, the current situation is deeply unsatisfactory. Every working day, for the entirety of the day, both sides of Battlefield Road are completely full of parked cars with the result that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The street becomes a single track with no passing spots for cars, with obvious road safety implications</li><li>• Due to impeded vision, it is dangerous for residents to exit from their driveways into the street</li><li>• Cars park so close to crossovers that it is extremely hard to drive into and out of driveways (the "H" road markings are inadequate as they are often ignored by motorists)</li></ul> <p>These are the special factors that affect us and which we ask you to take account of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Clare Lodge, which is a large care home, is directly opposite us. This is significant as Clare Lodge has many visitors who rely on street parking, for example staff, healthcare professionals, visitors to residents, contractors etc. We recall in this regard that the planning application for Clare Lodge acknowledged they need at least 8 parking spaces.</li><li>2. Our end of Battlefield Road is closest to the station and therefore the prime focus for commuter parking.</li></ol> <p>Proposed solution</p> <p>We suggest the following changes to the scheme proposed by the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Some parking bays should be designated solely for residents and their visitors, with no payment for parking in these bays.</li><li>2. The proposed parking charge should be increased significantly in order to deter regular, all-day parking by commuters. The charge (£2.90) is far too low to influence commuters to park at the station or change their habits as parking at the station is so much more expensive (£8.70) and it will be so convenient for commuters to pay the charge (simply by using an app).</li></ol> <p>Additionally, some measures are required (H markings aren't effective in our experience) to prevent cars from restricting the room for manoeuvre into and out of driveways and obstructing the visibility of traffic in the road.</p> <p>We would therefore ask you to carefully consider our suggestions. We believe that the combination of these revisions will result in enhanced road safety and there being space for residents and their visitors (including Clare Lodge) to park in the street at any time of the day. There should obviously be a residents parking bay close to Clare Lodge in light of our comments above.</p>
139	Lancaster Road	<p>Comments on above from paperwork and attending Forum on 1st Feb 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•add York Road, Gainsborough Ave and Jennings Road West to the scheme. It is unfair that they are not included and don't share the pain, I can see no reason why they should be exempt.</li><li>•the price for parking needs to be increased from £2.90. There is no incentive for commuters to use the car parks or bus/cycle at this price. It is way too low. If possible these costs should cover the costs of operating the scheme. I don't live anywhere exciting - not near Clarence Park or the station or the town centre yet I am being made to pay to be able to park outside my own house on occasions as will any visitors.</li><li>•the white lines across drives should be painted with no charge on roads away from the station. This situation has not been created by residents and it is unfair that they are penalised.</li><li>•how often will traffic wardens patrol and enforce the scheme?</li><li>•if possible can there not be more residents only parking at any time? I live at the end of Lancaster Road near Sandridge Road and at times there are no places to park near my house without parking on both sides of the road which causes chaos at busy times. There are ad-hoc cars parked there for days and then builders vans/cars. Residents will have nowhere to park.</li><li>•at the end of the day this scheme will not solve the inherent problem of commuters (mainly) having nowhere cheap to park. It is unfair that residents away from the station are being forced into a scheme where the issue has been created by poor management of the car parking problem and railway timetable issues at other stations forcing commuters to come to St Albans. There needs to be a coherent plan for the future.</li></ul>
140	Park Avenue	<div><div><p>We refer to your letter of 17 January 2020 in which you set out proposals to alleviate the concentration in parking some streets north of Sandpit Lane are experiencing. We note that to address this issue, the proposals have been extended to include changes to streets south of Sandpit Lane, including Park Avenue.</p><p>Whilst we accept that there is no doubt a need to bring about a more balanced parking arrangement north of Sandpit Lane we do not accept that this should mean a disruption to the current parking arrangement on Park Avenue. We would therefore like it noted that we contest the proposed change to Park Avenue and see no reason why the status quo should not be maintained. Our rationale is:</p><p>The current parking arrangement on Park Avenue was introduced in December 2018 to achieve the following objectives:</p><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ improve safety</li><li>○ reduce instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking</li><li>○ improve visibility at road junctions and property entrances</li><li>○ improve access to adjacent properties</li><li>○ reduce congestion</li><li>○ increase the available provision of resident parking spaces</li></ul><p>We are pleased to say that, in our opinion, these objectives have been met. However, introducing the new proposal for Park Avenue will inevitably return the parking situation back to the pre-December 2018 position, which was one that presented extreme risk to residents (adults and children), visitors and local school children, not to mention difficulty of access for emergency services or special vehicles for residents with disabilities. It is astonishing that the Council would consider such a retrograde step.</p><p>If the Council wanted to make any change to the parking arrangement on Park Avenue, then it should be to lengthen the white lines at the edge of driveways. These lines have proven to have little or no effect</p></div><div><p>and cars are still able to park too close to driveways, impeding both entrance and exit. On many occasions it is necessary to carry out a three-point turn to enter or exit a driveway, and there is a significant safety risk due to the field of vision being so narrow.</p><p><b>Proximity to train station</b></p><p>We feel there is a compelling case for treating Park Avenue differently, due to it's proximity to the train station. It will be the first street on which commuters will park and it goes without saying that should the current parking arrangement on Park Avenue be weakened in any way, then commuter parking will immediately return, bringing back the old problems and risks. The Council must surely be aware of this.</p><p>In summary, we believe Park Avenue should be left alone as part of this consultation, as the parking arrangement is working well. To address any parking challenge north of Sandpit Lane, there is no reason why the arrangements south of Sandpit Lane cannot be extended, pushing out further the point where a train commuter feels there is a benefit in parking and walking to the train station.</p></div></div>
141	Faircross Way	<p>We are in receipt of your letter dated 17th January regarding the new proposed parking zones in the above areas.</p> <p>After reading all the proposals the only point we would like to see reconsidered would be the £2.90 parking charge for the 2 hour period per day for public parking in the road which in effect allows people to park for the whole day as long as they like from early morning till late evening. We feel that this is too low and commuters will still want to park here in preference to paying the £8.10 daily station car park charge.</p> <p>Perhaps it would be possible to increase the daily charge to reflect the true amount of hours that commuters will actually be leaving their cars for?.</p> <p>Can anything be done to negotiate with the company who run St Albans station car parks to bring down their daily charges to a more reasonable amount as all of these problems and time and money being spent on new systems are down to commuters trying to avoid paying their extremely high charges?.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing further.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
142	Faircross Way	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b>I am writing to raise objections against the parking review ladder roads and Marshalwick South. Since the introduction of the ladder road scheme we have witnessed displaced traffic cause complete chaos and gridlock in and around our home. Faircross Way has become a car park with some cars parking here for over a week without moving clearly using our road as free parking whilst on holiday. Our driveway has been blocked and our grass verges are being damaged with little prospect of the council making good the damage that has been caused.</p> <p>The new solutions proposed do not address the shear volume of traffic that will continue to be displaced. All of Brampton Road, York Road, Gainsborough Avenue, Blenheim Road plus all the ladder roads is a significant volume of traffic to park elsewhere throughout the area. Furthermore, the new proposal does not address the bottlenecks and safety issues that I have raised. The plan for Charmouth Road is for one side of the Road to be available for paid parking and for both sides of the road to be available for residents parking. Equally this is the plan for large swathes of Faircross Way as well. Clearly this means that parking on both sides of the road will continue and due to both roads being busy thoroughfares the bottleneck will continue and overtime the accidents will increase.</p> <p>The new proposals will do little to improve safety and visibility at the top of Faircross Way as it approaches Charmouth Road. This part of Faircross Way will continue to be used as a car park as the new proposals effectively allow parking all day for £2.90. Cyclists must continue to pull out blind as sight lines will be obscured by parked cars. In addition, traffic turning into Faircross Way from Charmouth Road will continue to immediately be met by parked cars and a lack of road space, this situation is already dangerous, and we have witnessed near misses over the last year.</p> <p>It is clear that safety was not a concern when the scheme was first envisaged and in light of the safety issues that have arisen it is our view that the current scheme needs to be scrapped in its entirety including Brampton Road and the ladder roads. We need a proper long-term solution that includes a reliable bus service and either a park and ride scheme or a car share enterprise which will ease the congestion in the long term. The current proposals will continue to cause congestion, pollution, misery and reduce the safety in and around our roads. Finally, above all we need a long-term solution that does not compromise road safety; the next set of proposals do nothing to address the safety issues that have been created by the ill-judged ladder road scheme and it feels like it is only a matter of time before there is a very serious and possibly fatal accident. It seems ridiculous that any scheme would seek to increase road parking on busy thorough fares whilst leaving removing non-resident parking from no-through roads where the safety issues of constant traffic do not arise.</p>
143	Lancaster Road	<p>Further to your letter of 17th January 2020, your focus on dealing with parking and traffic safety are welcomed. My specific focus is Lancaster Rd, and I comment below on the proposed restrictions, noting comments are requested by Friday 28th Feb</p> <p>The proposal needs to make facility for residents only on one side of the road, or a section of bays on alternating sides.</p> <p>My wife uses the car during the day ,a nd works part time. We have a difficulty on finding a space during the day, as rail commuters take any spaces vacated- primarily from 7am till lunchtime</p> <p>The proposed charge of £2.90 for the restricted period is effectively a daily charge, given it can be paid remotely. This proposed charge is set too low, relative to rail car parks, and should be increased. The station has adequate parking provision, and whilst there may be a differential, the pricing structure should encourage commuters to use the property facility.</p> <p>My understanding is that the roads between Sandpit lane and the station are currently under-used, as a result of the restrictions imposed. The problem in Lancaster Rd was a direct consequence of the imposition of those restrictions.</p> <p>The scheme needs to re-appraise all the affected roads, and ensure that the burden of rail commuters casual parking is spread across all roads, alleviating pressure points</p> <p>My view is that imposing a workable scheme across the wider area must facilitate exclusive residents parking in some areas at the restricted times. Whilst it is accepted that this exclusive resident parking may be under-used at times, this will naturally provide safe passing spaces for vehicles to alleviate traffic safety.</p> <p>I would be grateful if my views could be taken into account in any determination, and await confirmation my E mail has been received.</p> <p>I am away at present, so my wife may E mail additional points to I under separate cover to represent the views of our household.</p>
144	Clarence Road	<p>Observations on existing scheme</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.It has improved quality of life and safety of residents</li> <li>2.Before it was introduced I assumed that the level of traffic at rush hour was simply people going to station/schools/work. There were bottlenecks and the York Red/Brampton Rd junction with Clarence Rd was chaotic. However, the drop in traffic levels made me realise that much of the traffic was generated by drivers looking for parking spaces. Additionally the traffic now flows more freely as the road has far fewer parked vehicles but I don't feel speed has increased.</li> <li>3.Previously wall to wall parking completely blocked visibility for residents exiting drives. The road is far safer now and feels more residential.</li> </ol> <p>Observations on proposed new scheme</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.For the section of Clarence Rd between York Red and Sandpit Lane the new scheme would mean a return to all-day, wall to wall parking. In effect reversing the existing scheme and the benefits it has brought to the road. It has no benefit for residents (although obviously it will provide income for council).</li> <li>2.Assuming there are about 40 parking spaces, there will certainly be 40 commuters prepared to pay £2.90 a day to be this close to station.</li> <li>3.I think the new bus service from Marshalswick (a great idea if it is publicised and gains traction) will struggle to get along Clarence Rd if all the parking returns.</li> <li>4.The proposal will leave residents worse off than before the current scheme was introduced, not least because we no longer have the option of letting visitors/workmen park across our drives or those of our neighbours. (Now white lined)</li> </ol> <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.My preference would be to retain the existing parking controls in Clarence Road</li> <li>2.Please do not introduce proposals in current form.</li> <li>3.If you feel there has to be some commuter parking, the only way to protect the interests of residents is to keep some sections of parking bay for residents. Clear signage "Resident permit holders only 11am-1pm" (as at present) would be a possibility.</li> </ol>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
145	Woodstock Road South.	<p>To follow up on my email below, we also now understand 1.) there is a plan to “Zone” Woodstock Road South and North and 2.) members of the public will be able to park in Woodstock Road North for a small fee.</p> <p>I think this is not well thought through as the cost to park on Woodstock Road North (£2.90) is significantly cheaper than the station meaning this will become congested quickly again. Zoning is a poor idea as we regularly need to park quite far from our house on Woodstock Road South so where would we park in this situation? We may find we can't actually park our car.</p> <p>I would urge this to be thought through again now you have feedback from residents. We are residents of Woodstock Road South. Parking is extremely challenging, especially since parking restrictions were introduced on neighbouring ladder roads.</p> <p>We are supportive of parking restrictions on Woodstock Road South But we have two suggestions.</p> <p>1. We do not feel the the proposal of restrictions 11-1pm is sufficient as while this will prevent station goers it will not stop those parking for the restaurants and shops on Hatfield road which is a major issue for us. We would suggest a similar parking permit as York Road which has permits from 8.30-18.30. Woodstock Road South experiences higher parking volumes than other ladder roads due to the numerous amenities, shops, coffee shops and restaurants on Hatfield Road.</p> <p>2. We also do not agree with the proposal to have double yellows on the opposite side of Woodstock Road South. This single yellow line provides needed parking for visitors outside peak hours. It also allows local residents to park overnight and means there is less stress on overall parking capacity of the road.</p> <p>We would be happy it discuss this further and we hope you take local residents views into account prior to implementing this new scheme.</p>
146	Fleetville Community Centre	<p>I know has been in contact with you as have perhaps others from Fleetville Community Centre where I am Treasurer.</p> <p>We are concerned about how the proposed parking restrictions in Royal Road, where the centre is, will impact on the many users of the centre and the activities they sometimes have to use cars to get to, particularly those with young children and the elderly. I understand that double yellow lines are also planned across our parking bays, which would seem unnecessary.</p> <p>Please let me know if the activities of Fleetville Community Centre will be taken into account.</p>
147	Homewood Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> 1. If restrictions were introduced in Faircross Way and Woodstock Road North, both of which meet Homewood Road, we believe this would simply serve to move the problems as described above to Homewood Road instead. We don't believe commuters would consider it “too far”. It would be a shorter distance from here than, for example, from the top of Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road where you are proposing to introduce restrictions. We don't understand why the top right hand corner of the proposed Zone P3 has not been included within your proposals - aWe believe Marshalswick Lane is a much more logical boundary to this set of roads, being a much busier road so people are less likely to park, and the busy junction of Marshalswick Lane and Sandpit Lane provides a natural deterrent to cross. So, if these proposals are to be extended, we believe they should also include Homewood Road and Marshals Drive. We don't want parking restrictions on these roads - we would far rather you sort out the parking provision at the station - but it would be the lesser of the two evils if you introduced restrictions on every road in the area except these two.</p> <p>Should point 1 materialise this would cause several issues in our opinion:</p> <p>2. The Homewood Road United Reform Church is located at the South end of Homewood Road. This church is heavily used by the local community for classes, choir meets, parent and toddler groups, senior meets as well as regular church goers. The car park is not sufficient and church users regularly park on Homewood Road and Faircross Way during church events. Parking is often very congested and poorly executed - eg blocking visibility around the Faircross Way junction - for this reason we welcome the proposed double yellow lines around this junction. Restrictions on any of the surrounding roads would have serious implications for the community church users, many of whom are elderly or have very small children. It is important that discussions with the church should also form part of your consultation and we understood from speaking to Robin Ray that this hasn't yet been considered.</p> <p>3. Unfortunately speeding is a big issue on Homewood Road, particularly at peak times when it is used as a short cut between Sandpit Lane and Marshals Drive. It's a road that many children use to get to local schools in both directions - Fleetville, Wheatfields, Verulam, Sandringham, Beaumont, Stags to name a few - and children will be walking and crossing the road at precisely these peak times when we see cars speeding.</p> <p>4. This whole “block” of roads has been used for many years by learner drivers due to the wide carriageways. Again, commuters parked in Homewood Road following these proposals would create yet more dangerous conditions where you have novice drivers negotiating tight gaps, lack of passing spaces etc. This already often causes delays and congestion now - I dread to think how much worse it would get.</p> <p>Can we please urge you not to create a situation where we have - at best 18 months of the nightmare Charmouth Road etc have suffered - at worst a bad accident - and then we find ourselves in yet another consultation to extend the proposals again and move the problem on. Can we please make every attempt to get it right once and for all, and create a safe and satisfactory solution for all. Please listen to the views of the residents who use these roads daily and know these roads best.</p>
148	Woodstock Road North	<p>Woodstock Road North (WRN) is probably the busiest cut through road on the list in terms of traffic volumes between Sandpit lane and Hatfield Road. The volumes will only increase significantly in the medium term as more and more of the new housing scheme on Sandpit lane becomes occupied and cars cut through to access Hatfield Road and Morrisons Supermarket.</p> <p>I just don't feel that the “purple lines” parking charge of £2.90 is enough to deter commuters and students from parking on our road as this is a massive saving on the current City Station car park charges and we are only a 15-18 minute walk to the station. We need to deter commuter parking and not encourage it with discounted pricing.</p> <p>The “blue line” scheme on Woodstock Road South (WRS) will only push displaced parking up to WRN. All those non-residents that currently park in WRS will now move up to WRN. Many of the staff from the retail businesses on Hatfield Road now park on WRS so will have to move up. Why not just “blue line” both roads During school run hours we are sandwiched between parents dropping off to both Fleetville schools and Verulam School. With extra displaced parking this leads to massive congestion and safety issues for cyclists (many of whom are schoolchildren).</p> <p>Lastly the narrowing “traffic calming” (if ever there was a misnamed feature that is it) opposite our house caused utter chaos both because of cars playing “chicken” but because of cars parked to close there is frequently no space for cars to queue to pass the narrowing area. All day long we are blighted by endless horns blaring as motorists argue of right of way etc. Also more scarily I frequently see school children on cycles coming through with cars trying to pass them on the narrowing sections. During the school run hours our part of WRN is more or less single lane anyway so cars cannot realistically and safely pass cyclists but many do try. The traffic is “calmed” anyway but the narrow lane so in a way this device is redundant and in my view is more of a hazard than it is a safety asset. At the very least please extend the DOUBLE YELLOW lines well beyond either side of the narrowing area.</p>
149	Monks Horton Way.	<p>My name is Warren Hochfeld, I am the owner of Monks Horton way. I understand that parking retrictions will come into force on nearby roads but not on Monks Horton way.</p> <p>I am concerned that this will greatly reduce parking for ourselves (and visitors), and will of course restrict access for all emergency vehicles, delivery lorries, refuse collections. I have small dogs too that need to be walked and cared for regularly. I do not want our parking reduced so that it becomes difficult for vistors to come and go.</p> <p>I object to no restrictions being put on this road and woud like an explanation for why other roads have restrictions brought into effect</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
150	Woodstock Road South	<p>I live at Woodstock Road South and we would like to give you our comments on the proposed new parking scheme.</p> <p>1.I am extremely relieved and pleased that Woodstock Road South (WRS) will have Resident Permit Holders-Only parking bays introduced Monday to Friday 11am-1pm. This is what the majority of residents want and is long overdue. It will also improve safety.</p> <p>2.Splitting Zone P into Zone P1 and Zone P2 is a good idea. I think all properties in Zone P2 have private driveways. White lines should be introduced to allow those residents to safely use their own driveway.</p> <p>3.The proposal is for 3 separate stretches of WRS (between Hatfield Road and Burnham Road) to have the single yellow line replaced with a double yellow line. These stretches are opposite/outside house numbers 10/12/14, 32/34/36 and 7/9/11. I am not aware of any safety concerns with the present single yellow line and this would result in up to 9 fewer parking spaces.</p> <p>4.The proposal is to introduce double yellow lines in WRS outside house numbers 24 and 26 where there is road narrowing. I am not aware of any safety concerns with the absence of yellow lines here and this would result in 2 fewer parking spaces.</p> <p>5.The proposal is to introduce double yellow lines opposite the junction with Brampton Road in WRS and Woodstock Road North (WRN). Double yellow lines are proposed in WRS outside house numbers 74 and 76 and in WRN outside house numbers 2, 4 and partly across house number 6. I am not aware of any safety concerns with the absence of yellow lines here and this would result in up to 6 fewer parking spaces.</p> <p>I hope you find my comments both positive and constructive and I would like to thank you for all your efforts with the proposed scheme.</p>
151	Battlefield Road	<p>We refer to your letter of 17 January 2020. Regarding the proposals for Zone P3 Area 2:</p> <p>1. On safety grounds and to stop all day parking in the road largely by commuters, we support the proposed introduction of single yellow lines which would prohibit any parking between 11am and 1pm Monday to Friday, and double yellow lines.</p> <p>2. As there is ample car parking available at St Albans City Station, commuters ought to be using those car parks. We do not therefore consider that shared use parking bays as shown by the purple lines on the plan are necessary and submit that these parking bays should be for resident permit holders only.</p>
152	Charmouth Rd	<p>As a resident already affected by the existing ladder parking scheme, these are my observations:</p> <p>1The existing ladder parking scheme – south of Sandpit Lane – needs to be relaxed. It is totally unnecessarily removing many parking spaces that could and should be used. It is daft that quiet side roads – like Blenheim Rd and Gainsborough Ave are to all intents and purposes “no go areas” during the week, when they could safely accommodate non-resident parking. At the very least, the hours during which parking is prohibited should be changed and reduced – ie, if the aim is to minimise commuter parking, then why not have the restricted period changed from 11:00 to 13:00 to – say – 08:00 to 10:00 – or even 08:00 to 09:00?</p> <p>2Many of the safety issues stemming directly from the current ladder parking scheme also need to be addressed immediately. Eg, double yellow lines at major junctions and especially on Sandpit Lane, between Walton St and St Saviours Church – already a high risk zone caused by indiscriminate parking (largely vehicles displaced by the earlier ladder parking scheme.)</p> <p>3The proposed new parking restrictions – ie, to Charmouth Rd etc – should aim to be as “light touch” as possible. Eg, again, given that the real problem is commuter parking, then the restrictions should target this, aiming to maximise usage by non-commuters – hence the restricted period should be 8:00 – 9:00, not the road-blocking 11:00 to 13:00.</p> <p>4Measures should be accelerated to ensure that “bad” parking is tackled. The increased volume of parked vehicles is bad enough; that some park way too close to cross-overs and often cause damage by verge and pavement parking does not appear to be addressed. I would like to see what the council is proposing to do to address these issues. Specifically, the council needs a defined policy on pavement obstruction which is becoming ever more prevalent across the city, forcing pedestrians off the pavement and onto the road.</p>
153	Gurney Court Road	<p>Thank you for the comprehensive package that you sent out on 17/01/2020.</p> <p>I live in Gurney Court Road and on your schematic there are yellow zones, I assume are Double Yellow lines, purple zones and orange zones.</p> <p>Could you please clarify what the purple and orange zones denote.</p> <p>I obviously do not need any parking permit to park on my drive but am I allowed to park across the entrance to my drive without a parking permit?</p>
154	Charmouth Road	<p>As long term residents of Charmouth Road, since 1978, these are our observations as pedestrians and car users. Our home is situated opposite the junction to Charmouth Court so we feel especially qualified to speak about this area. Our general observation is that since the introduction of the ‘ladder scheme’ on-road parking has increased at the southern ends of Charmouth Rd, Gurney Court Road and around the junction of Faircross Way and Charmouth Road. These specific areas are now much more hazardous to pedestrians and cycle users. There is also a lot of road congestion at busy times of the day. Considering the relatively small number of cars involved, some relaxation of the parking restrictions in the ‘ladder roads’ such as in cul de sac roads would alleviate this problem, so negating the need for restrictions to the North of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>Charmouth Road is long and we often witness cars travelling along it at high speeds. Where there is on-road parking this acts as traffic calming with a subsequent reduction in speeding. With this proposed plan, fewer cars will be parked on-road and the risk of speeding will increase making Charmouth Road unsafe.</p> <p>The idea (previously mentioned) of ‘home owners with off-road parking should use it’ puts you at odds with the DC having a sustainability plan. Expecting homeowners to destroy their front gardens to facilitate more off-road parking will reduce the amount of green space for wildlife and increase surface water runoff.</p> <p>Over the years we have observed the number of cars in Charmouth Court increase. It has now reached the point where many now park routinely on the Court’s junction which is dangerous and Charmouth Road which has a traffic calming effect. The junction does need double yellow lines but not the side opposite it as this offers valuable parking and traffic calming. An unforeseen consequence of adding double yellow lines to the opposite side of this wide junction will be to allow for a larger turning area. Lorries and other large vehicles will use this area to do U-turns; this will increase the chances of accidents and poorly executed manoeuvres will see heavy vehicles mount the verge damaging the grass, curbstones and trees (which is already occurring).</p> <p>We do not need more lines painted on our roads, just their sensible use in the ‘ladder Road’ zone.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
155	Brampton Road	<p>I live on the South side of Brampton Road in an Edwardian house with no garage, no potential for building a garage and no possibility of parking a car off road at the front (or rear) of the property. Almost all of the properties on this side of the road and in the 'ladder roads' between Brampton Road and Hatfield Road are of a similar age and, almost without exception, have no off road parking and no possibility of making any. This means that all the residents of these roads are forced to purchase parking permits if they wish to park on the public roads close to their homes. In addition, there is insufficient parking space on these roads for all of the residents' cars due to the narrow frontages of many of the houses and so there is overspill onto adjacent roads. An additional problem is that, on any given day, there are 6 or more trade vehicles parked on these roads, which further reduces the parking area available for residents. This is in distinct contrast to those who are able to afford homes on the North side of Brampton Road and in the 'ladder roads' to the North of that. These houses are built later (1930s onwards) and all have off street parking in spacious driveways and garages. These wealthier residents, with higher value houses, are not forced to pay residents' parking charges. Th Council now proposes to 'sell off' the parking areas on the road outside these homes at a daily charge, presumably in order to attract commuters travelling from the station.</p> <p>Currently there is, of necessity and because of inadequate parking space, 'overspill' from 'our' side of Brampton Road and the roads to the South into the ladder roads to the North of Brampton Road, notably Park Avenue, Hamilton Road and Woodstock Road North. Until now, this has not been a problem as our Zone P parking permit has been acceptable in these road (or there are no restrictions anyway). Under your new proposals, we would be required to purchase permits to park in zone P1 but, because of the inevitable overspill and lack of sufficient parking spaces in this area, we will then be forced to pay an additional daily parking charge to park in Hamilton Road (zone P2), opposite our home. This is completely unjust.</p> <p>It seems to me that the Council is now planning to penalise its least wealthy residents in this area not once, but twice, for not being able to afford larger homes with off road parking. I hope that this is an oversight on the part of the Council as I am certain it does not align with the ethos and tenets of the LD party or its local MP.</p> <p>The problem would, of course, be resolved very simply by allowing residents with zone P1 permits to park in zone P2 or by scrapping this new and complex scheme altogether.</p>
156	Battlefield Road	<p>Thank you for holding the open forum meeting on Saturday at the Council Offices. It was useful to chat through with one of your colleagues. Our over-riding feeling is that anything is better than nothing and the sooner that a scheme can be implemented the better. Being so close to the sandpit Lane end, both myself and my husband have had a number of near missed trying to either reverse onto or pull off from our drive. One of our cars was also hit whilst parked on the road. Our only real concern is that £2.90 does not feel like a deterrent to commuters, in fact they'd be getting a far better deal on our road than they would if they parked at the station all day. We recognise that the Council can't be seen to be profiting from this scheme and hence the low charge but there is a counter argument to say that offering such a bargain price will induce even more people to park here, thus looking to all intents and purposes like a profit making scheme. We would also like to request that H bars are put across both entrances to our driveway. As I type this a scaffolding lorry is parked directly across one of our entrances and has been there for the last hour. It feels like because we have two entrances, there is a view that it does not matter if one of them gets blocked. The point is we paid a great deal of money to have a driveway that we can just about go in and out of because of our road and our position on the road being so dangerous. When we had our dropped curbs installed, I requested H bars then, these were refused. Since that time, approximately 8 houses on Battlefield Road have had H bars put in, at no cost to themselves. Given the amount that we had to pay for the dropped curbs, this feels very unfair. I have emails to support this dating back to March last year from Brandon at the Highways Support Team and Philip King. Please can you let us know ASAP what can be done here as it seemed like a very straightforward process for some of our neighbours.</p>
157	Faircross Way	<p>I am a resident at Faircross Way and thank you for the consultation documents – I have the following comments:</p> <p>1.It is a shame that the introduction of the initial revised parking scheme have resulted in huge additional problems. However I now feel that the resulting proposals are creating a monster that will incur huge costs to the local community and will require extensive administration to police and manage the scheme – a solution that has got totally out of control. I fully understand that those involved with the original scheme will not be able to back down and admit there were huge errors made, but creating this new monster is unforgivable and a drain on the local community and Council who will have to administer it – which I now have to pay for.</p> <p>2.Why should I have to pay for a resident's permit as there is no benefit to me and this has all been caused by local politicians and bad planning by the Council. The first 2 permits should be provided at no cost to residents – or is this a scheme to create additional revenue for the council? I would like to see the financial modelling and cost analysis that the Council must have carried out.</p> <p>3.The pay by phone charge is too low and will only actively encourage current parking at the station to revert back to the local streets. I feel the minimum charge should be at least £5.00.</p> <p>4.Both Faircross Way and The Park are in zone P3 and it is proposed that they have a mixture of shared use (purple on map) and single yellow line parking (orange on map) together with double yellow lines at junctions. There is no need for such extensive single line parking and this will only serve to concentrate traffic into the remaining shared parking bands. This will be a huge problem when construction traffic, which is so often prevalent in the roads, will be forced to park in small zones. Making the majority of the roads a shared scheme is much more sensible and pragmatic.</p>
158	Arthur Road	<p>Many thanks for your letter dated 17th Jan 2020 in relation to parking changes on the ladder roads. This review is most welcome following the inability to park near our property in recent months.</p> <p>I wanted to clarify a couple of points if I may? We live in Arthur Road. Although this is shown on the map as proposed zone P1 Area 1 it's not listed within point 4 of the letter in the list of ladder roads affected, is it purely an oversight as we previously weren't in the residents parking zone? We would certainly want inclusion in the zone as the road is constantly "full" due to building work taking place locally (over 20 vehicles a day) and a garage based in Hatfield Road parking cars awaiting pick up there on a daily based (along with staff) which can sometimes be 15-20 vehicles.</p> <p>With darker evenings I feel uncomfortable my wife having to park 10-15 minutes away (not to mention the inconvenience to the residents of areas she has to park in!) so Arthur Roads inclusion in this scheme is vital in my opinion.</p> <p>I understand comments are welcomed until the end of February so is there a timescale for potential roll out of the scheme?</p>
159	Not Provided	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment again on the Council's proposal to extend and split Zone P parking.</p> <p>By creating this parking zone, the Council has generated most, if not all, of the problems alluded to in the latest set of proposals. The consequence of introducing the scheme was entirely obvious, i.e. that commuters would park on the unrestricted edges of the new scheme. The Council has introduced complexity and seeks to address consequent problems by introducing even greater complexity.</p> <p>I am completely and bitterly opposed to the new proposals. I struggle to see any merit in the Council's proposals, other than to raise even more revenue through extensive parking charges.</p> <p>The Council now wilfully appears to seek to implement regressive taxation ('charges'), which will have the greatest adverse impact upon the least fortunate residents. Those in the most fortunate positions (those with higher-value houses) will scarcely be affected. The Council now seeks selectively to tax the poorer families who are dependent on their cars.</p> <p>The area which the Council calls the 'ladder roads' plus the South side of Brampton Road comprises Victorian and Edwardian homes, closely built and almost exclusively without garages. Many frontages are of insufficient length to accommodate one, and all would be inadequate for two cars.</p> <p>The area from and including the North side of Brampton Road extending North to the far reaches of the Council's latest plan comprises mainly 1930s type dwellings, generously spaced, with driveways and garages. The vast majority can accommodate at least two cars in garages and driveways, and many houses can accommodate three or more cars 'off road'.</p> <p>The current position is that some vehicles owned by residents of Brampton Road have to be parked in Hamilton Road (I do not know if the same applies to other North-South roads). There is probably also some 'spill' from the North/South ladder roads into Brampton Road. The new proposal seems specifically designed to deny your least fortunate taxpayers access to adequate parking for which we must pay. Hamilton Road is generally sparsely used for parking and so there seems no reason to draw the sub-zonal lines in the way in which the Council proposes other than to create difficulties for a specific group of residents, and to compel residents in possession of a Zone P1 sticker to buy a daily parking ticket for Zone P2, effectively double-charging those residents to park near their own homes. This seems maybe an oversight, or maybe a spiteful attack on the least fortunate residents in terms of parking.</p> <p>It offends against natural justice. It is also staggering to see a LD Council and an area with a LD MP looking to penalise the least fortunate residents.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
160	Burnham Road,	<p>I am a resident at Burnham Road, one of the roads in Ladder Roads Consultation.</p> <p>I have grave concerns about Council's proposed plans, specifically in relation to the proposed parking charges for residence. It is too much for a family who has more than one vehicle, on top of other household bills, and still there is no guarantee of getting a parking space in the evening after restriction hours.</p> <p>Also, I am extremely against the proposed 2 hours parking restriction from Mon-Fri 11am-1pm, as it does not resolve the existing parking issue. If parking restriction needs to be applied on this road then it should be from Mon-Fri 8am- 8.30 pm. This will help the residents in terms of parking space and justifies the proposed charges.</p> <p>I hope that you will value and consider my views as a member of community and as a resident who has been living in St Albans since 1967.</p>
161	Not Provided	FYI - as to previous email re 11 Clarence Road
162	Gurney Court Road	<p>I am a resident of Gurney Court Road and am writing to oppose the proposed extension of the parking permit scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is not a parking problem in Gurney Court Road... All houses have drives and there are limited number of cars parked on the road even on weekdays (couple of pictures attached today, Friday!) and these do not block drives.</li> <li>•If the remaining parked cars are encouraged off the road or limited, the average traffic speed would increase on the road which is a well-known rat run in the area. This would increase traffic safety concerns, not reduce them. (see Clarence Road as an example where traffic speeds have increased since parking permit scheme introduced stopping many cyclists from using this road to get to the station)</li> <li>•A parking scheme would also dramatically change the look of this suburban area with painted lines up and down and many road signs and posts. This is not the center of St Albans and the suburban feel should be upheld</li> <li>•Finally this is not a joined-up plan. If the Council are really concerned about traffic safety concerns, why does it not take into consideration the needs of cyclists and pedestrians? The whole area is within walking and cycling distance of the city centre and the station yet nothing is being done to help everyone out of cars and to reduce the speed of traffic.</li> </ul> <p>However, I am in favour of double yellow lines at the corner of main junctions as this does support traffic safety for both vehicles and cyclists so they can see and be seen.</p>
163	Clarence Road	<p>Thank you for your update on the review on Ladder Roads .</p> <p>I was unable to attend the open session last Saturday as I have been away but trust that my previous comments - some which seem already to have been included - will be taken into account .</p> <p>I attach another photo of the situation which still remain re markings outside my property and am sure , as to your documentation , that these will be made “ right “ as part of the update referred to ie double yellows only ( no tiny parking slot which one driver parked with the front of the car pointing into the road ) from the t junction to the parking bay , as was the situation re safety / access prior to the last changes .</p>
164	Charmouth Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b>I agree with the proposal that roads with terraced housing and therefore no off-street parking should have RESIDENT PERMIT HOLDERS ONLY parking Monday to Friday 11am to 1pm, This should include all the ladder roads and also EATON ROAD which has terraced housing Also, if a road has some terrace properties then the terrace properties, only, should have this. eg parts of Clarence Road and Blenheim Road. I also agree with double yellow lines on junctions, for safety. The cost of parking for a day will be just £2.90, that is too cheap and will attract even more commuters to the area.</p> <p>I propose a simpler scheme:</p> <p>For all roads in zones P1, P2 and P3 that are not terraced, I propose that one side of each road has a single yellow line with 'No Waiting Monday to Friday 10 am to 11am' and the other side has a single yellow line with 'No Waiting Monday to Friday 3pm to 4pm.' as parts of The Ridgeway does now. Residents, builders, shoppers and visitors will be able to park. Commuters, who are parking for 12 hours a day, will be discouraged. The chaos of Charmouth Road has only been caused by the additional commuters parking in the road, if they are discouraged then the traffic will flow...here are my comments:The price of £2.90 a day is too cheap, Proposed Zone P1 EATON ROAD - this road must be included in the RESIDENT PERMIT HOLDERS ONLY parking Monday to Friday 11am to 1pm. This is a road of tiny terraced houses with no off-street parking, that joins Woodstock Road South and Burnham Road, two roads which are being changed to RESIDENT PERMIT HOLDERS ONLY parking Monday to Friday 11am to 1pm. Drivers for the Fleetville shops, Fleetville Community Centre, Fleetville playing field, Fleetville Steiner Kindergarten, Fleetville Junior School, Fleetville Infant School and Verulum School will attempt to park in Eaton Road as it will be the nearest road with no restrictions. Eaton Road is already oversubscribed. CHARMOUTH ROAD - There is not enough on street parking between 11am and 1pm that will be available for residents. For example where I live houses 29 to 61 on the odd side and houses 18 to 48 on the even side, a total of 32 houses, are expected to share approximately 12 parking bays. Three cars are left permanently on the road so that leaves the rest of us with our families and visitors and builders sharing the remaining 9. If the commuters park there, there will be no where for us to park.</p>
165	Eaton Road	I wish to be enrolled into the ladder rd permit scheme . As we will be the only free parking street in out area therefore making parking which is already at a premium extremely difficult.
166	Homewood Road	<p>Thank you very much for your letter 17th January 2020 with a proposal for a new parking scheme on the Ladder Roads.</p> <p>I will urge the Council to expand the parking zone to include Homewood Road and Marshal's Drive. There are already too many cars parked by train commuters along both roads during the day which inhibits traffic passing through.</p> <p>If the proposed parking zone is adopted without including both roads, the problem will get even worse.</p> <p>I am particular concerned about the impact this will have on road safety. The volume of traffic passing through Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road has increased considerably in the last couple of years with several daily incidents of very high speeding.</p> <p>If it would be helpful, I am happy to discuss my concerns in person or over the phone.</p>
167	Charmouth Road	<p>These are my main concerns relating to CHARMOTH ROAD</p> <p>There will be a significant loss of parking in Charmouth Road as the proposal does not include enough parking bays for the number of residents.</p> <p>The cost of £2.90 to park for a day's parking is too cheap and will only encourage more commuters to avoid station car parking costs and to park in the road.</p> <p>If commuters are allowed to park in the parking bays then the residents will have to park on the yellow lines and this will not alleviate the current congestion problems.</p> <p>EATON ROAD</p> <p>Eaton Road is now the nearest road to the Fleetville schools with unrestricted parking. This road has terraced housing with no off-street parking and is already oversubscribed and needs to be included as resident only parking.</p> <p>In the longer term as a priority the council should provide enough reasonably priced car parks to accommodate commuters and visitors to the town.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
168	Homewood Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b>The impact of the current proposal on the south end of Homewood Road residents between Sandpit Lane and Faircross Way is unacceptable. Many of the aims, as stated, in your previous documents relating to the already implemented parking scheme (December 2018) need to be upheld with this future proposal: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Reduce instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking</li> <li>•Improve visibility at road junctions and property entrances</li> <li>•Reduce congestion</li> <li>•Improve road safety</li> </ul> <p>Your current proposal does not achieve these and, as such, needs to be amended. I would strongly argue that the lack of road markings on the south end of Homewood Road is already a significant problem that needs to be addressed and does not currently conform with the above even before your proposal is implemented. However, your current proposal, as it stands, will make it much worse.</p> <p>Your current proposal increases the issue of car parking to our door. All the points 1-8 on pages 1 to 3 of your letter 17th January 2020, are also true for the south end of Homewood Road and, as such, need to be addressed. We already suffer regularly from over parking: -</p> <p>Significant Safety Issues: -</p> <p>The junction, intersection between Sandpit Lane, Homewood Road and Woodstock Road North already has an appalling safety record and this proposal will make matters even worse because Homewood Road would be blocked up by displaced cars from Woodstock Road. Sensibly, there are already double yellow lines on Woodstock Road North on both sides as you approach the junction. The same should be implemented on Homewood Road. The road design is the same and, as such, so are the safety concerns. I have seen many cars damaged at this junction and even know one of the poor drivers who was impacted.</p> <p>In summary, for safety reasons the south end of Homewood Road needs to have parking restrictions - double yellow lines or permit only at all times - to avoid parking on both sides of the road.</p> <p>nconsistency in road restriction criteria: -</p> <p>With the proposal of having all the roads up to, but not including Homewood Road, with restrictions on them will result in cars parking on Homewood Road, particularly the south end (up to the Faircross Way junction) as it is nearest the school and railway station.</p> <p>Student Cars: - Car parking needs to be addressed near the school and the problem should not just be moved to Homewood Road.</p> <p>Homewood Road is not wide enough to have parking on either side without significantly impacting traffic flow and visibility when exiting a drive and sometimes it is not even possible to exit the drive at all.</p>
169	The Park	<p>Reasons against installation of parking zones:</p> <p>Thank you for your detailed letter about the proposed parking zones. The introduction of parking restrictions / ladder roads to Clarence Road, has only moved the parking congestion to narrower roads further north eg Charmouth Road. Charmouth Road is not a wide road, and is now far more dangerous with the parking congestion that builds up at the south end of Charmouth Road and at times traffic even backs on to the roundabout on Sandpit Lane (a significant hazard!). This is an example of where the ladder road scheme has not been successful.</p> <p>People who live near the station (and are likely to have paid a higher price for their flat / house) will have done so by choice in order to have a shorter walk to the station (better commuting options). They will equally be aware that living near the station will likely mean greater traffic and busier street parking. None of this should come as a surprise.</p> <p>I have a 17 min walk to the station from my house, and this is acceptable. That is why I paid extra to live where I do, rather than on the outskirts of St Albans.</p> <p>Installing permit zones and patrolling them comes at a cost. I should not have to pay for this if I am against this. In the interest of clarity and honesty – please could you disclose the calculations for installation, upkeep and thus permit cost calculations.</p> <p>We chose to live in a ‘quiet’ area, as it easy for friends and family to visit us. Generally there is parking for them, along with nannies / builders / repair workers etc etc. Why should I have now to buy additional permits for these people to visit my house. I chose to live on The Park as it has no restrictions.....in fact the road’s main use seems to be for learner drivers...however I do not complain - we all have to learn and it is better people learn on roads and get use to the real world of traffic than learning on quiet industrial estates.</p> <p>My suggestion</p> <p>If people want a ‘parking zone/restriction’ outside their house, then they can pay the council for its ‘set up’ and also pay money for their own permits. This would seem entirely reasonable and fair. Those who refuse to pay / or who do not want parking zones outside their house – should have the option of this. This is very easy to set up on The Park, each house has its own obvious verge / street parking area where you could put a permit, if they were prepared to pay for it.</p> <p>Other comments</p> <p>I would strongly go against single yellow lines – either have parking zones or nothing. No need for single yellow lines on The Park. It is a fairly wide road.</p> <p>I am against a blanket permit zone policy. Individual houses could have the option of paying for their own ‘permit zone’ outside their property if they request.</p>
170	Gurney Court Road	<p>I am a resident of Gurney Court Road and am writing to oppose the proposed extension of the parking permit scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is not a parking problem in Gurney Court Road... All houses have drives and there are limited number of cars parked on the road even on weekdays (couple of pictures attached today, Friday!) and these do not block drives.</li> <li>•If the remaining parked cars are encouraged off the road or limited, the average traffic speed would increase on the road which is a well-known rat run in the area. This would increase traffic safety concerns, not reduce them. (see Clarence Road as an example where traffic speeds have increased since parking permit scheme introduced stopping many cyclists from using this road to get to the station)</li> <li>•A parking scheme would also dramatically change the look of this suburban area with painted lines up and down and many road signs and posts. This is not the center of St Albans and the suburban feel should be upheld</li> <li>•Finally this is not a joined-up plan. If the Council are really concerned about traffic safety concerns, why does it not take into consideration the needs of cyclists and pedestrians? The whole area is within walking and cycling distance of the city centre and the station yet nothing is being done to help everyone out of cars and to reduce the speed of traffic.</li> </ul> <p>However, I am in favour of double yellow lines at the corner of main junctions as this does support traffic safety for both vehicles and cyclists so they can see and be seen.</p>
171	Faircross Way	<p>Here are my comments/suggestions on the parking review.</p> <p>Overall I think the Parking Review has been well thought out.</p> <p>1) On the proposed map Zone P3 Area 1, there are 2 islands at the junction of The Park and Faircross Way. These should be marked with double yellow lines to prevent vehicles parking there. I spoke to you at the Open Forum on Sat 1st Feb and you said this would be done but you said it was too fiddly to mark it on the maps.</p> <p>2) The parking fee proposed at £2.90 should be higher to encourage commuters to use the station car park (currently £8.50 or £8.70 for the 2 car parks). Suggest it should be set at £5.00.</p> <p>3) It’s not clear where the street signs will be positioned, but I’m concerned that as my house (No 38 Faircross Way) has a low wall running along the front, putting a a sign post there will cause problems. Young children often walk along the wall with parents holding their hands and a sign post would make it difficult. It would also be unsightly.</p>
172	13 Eaton Road	<p>Further to your letter dated 17th January 2020, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed changes to parking restrictions in Zone P. Whilst I appreciate that you are trying to overcome some of the issues that have arisen since the resident parking restrictions have been in place, I am extremely concerned that that the proposal includes extending the the restricted parking area to include roads currently not restricted such as; Burnham Road, Royal Road, Woodstock Road South and Arthur Road.</p> <p>As a resident living in Eaton Road, I have already noticed an increase in vehicles using Eaton Road as a free parking option, since the original parking restrictions were introduced and this will obviously become a much bigger problem if/when the restricted parking area is increased, as Eaton Road will then be the only road in the area without parking permits. Unfortunately none of the properties in Eaton Road have the option of creating off street parking, so we do all need to be able to park in our street.</p> <p>Although initially I did not want to have parking restrictions in Eaton Road, I feel that with the current proposal to increase Zone P, we now have no option but to request that Eaton Road is also included in the resident permit zone.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you further as the consultation progresses.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
173	Homewood Road	<p>Station parking, Clearly St Albans has suffered for a substantial period of time from surplus cars needing to park during the working day, particularly for those using the station. The various schemes over the years have not managed to resolve the problem, simply shifting the surplus to different places, thereby creating new problems in different areas and typically lengthening commuters' journey times. The next set of changes must aim to avoid this. Given that there is a significant percentage of purpose built car parking that remains vacant each day due to the prohibitive pricing, a decrease in the car park price could resolve the vast majority of problems described in your letter. Whilst I understand that the car park is not council owned, relevant resource should be used to work with the car park owners / apply the appropriate 'pressure' to accommodate the change. Daily vacant spaces is a no win situation for all parties concerned. A pricing scheme for example that incentivises people to use the station car park could be packaged with the purchase of an annual season ticket.</p> <p>Phased approach, Should a price decrease in the station parking be attainable, a phased approach to the changes listed in the letter could then be implemented, thereby allowing the council to make measured decisions based on actual data, rather than trying to predict people's likely parking habits once investment has been made in a vast and costly scheme. The shared use parking could be trialled in the proposed roads closer to the station to ascertain exactly what the uptake would be at the suggested price of £2.90. This price even could then be amended accordingly before a decision is made to widen the parking scheme across a larger area.</p> <p>Inclusion of Homewood Road, In the instance that the proposed scheme is implemented, Homewood Road will need to be included, as acknowledged during the consultation on 1 Feb. The South end of Homewood Road is closer to the station (and to Verulum School) than other roads included in the proposal (eg the north end of The Park, Charmouth road and Guerny Court Road) and would therefore simply be the next location of overparking with all the associated issues that your letter currently describes elsewhere. In addition, the South end of Homewood Road is already overburdened with parking from the various activities that take place in the community spaces within Homewood Road Church, that currently cause significant visibility, accessibility and safety issues at various times during the week. The road has already proven not to safely accommodate car parking on both sides.</p> <p>Safety at the cross roads of Homewood Road, Sandpit Lane and Woodstock Road</p> <p>Finally, under all circumstances double yellow lines are required at this junction on both sides of the road on Homewood Road. There are significant safety issues currently posed by the busy crossroads due to the poor visibility and the high volume of road users here. Woodstock Road North already has double yellow lines at this junction and therefore it would be appropriate to replicate this in the Homewood Road section of the same junction.</p>
174	Blenheim Road	<p>Thank you for the update.</p> <p>The parking in Blenheim Road is at a manageable level &amp; restrictions have made a big improvement.</p> <p>There are still many residents cars but the junction with Jennings is much safer with less inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>We do have some concerns about the introduction of public parking although appreciate this will not be happening in Blenheim or the top end of Jennings. The cost of the parking will allow station parking to resume in the areas around us as it is a very low price compared to the designated station parking.</p> <p>Could a sliding scale be considered as the areas around Clarence, Jennings &amp; Park Avenue will obviously fill up much quicker than Charmouth, Gurney Court etc? This would hopefully ensure the parking is spread around the area rather than once again be closest to the station.</p> <p>The areas around Verulam School are underutilised but could permits be offered to the school &amp; local businesses rather than used for cheap commuter parking?</p>
175	Woodstock Road South	<p>Further to the correspondence recieved in relation to parking changes on Woodstock Road South, I would like to set out my concerns as follows:</p> <p>Although it would be good to see some permit parking on Woodstock Road South I believe your proposal will not further stress the already extremely stressful parking situation on this road.</p> <p>The removal of spaces on single yellow lines opposite our houses and being replaced with double yellow lines coupled with non residents being able to park from 1PM to 11am the following day will result in residents returning from work to NO parking on Woodstock Road South.</p> <p>I personally already struggle to park within a reasonable distance from my home on Woodstock Road South due to local businesses, commuters and shoppers parking. I have a baby and as you can imagine this is not an ideal situation for families with young children and babies not to mention the safety elements of having to park on surrounding roads and walking in the dark.</p> <p>I would urge you to consider restricting with a permit parking from 8.30am until maybe 6.30pm.</p> <p>I would welcome a meeting to discuss this with myself and other residents on Woodstock Road South.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration and I look forward to hearing from you soon on next course of action.</p>
176	Charmouth Road	<p>This is a response to the Parking Review proposals for the Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South from Charmouth Road, St. Albans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The joint "residents parking" and "paid parking" for the ladder roads scheme is an excellent compromise solution</li> <li>•The price to pay for parking can be used as a lever to regulate the amount of parking in the ladder roads. If it's too congested, increase the price. If it's empty and under utilised (as currently is the case), lower, the price.</li> <li>•An initial price of £2.90 seems exactly right as a starting price. It should attract some people to stop parking north of Sandpit lane and park in the ladder roads instead.</li> <li>•If too many people migrate from the station or Marshalswick South, then you have the leeway to raise the price. If you start too high, it's harder to lower the price.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding enlarging the CPZ to encompass areas North of Sandpit Lane, this seems premature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The fundamental mistake with the ladder CPZ, was changing too much in one go. We fear that nothing was learnt from this and it is about to happen again. Our main response to the council will be to plead to do this in phases.</li> </ul> <p>Phase 1, change as much as possible of the existing CPZ to paid public parking CPZ. And perhaps Woodstock Road North. That change should not cost the council too much extra.</p> <p>Then see if and how much the pressure on surrounding areas eases. Perhaps the extension to all the new areas will not be needed at all or will not need to be so big.</p> <p>Phase 2, only if it still seems necessary, extend to the lower parts of Marshalswick North (Harptree and half of Faircross for instance).</p> <p>Phase 3, Finally, only if problems are still being seen, extend fully to Marshals Drive etc.</p> <p>Parking costs a lot of tax-payer's money to implement and to maintain. It's an inconvenience and extra cost for 100s of residents. Why waste all that money/effort and inflict new pain on 100s of your constituents until it's proven necessary?</p> <p>If you and we learnt anything from the Ladder Roads CPZ, it's that it's incredibly difficult to predict all the ramifications of a change to parking restrictions. No-one thinks the planning department should be able to predict exactly how the public will respond to any new parking initiative. But as the paid-parking in Clarence Ward may possibly be enough to fix most of the issues by itself, surely it is irresponsible to spend a significant amount of tax-payer's money extending the parking scheme significantly until you know for sure it is required.</p> <p>If there is a chance of avoiding yet more CPZ in the long term, it must be worth waiting a few months to see. By adopting a phased approach, we are hopeful that both Clarence and Marshalswick South wards can be satisfied without the entire new plan being necessary.</p>
177	Battlefield Road	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 17 January 2020 regarding the above.</p> <p>We broadly support the proposals subject to one objection. We object to the fact that residents such as us who will have a house adjacent to a single yellow line (rather than resident parking bays) are required to pay £130 for a white line marking out our driveway. This service is free if you happen to be on the side of the road marked out for parking bays. We will still have people parking dangerously close to or over our driveway for free for most of the day, so why should we have to pay for a driveway line when others do not?</p> <p>We otherwise support the proposals and would like to see them implemented asap as current situation is dangerous and I have seen quite a few near misses and road rage incidents along our street, which was previously relatively quiet and unparked.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
178	Harlesden Road	In response to your recent correspondence and with regards to the parking restrictions in the Ladders roads section in Fleetville. I live on Harlesden road. The recent parking permits did ease the parking problem however as it is not policed (I haven't seen a parking warden on our road for weeks) it seems the problem is escalating again. We are inundated with builders vans who cone off large stretches of road and never use parking vouchers. Also there are almost always vehicles parked on the double yellow lines at both ends which makes it hard to pull out with a clear view. All very well bringing in further restrictions but what is the point if the restrictions aren't followed?
179	Monks Horton Way	Parking Review (Zone P) It would appear from your letter of 17th January that Monks Horton Way has been omitted from consideration in the above Review. Can you please advise?
180	Homewood Road	As discussed on Saturday 1st February 2020, overlooking Homewood Road in your current proposal is an oversight and you agreed to change it. The impact of the current proposal on the south end of Homewood Road residents between Sandpit Lane and Faircross Way is unacceptable and will only exacerbate the issues we already face as residents.  We have first-hand experience with cars regularly blocking the road on both sides causing a significant safety issue. Inconsiderate parking with the inability to safely exit drives, if at all It is unacceptable that we have to go into the Church Hall to request people to move their cars to exit our house Considerably reduced visibility at the road junction, which is well known as an accident hotspot All caused by parked cars during week days and in the evenings, resulting in safety issues. In summary, for safety reasons the south end of Homewood Road needs to have parking restrictions - double yellow lines or permit only at all times - to avoid parking on both sides of the road. Sensibly, there are already double yellow lines on Woodstock Road North on both sides as you approach the junction. The same should be implemented on Homewood Road. As discussed with you on Saturday, your proposal excluding Homewood Road is inconsistent. You agreed the proposal needs amending. The south end of Homewood Road is as close to the railway station as the other roads on which you are proposing to put restrictions and, therefore, needs to be included. At the meeting, I talked to many residents from Woodstock Road North, who confirmed that they have been blighted by many 6th form student cars on their road ever since you introduced the current scheme. The problem should not just be moved to Homewood Road. Homewood Road is not wide enough to have parking on either side without significantly impacting traffic flow and visibility when exiting a drive. Sometimes it is not even possible to exit the drive at all. It is also used as a cut through at peak times to avoid the traffic lights and backlog of traffic. As agreed, please amend your proposal to consider the residents of the south end of Homewood Road and everyone who uses the junction. The current proposal is addressing a failure of the previously implemented scheme that has created car free roads that have pushed commuter and student parking further out to the next available areas. This current proposal will continue to move the problem and potentially further empty the car park at the station. This is an opportunity to address a problem that blights residents living on the south end of Homewood Road.
181	Lancaster Road	With reference to your recent proposals for parking restrictions in Lancaster Rd and adjacent roads, I would like to make the following comments:  - If the council is concerned about safety in these roads, then the speed limit should be restricted to 20mph. - The planned orange zones would increase safety in the road but only if they are not completely occupied by commuters. I fear that commuters would see a charge of £2.90 per day (for the 2 hour restricted time) as much cheaper than parking at the station. I also fear that visitors to residents and tradesman will have nowhere to park. At no time is the road is free of white vans and lorries! - The commuters' cars should be fairly spread over all the available roads. For example, you are not proposing to put restrictions similar to Lancaster Rd in York Rd, parts of Jennings rd and other roads. -Less parking for residents and their visitors will incentivise the paving of front gardens which is both unsightly and bad for the environment. - There should be somewhere on the road where only residents and their visitors can park. -It would appear that the council (for whatever reason) has little control over the car parks at the station but the obvious solution would be to increase the parking at the station almost at whatever cost AND to decrease the cost. It is surely going to be costly to police all these commuter cars parked in restricted zones. The car park immediately adjacent to the station was originally constructed to be be able to add additional floors at some future point. The car park further away is never more than half full. - It is clear that many more commuters from Harpenden are driving to St Albans and parking their cars in our roads as fewer Thameslink trains are now calling at Harpenden under the revised timetable. Could this be addressed? - It is clear to me that a number of the cars parked in our road do not belong to rail commuters but to people who work in St Albans itself. Surely the Council could provide all day parking for workers (other than on residential streets) at a rate which people can afford.  The previous parking scheme (for the "ladder" roads) was not a success as no-one anticipated that commuters would simply park further away from the station. Can we hope that a great deal more thought will be put into new proposals before they are implemented and that the concerns of residents should be properly considered before more of our council tax is spent on another failed scheme?
182	Hall Heath Close	Thank you for sending us the consultation papers on Zone P. As a former resident of Glenferrie Rd I think the restrictions have been a huge success. I would ask that you consider Hall Heath Close AL1 4BL in any proposals. I think the road needs a mix of double yellow lines and controlled parking. Under the new proposals traffic will overflow in to HHC as we are closer to the station and Verulam School was than some of the areas in scope for the new controls. That will exacerbate a second issue, namely that much of the road is too narrow for parking, which means larger vehicle like refuse trucks, supermarket deliveries and on one occasion an ambulance have to mount the grass verges and footpath to get past which is destroying the Close (see picture taken recently showing damaged verges). Inconsiderate parking also makes it difficult to exit properties There is universal support on the Close for parking restrictions
183	Gurney Court Road	The scheme introduces alternate permitted parking all along Gurney Court Road, between 11.00am and 1.00pm. This leaves a moderately wide road width available all along the length of this road. Gurney Court Road has a noticeable slope, from north down to south which gives, when viewed from the Marshal's Drive end, a view of most of the road. With parked cars restrained to the permitted parking bays and driving down from the north, Gurney Court Road around midday may soon appear to be a fast road. For years the ad-hoc parking on both sides of the road has provided an effective restraint to speeding along the road. The proposed parking scheme is far better than we at present have, but early experience may indicate that traffic calming could be warranted.



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
184	Marshals Drive	<p>We refer to your letter dated 17 January 2020 regarding the above review. We note this builds on the initial consultation in June 2019. We understand your reviews are designed to deal with the parking by train users in residential areas during the week .</p> <p>In overall terms the review does have some merits, but we are concerned about a major omission. This is the consequential need for a short term parking restriction in Marshals Drive .</p> <p>We suggest say a 2 hour restriction is needed on Marshals Drive between Monday to Friday 11am to 1pm.</p> <p>It is our very strong opinion that this is needed because the current proposed restrictions on the " ladder roads", will just displace train user parking to Marshals Drive. Such parking would be dangerous due to the high traffic usage on this busy through road and general safety concerns, including the school age children using this road.</p> <p>Evidence of such displaced parking on Marshals Drive is already happening at the east end near the Marshalswick shops. Here shop owners/staff now appear to park in Marshals Drive following parking restrictions in the Marshalswick shopping area.</p> <p>We do not want train parking in Marshals Drive. This will happen as Marshals Drive is within a reasonable walking distance to the station and is close enough for a group to park cars on Marshals Drive and then travel together to the Station and pay for one car at the Station car park.</p> <p>Please can we add the 2 hour restricted parking in Marshals Drive, Monday to Friday, between 11 am and 1 pm.</p> <p>For clarity only the residents and their guests should be able to use the restricted areas. It must not be possible for the 2 hour restrictions on Marshals Drive to be used by train users for a fee.</p>
185	Battlefield Road	<p>Parking Review (Zone P) Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane)</p> <p>Thank you for meeting us at the open forum last Saturday. It was a useful and informative session, and we two now feel that the Council has got the gist of our concerns, which do include the important aspects of road safety.</p> <p>In general, any change put into action must be an improvement over the present for those of us in Battlefield Road. We are broadly in agreement with the Council's proposals, with the comments below.</p> <p>There needs to be tighter restriction on commuter parking in Battlefield Road. We accept the suggestion that the new scheme might encourage some of those currently parking here to move back to nearer the station. However, we feel that there needs to be an increase in the number of residents-only parking spaces and 9-11am restricted spaces, with a decrease in residents/ public spaces.</p> <p>Concomitant with that, £2.90 is far too cheap for a whole day's parking in this vicinity. £4.00 would be more reasonable, especially in the light of charges at the station of £8.00 and more. We understand that the Council can not look to profit from road parking charges, but we are sure that this increase would be reasonable and sensible, and also would be welcome to the Council's finances.</p> <p>We were pleased to learn of the extension of double yellow lines in Sandpit Lane, adjacent to St Saviour's Church. The current situation, especially with cars parked on the pavement, is definitely dangerous. Not only do vehicles going east have to pull out into the line of those going west, but also the presence of a long line of cars parked on the pavement blocks the passage of prams, pushchairs, and disability buggies – undoubtedly a hazard! Moreover, the word in Battlefield Road is that many of these particular cars are not owned by commuters, but by residents in Walton Street, Heath Road, etc, who do not wish to pay for a second (or even possibly a first!) resident's permit – with a further loss to the Council.</p> <p>We hope that the Council takes note of these comments and those of other residents in Battlefield Road</p>
186	Jennings Road	<p>We live at Jennings Road (Proposed Zone P2 Area 2).</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 17th January 2020. The proposal we are concerned about in your letter is the change from residents parking to shared use parking.</p> <p>You state this proposed change is necessary because parking areas surrounding Verulum School (such as Jennings Road) are now underutilised whereas other areas, where there are currently no parking schemes, have become oversubscribed.</p> <p>We agree that the effect of your original parking scheme was to move the parking problem to roads outside the scheme. However, we are concerned that your proposed shared use parking scheme across a wider area will simply recreate the problem your original plan was trying to resolve.</p> <p>You accept in your letter that our parking problems are mainly caused by commuters parking in our roads (addressed further below). However, we beleive that the introduction of shared parking for a flat fee of (effectively) £2.90 a day across a wider area will not result in the sharing of parking across the entire section of roads in the scheme as you are hoping. Commuters will be delighted to be able to park for £2.90 a day and will, of course, choose to park in the roads closest to the station. Thus the parking problem will simply move back to the roads in your original scheme.</p> <p>We have some proposed solutions to this:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All roads in your new scheme should only have a certain number of bays available for "public parking" and the others should be for residents parking only. This means that no individual road will become too busy with commuter parking.</li> <li>2. The cost of public parking should not be a flat rate. It should be higher for the the roads closest to the station. If the cost is the same throughout the scheme the areas closest to the station will become dangerously busy again. If you have different parking charges then some commuters will choose cost over convenience and be happier to park further away from the station, meaning that parking will be shared more equally across the roads in the scheme.</li> </ol> <p>Finally we believe that there is one simple solution to all of these parkng problems - REDUCE THE COST OF PARKING AT THE STATION. You accept in your letter that most of our parking problems are caused by commuters parking in our roads. You will know this is to avoid the high cost of parking at the station. PLEASE PLEASE consider reducing the cost of parking at the station. Can you imagine how clear and trouble free all these roads would be if a commuter could park at St Albans station for, say £2.90 a day?</p> <p>We hope you will take our comments into account when deciding your next steps.</p>
187	21 Cotsmoor, Granville Rd	<p>Although I live on the edge of the area I visit family in Charmouth Rd frequently. My comments relate to Charmouth Court where parking facilities are already inadequate and many residents park their cars in Charmouth Road and on the corner.</p> <p>I understand that Charmouth Court was developed in 1961 to provide retirement flats and maisonettes with the expectation that only a limited number of occupants would have cars. The green at the corner is rarely used and I suggest that the freeholder is asked to utilise part of this space provide the extra car parking spaces which have now become necessary.</p> <p>There is no current problem with vehicles turning into or out of Charmouth Court and the proposed double yellow lines opposite this junction will be an unnecessary inconvenience to residents.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
188	Beaumont Avenue	<p>I refer to the consultation above and letter sent to Beaumont Avenue residents on 17 January.</p> <p>I would like to raise a concern about the consequences of the proposals on parking on Beaumont Avenue.</p> <p>There are currently no parking restrictions on the road and widening the restrictions on adjacent and nearby roads is likely to result in parking in Beaumont Avenue from where the station is a c.17 minute walk and there are bus links to St Albans City station close by.</p> <p>I would urge consideration of this impact and appropriate measures be put in place.</p>
189	Eaton Road	<p>Thank you for sending me details of the parking review.</p> <p>I see that the proposals include residents' parking bays in Woodstock Road South, Burnham Road, Royal Road, and Arthur Road, but not Eaton Road. This will result in commuters and visitors' parking displaced to Eaton Road, where parking is currently free. Eaton Road is well within walking distance of the station, and I therefore call for residents' parking bays and permits to also include Eaton Road. There is no off-road parking for residents of Eaton Road, who would therefore have difficulty finding space to park their own car and would be unable to park in adjoining roads unless they also had parking permits. Some parking would be displaced to Salisbury Avenue, but this is less of a problem as residents there have private driveways.</p>
190	Not Provided	<p>I have noticed what I suspect may be an omission in the proposed plans.</p> <p>I am referencing document/page 00879 that shows some of the Proposed Zone P3 Area 1 Marshalswick South including Faircross Way and the Park.</p> <p>There are islands of land at both entrances to the Park from Faircross Way as there is an island of land at the entrance to Gurney Court Road from Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>The entrances to the Park and Gurney Court Road rightly have double yellow lines to prevent parking at the junctions.</p> <p>However, whilst the island of land at the entrance to Gurney Court Road from Sandpit Lane is shown as surrounded by double yellow lines, the islands of land at the two entrances to the Park from Faircross Way are NOT shown with double yellow lines surrounding them.</p> <p>I hope that it is self evident that if these islands are not themselves surrounded by double yellow lines then vehicles will be parked against them negating the effect of the double yellow lines on the other sides of the road.</p> <p>I am hoping that this is just an omission in the drawings rather than an omission in intent of the proposals and that the omission will be rectified before the proposals are progressed.</p>
191	Faircross Way	<p>I have noticed a stretch of road in the Proposed Parking Review where both sides of the road have shared parking and which potentially could have cars parked 24/7 on both sides of the road thereby causing a passing hazard and/or restriction for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>I am referencing document/page 00879 that shows some of the Proposed Zone P3 Area 1 Marshalswick South including Faircross Way and the Park.</p> <p>There is a stretch of Faircross Way between Charmouth Road and the entrance to the Park closest to Charmouth Road where shared parking is shown on both sides of Faircross Way.</p> <p>It seems to me that the sections of shared parking need to be organised so as to avoid overlapping sections in order to prevent 24/7 parking on both sides.</p> <p>I recognise that it will be possible to park on both sides of Faircross Way outside of the proposed 11:00 - 13:00 no waiting period.</p> <p>However, it is to be hoped that the overall impact of the proposals will be to greatly reduce/eliminate the all day commuter parking in Faircross Way and hence the long runs of double parking that cause the problems will no longer form.</p> <p>Those parking in the restricted parking areas will necessarily be more transient as they can not park in those areas 24/7.</p> <p>It would be a perverse outcome of the proposals if the curse of all day commuters is reduced or eliminated but residents who wish to park in the street use the shared parking bays appropriately but due to the overlap parking bays the residents create the same problems as those created by the commuters.</p>
192	Faircross Way	<p>I am a resident of Faircross Way and I am concerned about the impact of parking restrictions that are likely to be introduced in Faircross Way and surrounding roads.</p> <p>One group of users that need parking spaces are builders.</p> <p>I understand that residents can buy visitor parking vouchers for use in the proposed shared parking areas.</p> <p>However, builders will doubtless work on properties with the No Waiting 11:00 - 13:00 restrictions outside a property as well as properties with shared parking outside.</p> <p>Builders need to come and go during the day and also need to park directly outside properties rather than some distance away due to the heavy nature of some tools.</p> <p>In summary, it will not always be convenient or possible for builders to park only in the shared parking areas between 11:00 and 13:00.</p> <p>My question is: Is it possible for residents to:</p> <p>Either 1. Obtain parking permits that will allow builders to park in the No Waiting 11:00 - 13:00 restricted areas during these hours whilst building works are undertaken;</p> <p>or 2. Have the No Waiting 11:00 - 13:00 restricted areas suspended for a period whilst building works are undertaken?</p> <p>If these are not possible, is there an alternative work-around that builders can use to prevent the parking restrictions having an adverse impact on the ease of working on properties in this area?</p>
193	Not Provided	<p>We have station parking in the road. If the cost to the public is 2.90 this is much cheaper than the station. As such I will have to pay for a permit and still not be able to park? Why isn't the proposal for residents and residents guests only?</p>
194	25 Homewood Road	<p>I am a resident of Homewood Road and if I am reading your proposals correctly, you are recommending introducing many parking controls around Homewood Road - on Faircross Way, The Park, Charmouth Road, Gurney Court Road? And no such parking controls on Homewood Road.</p> <p>Will these parking controls just again once again move the problem? Homewood Road will become the place for free parking and cause significant congestion to our road.</p> <p>As you know, people are using all the aforementioned roads for parking, being close enough to walk to St Albans Station. Surely the logic of having parking controls on the top end of Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road (which are further from the station than Homewood Road) should also apply to Homewood Road?</p> <p>By also introducing similar parking controls on Homewood Road, I believe we will provide adequate parking opportunities in the area. This will also distribute all parked cars fairly amongst our area rather than creating a sought after free carpark on Homewood Road.</p>
195	Churchill Road	<p>Hi I received the parking review letter today I live on Churchill road and I'd like to understand the changes more</p> <p>In particular will station commuters now be able to park on my road all day for £2.90 by paying for the 2 hour restricted period? The letter was not clear.</p> <p>Your urgent response would be appreciated</p>
196	Eaton Road	<p>As a resident of Eaton Road I have regularly experienced difficulty parking outside, or near to, my home.</p> <p>Under the current proposal neighbouring roads would become 'resident permit holders only,' whilst Eaton Road would remain unrestricted.</p> <p>As evident under the current scheme, I am now concerned that as Eaton Road is on the wrong side of the boundary, this will result in additional cars attempting to park on an already oversubscribed road.</p> <p>I strongly believe that Eaton Road will be adversely affected under the current proposal and should therefore be included in the 'resident permit holders only' zone.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
197	Not Provided	I object to the above proposal as the problems will be pushed onto Beaumont Avenue which is used as a rat run. The cars drive at excessive speed, coupled with parked cars on both sides of the road by station commuters, often partially blocking driveways, the visibility when coming on and off the driveway will be further impacted and reduce safety. I look forward to hearing your comments
198	Eaton Road	Thank you for your letter dated 17 January 2020 detailing the eight major issues caused by the introduction of your ladder parking scheme, and how you intend to resolve the issues by extending the issue laden scheme. I would like to register my concern that your “solution” will, rather than solving the problems, in fact extend the problem to other roads, i.e. repeat your Issue 5 “...displaced parking into other oversubscribed areas” (for example Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue). Before implementing and deepening the issues, please explain how a repeat of Issue 5 will be avoided?
199	Charmouth Road	I am sure you will get lots of objections to the proposed scheme, as usual I imagine. But I would like to congratulate your people on coming up with a comprehensive scheme that seems to equitably balance the interests and needs of residents, the rights of the general public with traffic safety requirements. Well done!!
200	Not Provided	You have gone too far with the extension. Atm ppl dont Park from half way up Charmouth and gurney. You need to have an active sitdown with. Residents. Restricting parking all the way to marshals drive and then the audacity to charge ppl. You have left no free parking zones for a mile radius. The station parkers will simply move to other roads and then new problems. There's a simple solution which i sent you in the june. Consultation but you guys are showing a different kind of stupid as your not. Solving anything. Worst roads. Battlefield, Lancaster, Woodstock north, Gurney ct half way, Chsrmouth half way Double yellow all those. Open up York rd, clarence rd Park side. Jennings school side. Problem. Sorted
201	Not Provided	Hi just received new layout for the ladder scheme We have six cars in our household. You only give 3 permits. We were parking other vehicles in rds closest to our house with no permits ie Burnham rd, Woodstock rd, Harptree way You. Have now included all those roads. Can you please tell me where I can now park my cars during the day. You have now restricted where we can park. I am in p1 so will you now be offering me extra p2 p3 permits to accommodate the extra vehicles. I pay taxes and road tax and fuel tax. You have not considered anything towards families with multiple cars. What do you suggest I do. I am willing to pay the extra permit for p2 p3 as a resident ie £20 first £70 second. I am not paying £152 for each subsequent car. I already pay taxes to park on the street. You have now restricted my ability to park anywhere close to my home. I await your Resposnse to this Matter with utmost urgency.  I have Parked permanent vehicles elsewhere further afield only to be abused by people in that road for parking despite being legal to do so
202	Charmouth Rd	Thank you for the considerable work which had gone into finding a solution to the problems caused by the Fleetville CPZ. I have 3 main concerns regarding the proposals for Charmouth Rd : 1. The single- yellow lines are on the odd-numbered side at the Sandpit Lane end of Charmouth Rd which is the opposite of the main traffic flow i.e. in the morning most drivers head South and queue to exit onto the roundabout. This should be changed to be on the even-numbered side to better accommodate actual road usage. The afternoon school/evening rush is much more staggered. 2. More than 50% of the parking will be unavailable to residents due to yellow lines. There are only 6 resident spaces for the 24 houses at the section before Faircross Way. This is insufficient and the balance between yellow lines and resident bays needs to be better balanced. Re the whole scheme: 1. The Marshalswick area should have restrictions 8-10am, not 11-1 as proposed for these reasons: a) This timing would closer align with the main morning rush-hour traffic when the road needs to be as clear as possible. b) to stagger available on-street parking in the area across the CPZ with us and Fleetville. c) it would inconvenience residents the least as most visitors in the day are over lunchtime. The need to use vouchers would then be minimised. d) the hours needing patrols would be staggered across the area. 2. There is only an option to pay for 2 hours parking proposed. There should be an option to pay for half an hour, 1 hour or 2 hours in this area as there are in other pay parking areas of St Albans.
203	Stanhope Road	I live on Stanhope Road and i like the sound of the new proposals on the ladder roads as I hope it will lessen the volume of people parking in P zone original, assuming that is no residents on zones P1-3 can park in P original? Please clarify I have interpreted the new proposal correctly.
204	Brampton Road.	We've received the proposed amendments to the parking scheme but I'm wondering if there's a mistake or an oversight for our address Brampton road. We would be taken into the new zone of P2 however this is just our side of the road and only our small section between Hamilton and Woodstock. We wouldn't be able to park opposite our house (P1) or on our road during restricted hours if there aren't spaces in the tiny bit of P2. Also our side stretch of road is predominantly houses with drives so there are limited spaces to park in. We surely should be P1 as per the rest of the road?

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
205	Not Provided	The main planning issues are caused by school drop off/pick up parking. This is a school with a small catchment area and driving kids to school should not be encouraged.Can the restriction be at school drop off and pick up time? We have a major environmental crisis and St Albans parents driving to school seem to be ignoring this issue which isn't acceptable. This may be a deterrent?
206	Charmouth Court	With regard to the new parking restriction consultation proposed for Charmouth Court St Albans, I am responding to the letter from Gary Payne (21 January 2020). Can I ask if anything will be done to make good the road surface of Charmouth Court before this plan is implemented? - As far as I am aware this road has not been touched in at least the 10 years that I have lived here, not even a posthole has been filled. I fully support the proposed new parking plans but also think it would be sensible to attend to the road surface before applying any lines.
207	Marshals Drive	I am in receipt of your document dated 17th January, which seeks to find a solution to the problem of parking displacement from the station area.  In this proposal you identify Marshal's Drive as not requiring any action, but you put restrictions on all other roads. I presume you feel that MD is too far to attract casual parking and you may indeed be correct in that assumption. What, however, you seem either to have ignored or are unaware of, is the problem of pooled parking. Thus is where, for example, three other drivers park their cars in the most convenient place (ie no charge) and then share a lift to the station car park. This is precisely why the Quadrant introduced parking restrictions and cameras some time ago.  Marshal's Drive has the potential to become a displaced car park unless you include it in your proposals. A 2 hour restriction from say 12 noon until 2pm, Monday to Friday would solve the problem (no need for elaborate yellow lines or ott signage.)
208	Sandpit Lane	I'm glad you are addressing the parking on both sides of roads such as Charmouth Road. My only concern is that the only pace left for people to park now may be Sandpit Lane. As I understand it there are no restrictions on the main road. When builders have parked on Sandpit Lane whilst working it's led to traffic disruption. Would it be an idea to place restrictions on this road too?
209	Gleave Close	I just received the notes with the outcome of the initial consultation for zone P. I live in Gleave Close (off of Woodstock Rd North) and we already have issues with commuters and students parking in the cul-de-sac. With the proposed changes our road would become impossible if it is not under the same scheme as other local roads. Can I ask is there any reason why it wasn't included in the same proposal? Is it possible to re-evaluate given the location?
210	Gurney Court Road	Many thanks for the information on the parking review. I live on Gurney Court Rd and I'm sure the changes will help. I wanted to find out why Gainsborough Ave, Blenheim Rd and the top of Jennings Rd are being treated differently, and not being converted to 'permit parking shared with public parking'? I think those roads should be treated in the same way as the others with mixed use parking. These roads are mainly empty during the day and it seems logical to spread the public parking. I can understand why it would remain residents only between Brampton Rd and Hatfield Rd, given that there is little off-road parking in that area.
211	Not Provided	I have read all the info and just have a question on the P2 restriction. Does it mean a non resident can park there all day as long as they pay for the 2 hr slot? Can you pay for the 2 hrs in advance ie when the car is parked at 8am in the morning before walking on to the station. Or can you only pay at 11am?
212	Lancaster Road	I have studied the proposals with regard to his they affect Lancaster Road. They seem well thought out and overall they should improve matters. My only concern is that given that a commuter can pay £2.90 over the phone and still park all day, the purple areas might become full of commuter parking making it hard for residents to find places. After all, £2.90 is still a lot cheaper than paying for a car park for the day. Where has the sum of £2.90 come from? Shouldn't it be higher to deter commuters from parking on the road? Surely commuters should be encouraged to use the car parks at the station. I fear that parts of our road will remain a commuter hot spot.
213	Brampton Road	There are a number of problems which have arisen due to the new parking scheme proposals. It was a long time before our views were listened to and when they were they were acted upon. Great! Now our concerns from the past, itseems, are to surface again. I have spoken very briefly to a number of residents of Brampton Road and Park Avenue who are not keen on the proposals to say the least. Brampton Road and Park Avenue are now to be split into 2 zones P1 and P2. I have a corner house; my address is Brampton Road but the length of my house is in Park Avenue where I always park my car. Will my new permit prevent me from parking here? Up to 12 residents of Brampton Road park their cars on Park Avenue because there is not enough space on Brampton Road. The residents of Brampton Road cannot all park on Brampton Road. Where will they go? I expect the parking problems of the past will return to Park Avenue and Jennings Road. Where will all the tradesmen and delivery drivers park when the spaces are full. Builders, painters and decorators, electricians, gardeners, scaffolders etc all use these roads on a daily basis. I am also concerned about those who have a drive and cannot get out. Drivers can legally park up to the edge of the drive on both left and right and also opposite; but it is absolutely impossible to manoeuvre the car out onto the road. I am an asthmatic and have long suffered respiratory problems. I have noticed a considerable improvement since the present parking scheme began. Is that all going to change back to the way it was? People without these problems just dont seem to understand!!What about all the children using these roads to come to school at the busiest times? Will they not be storing up problems for the future? With the massive house building projects in St. Albans at present parking problems can only intensify. You must consider building multi storey car parks that can take commuter cars off the roads so that residents can be left to freely park where they live. When I suggested this before I was told that there was enough space at the station. Well make people park there then and keep these parking restrictions in place!
214	Not Provided	I require some assistance to understand the impact of your review on Cavendish road and it's current parking permits. At being within a 5 minute walk to a popular train station where it costs over £8 to park for the day, it seems your current proposal is either to : 1. Remove any parking restriction, meaning residents like myself will have to battle with london commuters to park outside my own house (I sincerely hope this is not the case.) 2. Put in place a 2 hour restriction, meaning as above that commuters can park their car at 7am, spend £2.90 and then pick their car up at 7pm when they return home from london. (Again a ridiculous proposal for somewhere so near a train station which has cheaper tickets to london than the surrounding area - so draws many people from more rural areas to commute to the track in station by car and to then get the train into london). this proposal also only seems to benefit the council in reviewing £2.90 a day and has zero benefit to residents. 3. The time of the current restriction moves to 11-1. With only residents able to park or offer their visitors parking through permits. I sincerely hope I am completely misinterpreting these guidelines. Could you inform me of what is actually happening to original zone P, as both online and in the letter it fails to show us on a map and the impact of this review. Please be aware that parking really impacts mine and my neighbours quality of life and that the above 1 and 2 interpretations will result in much anguish, pain and undue stress if accurate.

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
215	Gurney Court Road	<p>I have received your proposals that affect the parking for our house. We currently are a family of 5. 4 of us are of adult age and we have 3 cars, 2 of which park on the road. This change will have a big impact on us financially as we commute by the train, so our cars will be on the road for the times mentioned as we bike to the station.</p> <p>The solution you have put forward will encourage us to use our cars which with pollution and global warming cannot be the solution you want. You mention access difficulties. Gurney Court Road is a wide road and I have lived here nearly 20 years. I have yet to see any access difficulties for any emergency vehicles. The road will accommodate an emergency vehicle even with vehicles park either side of the road.</p> <p>The other point I wish to make is that the restrictions will only encourage the road to become a race track as the number of parked cars is likely to reduce. People race down this road as it is and your proposals will make this worse and therefore more unsafe.</p> <p>Please, please leave the status quo as it is. We do not want this change.</p>
216	Homewood Road	<p>We are resident at Homewood Road</p> <p>The proposals, as we understand, introduce restrictions to all the adjacent roads to Homewood Road - including Faircross and Woodstock North.</p> <p>The junction of Homewood Road/Sandpit Lane has witnessed numerous traffic accidents - although it is difficult to understand what the primary cause is. We are however concerned that with Homewood Road remaining unrestricted their will be a shift of those wanting to avoid parking payments in either Faircross or Woodstock Road North deciding to park in Homewood Road.</p> <p>This may cause an issue at the south end of Homewood Road - basically the frontal footage of our property and on the opposite side of the road.(frontal footage of the church). We would suggest that double yellow lines with no parking at any time for this small area should be added to the current proposal. - primarily on safety grounds - so that the exit to Sandpit Lane is kept as free from obstruction as possible.</p>
217	Gurney Court Rodd	<p>Many thanks for the letter dated 16 Jan 2020 which outlines the proposed changes to Gurney Court Rd and others.</p> <p>I am very pleased with all the proposed changes around the junctions of the roads in question primarily as safety will be increased. In particular, I am very pleased that my request to extend double yellow lines up to no. 12 Gurney Court Rd has been accepted- this will improve the vision, therefore safety, of drivers going in both directions, and myself, at bottom end of the road at the dangerous double junction with Sandpit Lane. Recently, there has been an increase in all day parking on the pavements at this end and along both sides of Gurney Court; on numerous occasions I have not been able to reverse my car out of my drive and then when I have managed to manoeuvre out, usually a car/van comes hurtling down the road.....very dangerous indeed.</p> <p>Significantly, Gurney Court Rd is a through road particularly used for commuter traffic during rush hour. Many drivers travel at dangerous speeds on a what is a residential road; I hope that the proposed Order will be implemented quickly so that “the accident waiting to happen” doesn’t. Upon receiving your Parking Review letter dated 17 Jan 2020 about the Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South roads, I note that there is a slight difference to the parking restrictions planned at the Sandpit Lane end of Gurney Court Rd as proposed in the letter dated 16 Jan 2020 ( see my response below).</p> <p>I still request that there should be double yellow lines along this section of Gurney Court Rd up to the boundary of no. 9 (lhs) and no.12 (rhs) - this would increase the line of vision for drivers in both directions at the dangerous double junction which has 2 sharp bends, and also it would facilitate a larger passing place for traffic particularly during busy periods. As it is a straight through road, many cars travel at speed along Gurney Court Rd. Also drivers travelling down Sandpit Lane, turning right onto Gurney Court Rd travel at dangerous speeds. If the double yellow lines are extended then having no parked cars on a longer section will open up the passing space area at this junction and neither will there be reduced vision for drivers/pedestrians using this section of Gurney Court Rd.</p> <p>As for myself, I will actually be able to reverse my car out of my drive safely, with more room, greater vision, and without having to worry about cars bumping into me at speed.</p> <p>All in all I am pleased with the proposed TRO for the bottom end of Gurney Court Rd but specifically to have double yellow lines up to no. 12..... this will increase the safety for all who live on it and for those who drive along it.</p>
218	Park Avenue	<p>I am a resident of Park Avenue and am writing to express my serious concerns over the proposed changes to resident parking on this, and other neighbouring roads. My main concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Park Avenue is very close to Verulam School. As a result, at certain times of day, there are large numbers of boys walking and cycling both on pavements and in the road. Their behaviour is often typically reckless, and I have personally witnessed many near misses involving students and motorists, mostly before the parking restrictions were introduced.</li> <li>•Before residents' permits were brought in, our street was used every day by station commuters. Cars were parked on both sides of the road, often dangerously close to the edge of drives. Not only did it restrict space for cars to pass, but significantly reduced visibility for residents getting in and out of their drives, thus increasing the risk of a potential road traffic accident.</li> <li>•A minimal daily charge of £2.90 to park between 11-1pm will make Park Avenue and other nearby roads a cheap alternative to station parking for commuters and therefore, I am clear that the proposed new arrangements will see a return to the dangerous road conditions on the road.</li> </ul> <p>I would ask you to re-consider the proposals and maintain the current parking arrangements, for the safety of residents and other members of the local community.</p>
219	Marshal's Drive	<p>The lesson from the Ladder Roads parking experiment is that, where you introduce such restrictions, parking will be displaced to other roads. This is clear from the emptiness of Jennings Road during most of the day, for example, and the dangerous and unacceptable situation created in Charmouth Road.</p> <p>A statement of the obvious, maybe, but it does give a clue as to what will happen if the proposals in your letter of 17th January are adopted. It is possible that the displaced parkers in Charmouth Road etc will return to the Ladder roads at a cost of £2.90 per day and we would regard this as a welcome outcome.</p> <p>However, you need to understand that most of the displaced parkers are going to the station and are either pool-parking ( parking free and sharing a lift to the station car park), cycling or walking. Walkers might be inclined to pay £2.90 to be near the station but pool-parkers and cyclists are going to go to the nearest free option which in this case will include Marshal's Drive which already suffers from non-resident parkers at both ends. The parking at the eastern end, which has appeared since the Quadrant management introduced restrictions in their car park, already presents a dangerous hazard.</p> <p>We would suggest that you should do one of two things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abandon the Ladders roads sheme and accept that it has caused more problems than it has solved or</li> <li>2. Introduce a 2 hour restriction in Marshal's Drive, say from noon til 2pm, Monday to Friday.</li> </ol>
220	Jennings Rd.	<p>As we will be one of the nearest roads to the station to offer the 'pay by phone' option of parking, Jennings road will be the principle road that commuters will choose to park on. This will lead to a recurrence of the problems that prompted the original request for resident permit parking.</p> <p>A fee of £2.90 is no disincentive to commuters, especially compared to the cost of the station car park.</p> <p>The increased parking by commuters would again make it difficult for residents to enter or leave their driveways due to the reduced visibility and turning circles caused by vehicles parking close to, and opposite drives.</p> <p>Furthermore such a scheme, which would allow commuters to park on both sides of the road, will cause increased congestion. This will be very dangerous on a road that has so many school children pedestrians and cyclists, and such heavy school traffic.</p> <p>I believe that if one side of the road be kept exclusively for residents parking, (including residents visitor permits) this problem might be avoided. Residents will be more mindful of not affecting access to their neighbour's drives. I also think that this will avoid the narrowing of the street by continuous parking on both sides of the road, and ease congestion especially around school pick up time.</p> <p>To have a pay to park scheme on both sides of Jennings Road will be disastrous for local residents. I ask the council to only apply 'pay to park' to only one side of the road.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
221	Charmouth Road	<p>We are residents of Charmouth Road, now P3, near the sandpit lane roundabout, and among those very badly affected by the parking problems on a daily basis through 2019 and ongoing.</p> <p>We have received the letter proposing a solution to the parking issues, we object to the proposal on the basis that it has simply converted the dangerous and wrong situation we're in with excessive commuter parking into a profit making opportunity. This solution will leave us with no parking still for visitors, contractors and deliveries as all spaces will fill in the early hours each day. With this £2.90 approach to parking through 11 - 1pm the council are formalising their treatment of our residential roads as the cheapest commuter car park in st albans, - and it is not acceptable. Comparing this parking charge to the station carpark - it's clear it actually encourages people to use this alternative option at a significant saving.</p> <p>Considering that the council receives ever greater amounts of council tax each year, as the town expands, it's unacceptable that they are not resolving the issue of commuter parking by providing a proper cheaper carpark for those that need it, at whatever distance is workable. It's a disgrace that the station carpark is as expensive as it is, but that's a different issue for you to resolve.</p> <p>We do NOT accept converting our roads to a commuter carpark.</p> <p>We also have an increasing number of cars park for long periods of up to two weeks, - which we assume is people parking for holidays/business trips, we had a growing problem with it a year ago, but now it's more of an issue, and I would expect that the £2.90 per day may encourage that to continue rather than discourage it.</p> <p>Making our roads safer is the priority, and there is an attempt in these plans to do this with single side parking only. However we're very disappointed that the planners are now delaying the resolution of this urgent problem while they explore the idea of profiting from their poor planning over a year ago. It's an unacceptable proposal. It is greedy and inconsiderate to the residents in this P zone. If those residential roads nearest the station can be protected from being a commuter carpark then so the the residential roads farther out. We have been surviving the proof (consistent daily basis) that many commuters will park and walk the distance. Our road is RAMMED with commuter parking and it will continue, because people are now in the habit of using our road, and also there are an increasing number of commuters coming in from the newer developments farther out.</p>
222	Jenningd Road	<p>1.Your address of stalbans gov.uk/troconsultations led me nowhere.</p> <p>2. Concerning the road I live in- Jennings- if I am interpreting your shared parking solution of being able to pay £2.90 per day for the ability to park in resident only bays are you not defeating the object.</p> <p>As anyone can park in a residents bay space at any time of day apart from the hours of 11.00am and 13.00pm- currently, unless they have a £1.30 day parking card, will this not allow people who travel into London, say, for work, to come along, park in a bay, go and catch a train and then phone you up and ask for a shared parking bay permit at 10.45am and then be covered for all day parking at the princely sum of £2.90. How much does it cost a day at the station???</p>
223	Charmouth Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> Just as an observation most of the houses on Charmouth Road have very large driveways and most with one garage as well so there is not really a lot of excuse to park on the road. Charmouth Court proposals seem fairly straight forward to agree so I would not expect to see any changes. I would hope that the yellow lines in the court will be regularly inspected and fines issued accordingly. The suggestions for Charmouth Court make complete sense as it has always been a concern that access for emergency vehicles is extremely difficult with inconsiderate parking, particularly in the evenings and weekends. It is not clear how tradesmen, removal companies will be able to park particularly if they have a job that last several days. This does need clarification.Charmouth Court/Charmouth Road Junction and Charmouth Road to Marshals Drive,It is extremely important that the corner of Charmouth Court exit to Charmouth Road and on Charmouth Road (towards Marshals Drive) is kept as clear as possible and while it may be of some inconvenience to No's 78-86 Charmouth Road the single yellow line on the even side of Charmouth Road is an absolute must. (Some cars are left parked for several days without being moved and at least the single yellow line will motivate car owners to move their cars so leaving a clear view of traffic.) Drivers from Charmouth Court onto Charmouth Road and likewise from Charmouth Road toward the Court exit are having enormous difficulty getting a clear view of traffic because of (permanently) parked cars so the single yellow line should help to alleviate that problem.</p> <p>The double yellow lines opposite the exit from Charmouth Court to Charmouth Road are essential. 78-86 Charmouth Road Suggestions will be made that 78-86 Charmouth Road are five flats that are part of Charmouth Court and do not therefor have the benefit of driveways to park their cars so a preference would be for residents parking permits outside those flats. I would disagree. Three of those flats do have access to a garage on the estate. The single yellow line, while being and inconvenience, will be much safer for drivers and road safety so I sincerely hope the present proposals remain unaltered.</p> <p>Charmouth Road (purple line).</p> <p>I am strongly against residents permit bays with a pay by phone option for cars parked between 11.00-1.00pm. This will simply mean that residents/car owners can park their car for as long as they wish - even when going on holiday- and just call in by phone to pay the necessary time. It will not stop cars being left on the road indefinitely and will not solve the present problems.</p> <p>Once the website becomes available and I can see the proposals more clearly I may add comments but I do stress that the website not being available during a consultation process seems very poor planning.</p>
224	Eaton Road	<p>I am deeply concerned regarding your letter sent, dated 17th Jan, regarding further parking restrictions in Fleetville / Clarence area and how the 8 issues the scheme created will be resolved.</p> <p>In the last 12-18 months the parking on Eaton Road (where I live) has got significantly worse. This started exactly the same time as the surrounding roads had parking restrictions placed on them.</p> <p>From my understand all of the parking issues in Clarence and Fleetville started when restrictions were put in place primarily on York Road.....a road where all the houses have drives.</p> <p>Your letter points out that you plan to resolve the current issues is to further extend the scheme, surely this just pushes the issues onto the surrounding roads that are not included (exactly as it did before)?</p> <p>I believe Eaton Road in particular will become even worse for parking if the new plan is introduced and is the last terraced house road (i.e houses without drives) in the area that will not be included.</p> <p>Can you explain your thinking for not including it? Most residents on the road I have spoken to previously did not think permit parking was required, but I'm sure this will change with the new plan.</p>
225	Grasshoppers day nursery	<p>I am emailing you this morning to ask for your reconsideration into how many parking permits we would be allowed for our staff members.</p> <p>We currently have 10 but ideally we would be allowed 10 more to cover everybody that's works with us.</p> <p>York road is mostly empty throughout the day, leaving the outcomes to agreeing more permits to be financial gain for the council with no negative consequences for the residents on the road or visitors to Clarence park.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing your thoughts and if you would like to discuss this further please do not hesitate to call me on the number below</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
226	Not Provided	<p>It is clear from the consultation responses that your initial changes to parking restrictions were very poorly thought out. You only consulted the people on the road for which the changes took place and made no consideration for where the cars would then be parked. The responses you have received confirm this - with over 70 per cent of those affected stating that the changes have made things worse. It really couldn't be clearer! This doesn't reflect well on your team. It also brings about a great level of concern that similar mistakes will be made again.</p> <p>Taking part in our neighbourhood watch scheme it became clear that the vast majority of residents would like the parking changes to be put back to how they once were. What is the point of Clarence road being ninety per cent empty during the day with no option to pay to park there? Yet all of the cars are parked on Clarence road and faircross way. There are two very simple cost effective solutions - simply offer the same charging that you are attempting to put onto faircross way onto Clarence road and York road.</p> <p>Put double yellow lines on the ends of the road that have been affected by the displacement parking</p> <p>There is absolutely no need to extend your failed scheme and create yet more issues and costs for the residents. They deserve better than your poorly throughout and implemented schemes.Looking at the specific negative impact upon my house at 21 faircross way why would I no longer being to park outside my own house when it represents no danger to anyone and creates no issues for the flow of traffic?</p> <p>Currently neither I nor my neighbours have had issues outside my house at 21 faircross way. I have lived here since 2011 and not ONE person has had any issue parking outside my house. When my elderly mother, and indeed anyone visits currently they park out side our house. This causes no issues or danger for anyone. Your proposals are to put a double yellow line outside my house. This is nothing but detrimental to me and for the other neighbours guests who park there. It creates a situation where a 75 year old lady now has to pay for a permit and walk in darkness around to my house. This is dangerous and frightening for someone of that age. No one has requested this why are you doing it? How will my elderly mother get to my house with ease now you have effectively blocked her from parking nearby ? And for what ?</p> <p>You simply need to put double yellow lines on the ends of roads to stop people from parking there. He rest should remain permit free. This whole project is a huge waste of time and money which could be spent on deserving and needy people. The truth is that you have now created all of this additional work as an attempt to provide a solution for a problem you have created. Where did you think people would park who you dislodged from closer to station - charmouth way etc it was obvious. Now you propose to dislodge further parking and residents lives because of your mistakes?</p> <p>Better to revert back to how the sparking was before with the exception of double yellows on the end and corners of roads. Under no circumstances should double yellow lines be put outside of my house thus forcing my elderly mother and other guests to park around the corner.</p> <p>As an FYI I have called to discuss the reasons behind this proposal and to articulate my concerns specifically about the yellow lines outside my house to</p>
227	Brampton Road	<p>I wrote toto yesterday regarding the parking issues around zone P and areas 1 and 2. Unfortunately my letter seems to have been distorted somewhat. I would describe myself as a bit of a technophobe who is trying to keep up. The trouble is the older I get the faster technology moves forward.</p> <p>Can you read and understand what I have written or would you like me to try again?</p>
228	Park Avenue	<p>I am a resident of Park Avenue and further to the correspondence regarding the Ladders Road consultation, I am writing with my comments and suggestions regarding the proposal. As I understand it, parking restrictions were introduced on the Ladders Road network first and foremost as a safety measure. My suggestion is for this to be maintained as, to date, it appears to have been effective in allowing safe road use. Verulam's Headteacher, Paul Ramsey wrote online about the very real dangers and a recent accident on 15 November 2019:"As all parents are aware, the roads surrounding Verulam School can be very dangerous. Only this week, two Year 6 girls were hit by a car on Brampton Road. Fortunately they were not hurt as they were only dealt a glancing blow. Our neighbouring roads are very narrow and often congested with parked cars and other traffic. This means that sight lines for both pedestrians and drivers can be restricted, thus increasing the risk of accidents. I would, therefore, ask that parents adopt the following practice if they need to drive their son or daughter to/from school: Please drive at no more than 20 mph in the vicinity of the school. Be aware of the potential for young people to step out from behind parked cars. If at all possible, arrange a pick up or drop off point away from the school. Could I also take this opportunity to remind parents that parking on the yellow lines outside the school and in particular the junction of Brampton and Sandfield Road is highly dangerous." The proposal to maintain the existing parking restrictions on Gainsborough, (Little) Jennings Road and Blenheim Road is inconsistent with the proposals for the roads surrounding Verulam School. These roads are a similar distance to the station and they do not have the same intensity of school related road use, which roads such as Park Avenue, Jennings Road, Churchill Road experience. I would suggest that the current restrictions are maintained on the roads surrounding Verulam School as these measures appear to be effective and allows for a large volume of school traffic to safely use the roads at peak school times. I recognise there is clear rationale for introducing further parking restrictions in the area beyond the existing provision as the displacement of parking is clearly having a negative impact on other residents. The proposal to have a combination of single yellow lines, double yellow lines and resident parking zones to allowing safe passing in the roads north of Sandpit Lane seems sensible. It should achieve the desire to limit the amount of commuter parking, therefore further improving safety on roads which currently do not have any parking restrictions. • A daily fee of £2.90 is considerably cheaper than the privately owned car parks at the station and will encourage rail users to park on the road network rather than at the designated parking at the station. I would suggest that any parking fee introduced (on the roads north of Sandpit Road) acts as a suitable deterrent to commuters. The council must have a long term commitment to both promoting public health and sustainability. Unnecessary car use should be discouraged and incentives provided to use public transport to access both the station and city centre. Council decision making should be focused on encouraging environmentally friendly/carbon neutral methods of transport such as cycling and walking. Aspects of the proposed parking review contradict this ambition and appears to encourage commuters to use cars and to park all day, close to the station.</p>
229	Beaumont Avenue	<p>Many thanks for sharing the detailed report on the proposed additional parking restrictions north of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>As a resident of Beaumont Avenue for the past 20 years we have always suffered with our road being a "Rat Run" as drivers seek to avoid the traffic lights at Sandpit Lane and Beech Road. Following the introduction of the "Ladder" Scheme we have seen additional parking at both ends of our road resulting in, effectively, a single lane both into and out of Beaumont Avenue regardless of which way you are travelling. I walk to the railway station daily and see people parking up in both Beaumont Avenue and Salisbury Avenue walking with me. Additionally, we have seen the build-up of cars being parked for long periods of time sometimes up to two weeks. Could this be people parking and then getting the train to Luton Airport! Additionally, the parking build up has been accentuated at the Sandpit Lane end due the staff parking there all day from the expanded Mount Karmel Kindergarten.</p> <p>The now long lines of double parking are leaving long lines of single carriage way during the week which is an accident waiting to happen as people try and force their way through to make the best use of the "Rat Run" they have chosen.</p> <p>In conclusion, we would welcome the opportunity for Beaumont Avenue to be included in the scheme otherwise it will become a very dangerous car-park.</p>
230	Brampton Road	<p>I was alarmed when a neighbour alerted me to proposed changes in relation to the proposed Zones P1 and P2. The maps are difficult to read as the writing is so small but the colouring on the map for Zone P1, and the overview map suggests that the whole of Brampton Road is included in P1.</p> <p>However the text box for the stretch of Brampton Road (north side) between Hamilton Road and Woodstock Road North states that the proposal is "Resident permit holders only Zone P2 Mon-Fri 11am-1pm Parking bays". This contradicts the maps and I think it is probably a typo. But if it is serious would cause significant parking problems in the eastern end of Brampton Road, given that we will no longer be able to park in Hamilton Road or elsewhere in P2.</p> <p>More generally, the division of Zone P into three (plus the inclusion of Burnham Road) reduces flexibility of parking in this part of St Albans and is likely to make matters worse, not better. A more significant parking problem is the amount of parking space taken up by contractors working on houses in the area.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
231	Marshal's Drive	<p>With regard to the initial consultation outcome and your recent letter to all residents, I would be grateful if you would please include Marshals Drive west of Gurney Court Road.</p> <p>This is a narrow road leading to a cul-de-sac. There is only enough space to allow parking on one side of the road, and access to our drive is frequently blocked.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would look into providing restrictions on this road, as it is frequently used for pick-up/drop off from schools as well as a parking space for commercial vehicles.</p> <p>In 2015 an H-Bar was painted across our drive, but the has not deterred people from parking across it. My preferred solution would be a double yellow line along the whole of the north side of the road, including across our drive. I am aware that it may be difficult to enforce, but I think it would be a stronger deterrent.</p> <p>I have attached some photos as evidence.</p> <p>I hope you will consider our situation.</p>
232	Marshal's Drive	<p>We live in Marshals Drive in the section between Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road. Our section of the road is already used as an overflow car park by businesses, their workers and customers in Ronsons Way such as the car/van hire offices, the Pilates studios and by workers from the refuse and recycling depot. They also use Gurney Court Road and probably at busy times Charmouth Road. We also have parents parking here for school drop off and collections.</p> <p>When the new restrictions come into force and Charmouth and Gurney Court Roads are no longer available for long term occasional parking the displacement caused is very likely to result in our road becoming a weekday car park. In the morning and afternoon 'rush hours' our road is very busy with tail backs from the William IV junction so if there is intensive parking plus tail backed traffic along Marshals Drive it could become grid locked and possibly more hazardous.</p> <p>Will you be monitoring the displacement effects of the restriction implementation and consulting with us further? Will you consider further restrictions in our road if necessary?</p>
233	Lancaster Road	<p>Could I just ask if I read this letter correctly that if someone uses public parking they need to pay £2,90 for the day? If so of course they will continue to park here rather than pay more in the Station Car Park causing difficulty moving up and down the road. Does this mean that they can ignore the parking restrictions from 11am to 1pm? I have spoken to several people in the road who also read this the same. Are we right?</p> <p>Please could you clarify this for us?</p>
234	Not Provided	<p>Please can you clarify the proposed new parking restrictions for Charmouth Court.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can residents with a valid Parking Permit park all day in designated parking bays in Charmouth Court, including between the hours of 11.00 am to 1.00 pm?</li> <li>2. Are visitors to be restricted from parking in Charmouth Court between the hours of 11.00 am to 1.00 pm but will be able to park at other times? Will they need a valid Residents Visitors Permit?</li> </ol>
235	Charmouth Road	<p>We would prefer to have 11 - 1pm requiring a visitor or residents permit, as it tackles the growing problem of commuter parking expanding across roads at an increasing distance from the station.</p> <p>This leaves room therefore for more regular use by the public for visiting residents, the park, cleaners and other kinds of practical contractor work etc, including better safeguarding of all residents due to better hope of finding the car owner as no car will be there long term with no hope of access to the driver should it need to be moved for any reason (even council access for any of the facilities, or problems like general maintenance urgent or not, together with being able to resolve inconsiderate parking near driveways, which is surprisingly common).</p> <p>I would highlight also that currently when we have needed to park our own car on the road, if I am gone for 20 minutes before 9 the space is gone when I return, and I have to park much farther up Charmouth Road, my worry with the proposal with this aspect is that as a result of the paid-for parking being full (I truly expect it will be) when the grandparents visit they will have to walk an unreasonable distance, including returning of course to put a permit on the car, - it's not reasonable, - and the reason that I believe the distance to park will still be significant is because the parking currently is so intense. I realise the planners are proposing opening up more of the roads in P2 to similar £2.90 parking, however they will fill, and those used to parking here will continue.</p> <p>In my opinion there's the issue of treating the residents and the general public (excluding commuters*) fairly on the one hand, and on the other recognising that the commuter parking problem does also need resolving, - but don't blend the two issues, - I sympathise with any commuters who park because they can't afford the station carparking, - in many ways if we could just provide cheaper parking for them it would not concern me, - but it's unworkable to means-test car parking, - most of the people who are blocking our road to go to the station are doing it because it's free, and it's likely they're valuing the walk it also gives them, therefore their habits won't change when you slap a £2.90 charge on top. But I think you definitely do need to find a solution for those commuters who can't afford the carpark, and many clearly wouldn't mind walking approx 1k for cheap parking.</p> <p>* I single out commuters from the general public here because the nature of how they park is an extreme version of parking.</p> <p>Note that the parkingrestrictions email came back as 'undeliverable'. I can't spot my typo in that email address at the moment!</p>
236	Park Avenue	<p>We write with reference to your letter dated 17th January 2020 regarding a review of the Zone P parking restrictions, in particular those changes proposed for Zone P2.</p> <p>As a resident of Park Avenue the introduction of the residents parking scheme greatly improved safety for road users, residents and pedestrians. Prior to the introduction of the scheme, visibility on the road for pedestrians and car drivers was poor.</p> <p>We live at the end of Park Avenue that meets Jennings Road. When Park Avenue and Jennings Road were crowded with parked cars, the addition of school traffic at pick up and drop off times made the road and junction very dangerous, and we witnessed several near miss accidents involving Verulam students as they attempted to cross Park Avenue. Cars would park up to either side of residents' drives and opposite them, reducing visibility and making access to and from driveways dangerous. The introduction of residents parking and the subsequent improved visibility when accessing driveways, driving and crossing the road, made the road significantly safer.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the introduction of the scheme lead to a displacement of cars to the north of Sandpit Lane and as such decreased road safety there, we do not feel that a return to allowing commuter parking on Park Avenue is in line with improving overall road safety in the area.</p> <p>The concerns raised by the residents north of Sandpit Lane with relation to the displaced cars, namely, blocked driveway access and reduced visibility, are the same problems encountered in zone P2 prior to implementation of the residents parking scheme, The latest proposed amendments to allow a return of commuter parking on Park Avenue would see a return of the poor visibility and potential for accidents seen before the current changes were made.</p> <p>In order to maintain safety the existing scheme should remain and be extended to the north of Sandpit Lane. Whilst we have no-objection to local business owners/workers and the students at Verulam parking on Park Avenue, enabling all day commuter parking would in no way improve road safety. Commuters should be encouraged to use the existing station car parks rather than residential areas if they are unable to travel to the station by foot or public transport.</p> <p>We hope you will consider our concerns.</p>
237	Glenferrie Road	<p>I live in Glenferrie Road and have no objections to the proposals for my road and those surrounding it. I am concerned that some action should be taken to assist visitors to Clare Court care home in Battlefield Road.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
238	Glenferrie Road	I'm responding to the update letter about the parking review in zone P sent on 17 January.I would like you to consider including Park Avenue in the new zone P1 or to allow zone P1 permit holders also to park in zone P2. This is because Park Avenue is used as overspill parking by residents' permit holders in Glenferrie Road, for which there is still often a need in the evening and overnight as there is insufficient space in Glenferrie Road for all of the residents' vehicles. This was of course also the practice before the ladder roads' restrictions were introduced in 2018. I suspect there may be a similar need for residents in the eastern end of the ladder roads to use Hamilton Road. If this change is not made that some residents will suffer inconvenience at a minimum, probably having to park in York Road. It will not always be possible for someone who, for example, parks in Park Avenue on Sunday evening to move the vehicle before going to work the next morning.
239	Not Provided	I would ask one question and make one objection: 1) Will the residents at Canterbury Court be entitled to residential parking and visitor permits for Battlefield Road? This is on the basis that the flats are in existence and should be treated the same as any other property adjacent to the proposals and not excluded. I recognise that this would be different were the flats being proposed to replace an existing property and would therefore not be entitled to permit. 2) Implications of removal of parking by the church. It would be far more sensible to place double yellow lines on the area which is the south side of Sandpit Lane by the Church only. This would ensure that the road remained passable whilst supporting the activities of the community space. In addition, double yellow lines on both sides of the road would potentially increase speeds as it would remove all blockages. If something is required both sides then ideally this should be for the period 8am-10am and 3pm-6pm, Monday to Friday.
240	Sandpit Lane	With reference to the proposed parking restrictions, whilst we fully support your proposals, we are concerned that there are no proposals to restrict parking on Sandpit Lane beyond the mini-roundabout with Clarence Road/ Charmouth Road. You will be aware that Sandpit Lane is always busy, especially at peak times with traffic approaching St Albans. It seems to us that as parking in the area becomes increasingly restricted motorists may well be tempted to park on Sandpit Lane resulting in more congestion & pollution. We would welcome your comments.
241	Charmouth Road	want to raise our serious concerns about the impact that the proposed changes will have directly on us as a result of the proposed introduction of the double yellow lines at the Charmouth Road end of Charmouth Court. It is clear to us that the proposed changes will prevent us from being able to access our driveway for the following reasons: 1. The proposed double yellow lines will mean that there will be insufficient parking for the residents at Charmouth Court because around 5-6 cars are usually parked in the areas where the proposed double yellow lines will be 2. Alternative parking will need to be sought by those residents and given the proposed restrictions, the two closest available places where there are no restrictions will be either side of our driveway (1) outside the front of our property and (2) on the verge between our property and number 95 Charmouth Road - there is insufficient space between our property and number 95 Charmouth Road 3. We will then be blocked in and prevented from either leaving our drive or being in a position to park on our drive. The reason for this is because across the road from us there are no houses with driveways and the entire side of that road has been earmarked for parking bays. This means that when cars are parked either side of our driveway it is impossible for us to manoeuvre around those cars in either direction because there will be no space in front of our drive to turn into because of the cars that will be parked in the residents bay. It is physically impossible to turn the car out of the driveway when there are cars either side of the drive and in front of us. We cannot turn left or right when this situation occurs and this will be a frequent occurrence with the changes being proposed to Charmouth Court 4. There were recently some substantial building works being undertaken at 99 Charmouth Road with vans being in the area and we were frequently having to ask them to move to access our property. On one occasion, we ended up with damage on our vehicle when trying to get back into the drive in this situation. Our issue is not relating to commuters parking on the road, it is the inevitable overspill from Charmouth Court that the proposed changes will lead to. The restriction from 11-1 will not prevent this overspill as we will be blocked in over the weekends, during the 'school run' in the mornings and afternoons and then in evenings. We have attached for your information some photographs which highlight the position. We do believe that we are in an unusual situation given the position of our property (with no houses opposite so proposed solid parking bays) and it is clear that the proposed parking restrictions will prevent us from being able to freely access our property. I look forward to hearing from you and would be happy to meet to discuss further. Regards
242	Eaton Road	Having recently received information through the door regarding the Ladder Roads Restrictions I am emailing to raise my concerns that Eaton Road is not being included in this scheme. I live on Eaton and believe given the proposed restriction all station parking traffic will be pushed onto our road since all other surrounding roads will have permits. I already experience difficulties with parking which being a mother of two young children is both problematic, frustrating and inconvenient. We also get traffic from the local school and local businesses not to mention the fast speeds of some cars. Hence to deter this with permits would be a very effective method I believe. This to reiterate I wish Eaton Road to opt in to the Ladder Roads permit.
243	Clarence Road	I live in Clarence Road and am totally against the proposal to allow any pay by phone possibilities during the restricted hours. This will just see a return to the pre-restriction times of commuters parking all day.
244	Blenheim Road	I live in Blenheim Road and object most strongly to allowing any pay by phone areas in any of the roads around here. This will just reinstate all day parking by commuters which was the problem the current scheme has solved. Allowing this has nothing at all to do with safety.
245	Charmouth Road	I would like to suggest a simple yellow line; or a residents parking only, with a purchased permit, outside my property (11am to 1pm restrictions) - NOT a pay by phone parking bay, which is currently proposed. The problem is cars parking all day on our road. Our car has already been damaged because it's very difficult to get in and out of our driveway due to parked cars. A commuter will pay £14.50 a week to park here, rather than in the station car parks. I understood the idea of restricted parking to be encouraging commuters to use the car parks provided. Please reconsider.
246	Brampton Road	I live at Brampton Road which is on the corner of Brampton Road and Park Avenue, the pedestrian gate to the house is literally on the corner, the gate for the off street parking is on Park Avenue and the front of the house faces Brampton Road. We notice that Park Avenue is a bit of an overflow for the Ladder roads, so often cars from the Ladder roads park on Park Avenue when they cannot find a space on the Ladder Roads or Brampton Road. Also we use Park Avenue the same, if we cannot find a space on Brampton then we park on Park Avenue. I think your proposal makes a lot of sense in many ways but will make parking more difficult for the folks on the Ladder roads as they will no longer be able to park up Park Avenue when it is busy. I would suggest making Park Avenue part of P1 to alleviate this. If you do stick with your proposal will we be able to get a parking permit that covers P1 and P2 as the house is on both Brampton Road and Park Avenue

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
247	The Park	You recently sent me a letter detailing the results of the above parking review. In the letter you provided a location on your website where I could find pdf's of the maps as I cannot read those you included with the letter.
248	Marshal's Drive	<p>I am writing to comment on proposals dated 17 January regarding changes to the parking restrictions in ladder roads and Marshalswick South.</p> <p>I object to the fact that these proposals would leave free all-day parking in only two roads in this entire grid (Marshal's drive and Homewood Road). I am concerned that people will displace to park free all day in these roads. From there they may walk/car-share to the station car park, walk to work in central St Albans, or get a bus at the Quadrant to their destination.</p> <p>I believe the introduction of limited waiting time at the free Quadrant car park was introduced to manage the problem of all day parking, confirming that the area round Marshals Drive may not be too far to walk to the station or to town (indeed we do both!); while the introduction in 2018 of restrictions in the ladder roads (and the impact especially on Charmouth Road) has shown how far people are prepared to go to secure free parking, both in distance from their destination and in parking dangerously near junctions and drives.</p> <p>I support the introduction of yellow lines and no-parking stretches for safety reasons, but note this will result in less roadspace being available for parking. I doubt that the demand will be accommodated without overspill to Marshals Drive, even once people are able to pay-by-phone to park in ladder roads with capacity; moreover I think the earlier changes have shown that some people are simply not prepared to pay for parking. Under your proposals our road will suffer the displacement of all those who cannot (or will not) park in the southern ladder roads.</p> <p>For these reasons I think it would be preferable to extend the two hour parking restriction to Marshal's Drive also (and to Homewood Road if the residents there wish) so that all roads within the grid are treated equitably, and so that these last two roads do not face excessive parking pressures created directly by the Council's decision to impose restrictions in all the other ladder roads.</p>
249	Woodstock Road South	<p>It is great to see a thorough review of what is working and what could be improved.</p> <p>I am happy to see some permitting on Woodstock Road South but fear it will not be a sufficient measure. This coupled with the inclusion of double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road and actually the situation could be worse than it is currently. The key consideration is that non-residents are free to park after 1pm and until 11am the next day. Returning from work to no spaces and then no additional space on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>I think double yellow lines is important for emergency vehicle access to other areas. My thought is that the best solution is to mirror York Roads restrictions with a permit from 8:30am until 6:30pm and a one hour no return policy. Due to the proximate to Morrison's and the Post Office we experienced higher volumes than other ladder roads. There is also the challenge of two popular eateries - Souvlaki City and Nonno's which attracts people in the evening along with the school hall hire. I would also recommend a letter to the school asking them to open the school car park when hiring out the hall. This weekend was another example where we cannot park and it is due to a 5th birthday party. It would not be as much an issue if the school provided access to their car park which holds approx 8-10 cars.</p> <p>I have spoken with other local residents who have the same thoughts. One expecting a first child and concerned about walking from other roads just to get to their home, especially in dark and/or bad weather.</p>
250	Brampton Road	<p>Hopefully the revisions will solve some of the problems which have arisen since the scheme began. As a resident of Brampton Road it has made a considerable difference to our quality of life.</p> <p>I have one comment.</p> <p>The distance the access protection lines extend beyond the dropped kerb do not take into account the narrowness of the road. My driveway exit in Sandfield Road is protected by a line but is often parked very close. This makes it very difficult to turn out safely - an extension of about a metre, even on side side only, would make a substantial difference.</p>
251	Sunderland Ave	<p>As a resident of Sunderland Ave we object strongly to the introduction of pay by phone parking for the public as it will only encourage commuter parking overspill from the railway station. Charging only £2.90 a day to cover the two restricted hours will be considerably cheaper than daily parking rate at the station and will attract commuters driving from further afield, which is not at all sustainable and will clog up our roads with commuter parking Mon to Fri. There is no necessity for public parking in Sunderland Ave as there are no public facilities or shops/services nearby which people need to access. Those vehicles associated with Sunderland Ave residents are presently issued with a daily permit. If the suggested remedy relates to Verulam School parking then the council could simply issue the school office parking permits for staff and public in Zone P 2 and this would not facilitate commuter traffic.</p> <p>Why this is being suggested in Point 2 of your letter in response/remedy to problems of blocked driveways in roads north of Sandpit Lane makes no sense whatsoever?</p>
252	Clarence Road	<p>I think this is worth a try as it stands.</p> <p>That said, there is a strong need for commuters to be able to park in the morning and the real problem here is spreading the load. It would make sense to have two charging regimes so that it costs more to park nearer the station. If you include the charges for actually parking at the station there are three parking regimes. People will then have a choice.</p> <p>You may wish to be a little more careful about unintended consequences. Before the current parking regime, visibility from our drive was almost nil. For 23 years we have avoided an accident when reversing out of our drive, but – believe me – there have been some close calls. If your new regime reverses this situation, you could be directly liable for any consequences. It might be more sensible to be a little more flexible about where you put access protection lines and who you intend charge for it.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
253	Not Provided	<p>I have read your Parking Review with interest. With regard to Charmouth Court (P3), I agree with, and approve of, all the double yellow lines proposed in Charmouth Court, indicated on the relevant map.</p> <p>I am unsure about the arrangements for parking in areas indicated by a blue line on the map, and would appreciate further clarification.</p> <p>1) Does the sign on the map “Residents Permit Holders” refer to visitors for whom the resident has bought a book of permits, costing £1.30 per day?</p> <p>2) Are visitors only allowed to park Mon.- Fri. 11am - 1pm?</p> <p>3) I am assuming there are no parking restrictions at weekends?</p> <p>4) Are residents, and other essential visitors and service providers, allowed unrestricted parking at any time ?</p> <p>As Charmouth Court is a complex of flats, <b>with no private drives</b>, it is important to consider the following facts:</p> <p>Residents vary in age, from young babies to senior citizens, and their requirements vary accordingly. It is necessary for some categories of visitors to be able to park in the road at any time without payment, for example:</p> <p><u>Health Care Professionals:</u> Doctors, Midwives, District Nurses, other health care staff, Care Workers, Home Help eg “Molly Maids”.</p> <p><u>Relatives and Friends:</u> Especially important for young mums and the elderly.</p> <p><u>Tradesmen:</u> Plumbers, Electricians etc. Workers carrying out building repair and maintenance. Painters and Decorators, Gardeners working on residents private gardens. Landscape gardeners tending the communal grounds. Mobile hairdressers.</p> <p>It is necessary to devise some system that will allow certain categories of visitors to be exempt from parking restrictions and parking payments.</p> <p>You will be aware that there are garages on site in Charmouth Court but not every resident has a garage. Many modern vehicles will not fit into a garage. Families often have more than one car. Some residents have a disability and, at present, park in bays designated for the disabled. Even garage owners need to be able to park near their flat at times.</p>
254	Clarence Road	<p>I do agree that something needs to be done on Charmouth and surrounding roads as they are very congested following the introduction of restrictions. I live on Clarence Road which does have free space since restrictions were introduced. I have a question about proposals for the shared permit/public parking in zone P2:</p> <p>Will a commuter be able to park eg at 7am, and either</p> <p>a) buy a ticket at that time to cover the 11am-1pm period and therefore park there all day?</p> <p>b) purchase a ticket later in the day to cover the restricted period?</p> <p>If a commuter is able to do either of the above, then we will be back to the situation before restrictions were introduced, when there was no parking available for residents, their visitors and park users. Worse still, this new system may even tempt additional commuters away from the more expensive station car parks.</p> <p>I think it would be entirely reasonable to have some spaces made available for commuters to use, but not the whole of zone P2.</p> <p>Please could you clarify the proposal to address my query.</p>
255	Not Provided	<p>The proposals look sensible. I think for Albion Road residents this means that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We can still park in our road and Cavendish Road (zone P)</li> <li>2. People in zone P1 - P3 will no longer park be able to park here with their permit</li> <li>3. We can no longer park in zones P1 - P3</li> </ol> <p>Is this correct? Could you also please clarify which roads will be in zone P as I can't work it out from the maps.</p>
256	Not Provided	<p>Thanks for the useful conversation the other day - you may recall that I live in that part of Woodstock Road North very close to Brampton Road, and so hugely affected by their parking displacement immediately following the introduction of the Ladder Roads Scheme.</p> <p>I would like to better understand the 'reasons for parking' survey data you mentioned, and which formed part of the basis for your current proposals. In particular, would it be possible see the source data showing where and when in WRN the survey information was collected; and the results relevant to each section of WRN?</p> <p>I look forward to meeting you on the 1st Feb, but would really appreciate it if I could have sight of this survey data in advance.</p>
257	Hatfield Road	<p>As a local resident, but outside this scheme and therefore no permit, I wanted to request the council review the times of the restrictions to allow customers and church goers to find suitable parking for lunch visits and church groups. I understand the original purpose of this review was to stop commuters parking all day in this area, not to stop short term parking which supports local shops and community gatherings.</p> <p>As the current plans are suggesting to restrict all accessible zones near Blandford Road from 11-1, it would mean it is likely I could no longer attend baby groups on Thursdays or Friday mornings with my baby and toddler. (I wouldn't be able to use the further away pay zones as it's too far away to walk with both children). The restrictions would also deter me from visiting new and existing local cafes on other days as I would not be able to park between 11-1 when we would have lunch.</p> <p>I suggest that a better solution to enable a growing church community and for local businesses to thrive is to have restrictions happen at different times on adjacent roads.</p> <p>I also don't understand how the pay by phone service is going to stop commuters parking there as they could pay remotely from London. More on this should be communicated to the public so we can understand how this suggestion works.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
258	Clarence Road	<p>I am deeply unhappy about the proposed changes to the ladder roads parking scheme. Allowing commuters to park all day in our local streets will turn them back into a car park. Given that your charges are appreciably lower than the station car park, all the spaces will be gone by 8 am in the morning and if I move my car I have no hope of parking again near by.</p> <p>This is worse than the previous situation, when there were no parking controls, now I have to pay £20 for the privilege of not being able to park. At least before it was free.</p> <p>Are you sure that this is not a money making exercise? The council stands to make money charging £2.90 a day and yet the local residents are going to see a degradation in their environment.</p> <p>I know that there are problems with Charmouth Road and Woodstock Road North and these need to be addressed. If you want to free up parking then why not release half of it for commuters and keep half as residents only? That would be a fair compromise. Alternatively you could extend the scheme as it is to cover the areas that are affected.</p>
259	Eaton Road	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the plans being put forward regarding parking permits in Zone P, Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane).</p> <p>We live on Eaton Road and the major concern with the current plans is that it will push all non permitted cars (school drop offs, commuters, shoppers, tradesmen) onto our road which is already crowded, narrow and unsafe. The plans also means we will not be able to park on any surrounding roads when we are unable to park on Eaton Road because they will all be permitted and we won't be eligible. Unlike some of the houses within the permitted areas, we do not have driveways, so the concern is that we literally won't be able to park anywhere, let alone outside or even near our houses which I think you will agree is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>If you look at the plans, it seems crazy that all the roads in such a large area will be permitted, with the exception of ours, and seems totally obvious and inevitable that the outcome will be that cars will be driven to park on Eaton Road.</p> <p>I would therefore ask you to consider, if the plans continue to progress, that you add Eaton Road into the area that will be permitted.</p>
260	Charmouth Road	<p>You ask for comments and suggestions on the proposals as per your letter of 17 Jan 2020 of which I am broadly in favour.</p> <p>1) Why is the western end of Marshal's Drive excluded from the extension? This is already used as overspill parking for the Ronson's Way Industrial estate and collection/drop off for STAGS. If the implementation of the first wave of Ladder restrictions taught us anything it is that inconsiderate parking, if controlled in one area just moves to another. Already, should the inconsiderate park opposite another parked car on the other side of Marshal's Drive traffic flows are impeded. Restrict Charmouth and Gurney without involving Marshal's and I predict more objections in future.</p> <p>2) The same applies to the eastern end of Marshal's which is used by those using the Quadrant.</p> <p>3) It seems brave to exclude Homewood from these restrictions for similar reasons but perhaps you will hear from Homewood residents about that. But perhaps not since they are not yet affected. I suspect they will be if these proposals go ahead, however.</p> <p>4) There is a vehicular access to a block of garages to the rear of 110 Charmouth Road opposite 143 not acknowledged on plan which will need to be protected with double yellow lines to allow access. There is also a planning application in play for the division/extension of 110 of which I am sure you are aware which might affect this matter if the build there proceeds.</p> <p>5) There is a preponderance of driveway accesses in Charmouth Road, for example 145,143,141,139,135,133,131,129,127 to name but a few. Once appropriate access protection has been provided for these it will often not leave sufficient space to park a modern large car between them. If only a single yellow line is used in these locations the temptation will be great for inconsiderate visitors to encroach on driveway access with the generation of more ill feeling. Also, as we have learnt at the south end of Charmouth Road it is too narrow to allow for parking on both sides as well as the safe flow of traffic.</p> <p>I would suggest that the only workable solution would be create as many safe 'marked parking bays' as the road can carry and prevent parking elsewhere with double yellow lines.</p> <p>Allowing for parking on both sides of this relatively narrow road is clearly unworkable as we now know.</p> <p>6) To whom do residents make an application for 'an access protection line', please? It seems it is time I applied!</p> <p>7) I am happy to discuss this at any time: you will find me approachable and realistic, I promise!</p>
261	Brampton Road	<p>The proposals for the ladder roads seem largely sensible. However I have a concern about the impact of the public parking in zone P2.</p> <p>I live on Brampton Road with no off-street parking with one car which is regularly used. What concerns me is whether a commuter can buy their £2.90 ticket early in the morning to cover the restricted period 11-1 in zone P2 (streets just north of Brampton Road). This is because, after 1pm, Brampton Road starts to fill up with non residents/school kids or on Fridays, at 1pm, Brampton Road and surrounding streets fill up with mosque users. Ordinarily, I would park my car in Hamilton Road if no spaces were available in Brampton/Harlesden. If Hamilton road was full with commuters, there would be no where for us to park after 1pm.</p> <p>Could I suggest that ticket machines in zone P2 only dispenses tickets after 9.30 to restrict parking in these zones to allow for the overspill from Brampton at 1pm?</p> <p>Also, I believe some residents park their vehicles in Woodstock Road North rather than buy permits for their car so there will be even more pressure on Brampton once these revisions come into effect.</p> <p>Thank you for all your efforts in resolving these complicated issues.</p>
262	Arthur Road	Many thanks for your letter dated 17th January. We agree with the proposal and believe it will make Arthur Rd safer and reduce pressure on parking for residents.
263	Not Provided	<p>The proposal is not workable as a RESIDENT its meant to stop commuter parking but you are stopping my family from parking their own vehicles.</p> <p>Either you give me more permits as a resident I am legally entitled to park my car in my street.</p> <p>You need to stagger the times of the zones.</p> <p>11 to 1</p> <p>130 to 330</p> <p>In adjacent zones so residents who have freinds or family visit are able to park close by.</p> <p>Why are their no free zones and by charging committers per day they gonna park and block the same existing areas.</p> <p>I will seeking legal advice as a resident you are restricting me in parking my legally owned/taxed / insured vehicles.</p> <p>We are a family of 7 who all drive.</p>
264	Not Provided	We feel that the latest changes are a retrograde step in regard to Jennings Road. Parking charges of £2.90 a day will not deter commuters and at busy school times the road will become more dangerous and the existing scheme should remain.



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
265	Not Provided	<p>The scheme was originally brought in to stop our roads from being public free for all parking because we had in affect become free parking for station/city centre users.</p> <p>Since the introduction the scheme has worked well for users.</p> <p>As you are aware we are adjacent to a school, a narrow road and have a terrible camber on the tarmac.</p> <p>Many of our elderly residents can just about cope with the road as it is.</p> <p>Having reviewed the scheme we note that roads further away from the scheme are not pay by phone (Gainsborough, Brampton and others) and yet those roads (parts of if not all) are further away from the station/ city centre.</p> <p>This would inevitably mean that Park Avenue being one of the first public pay on street parking areas would again take the brunt of the cheaper parking.This is totally unreasonable and means that the Council may as well have not started the whole process in the first place.</p> <p>It is for this reason we object to the proposed changes and hope that common sense will prevail.</p> <p>We are also holding a residents meeting as everyone in the street we have spoken to is firmly against the proposed changes.</p>
266	Gurney Court Road	<p>I do not understand why there needs to be a 2-hour restricted period. Surely the only point of a restricted period is to prevent all day parking. Why cannot the restricted period be 30 minutes only?</p> <p>If the rationale for a 2-hour period is to allow parking officers to patrol the roads this can be accomplished by having a staggered restricted period, say:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lancaster Road 11am – 11.30am</li> <li>2. Gurney Court Road – 11.30am to 12 noon</li> <li>3. Charmouth Road – 12 noon to 12.30pm</li> </ol> <p>This would cause minimal disruption to residents and would cut the costs of both residents and visitors permits.</p> <p>I am keen to make the cost of on-road parking as cheap as possible. There are so many houses where there used to be a front garden but there is now just hard standing. My concern is that people may feel it cheaper in the long run just to concrete their front gardens and that is not good for the local environment.</p> <p>I am on holiday when there is the open forum on 1st February so will not be able to make my comments in person.</p>
267	Brampton Road	<p>I am incredulous at the absurdity of the new P zone parking proposals for the Ladder Roads and protest strongly against the planned changes.</p> <p>When this scheme was introduced, we were assured it was to mitigate all day parking problems caused primarily by those commuting from the City Station. Life would be easier for residents with parking permits we were told.</p> <p>Now:</p> <p>Brampton Rd, according to the map supplied is in 2 zones, madness.</p> <p>The new proposed smaller P zones take no account of the effect of eve and overnight parking from the ladder roads onto Brampton Rd and from there beyond to the roads off Brampton Rd including, Hamilton Rd, Park Ave and Woodstock Rd North. This means that residents unfortunate enough to be in the wrong zone overnight need to move their cars early in the morning to be in the correct zone for their parking permit to be valid! This is ridiculous, unfair and sometimes impossible. Residents are being penalised for living closer to the edge of an imaginary boundary that does not take local parking needs into consideration.</p> <p>This is a much more significant problem affecting many more residents than the occasional person from the Sandpit Lane end parking further forward, the example quoted in your letter as explanation of why the new smaller zones are being introduced.</p> <p>Additionally it seems the scheme is now officially a money making venture for the council with pay by phone at £2.90 for the 2 hour permit period in roads which might just have space early am; officially turning the whole area into a cheap carpark for the station and beyond. Remote payment means those car owners can be anywhere, even outside the UK. This is not my idea of benefits to residents paying for parking permits and is against the rationale of the initial scheme.</p> <p>As you can see I have copied in local councillors in this correspondence and I expect them to take note and ask questions in support of local residents.</p>
268	Brampton Road	<p>I think you have made a mistake on the map with Brampton Road. The north east stretch between Hamilton Road and Woodstock North should I think be marked P1 (not P2).</p> <p>I hope it is an error!</p>
269	Clarence Road	<p>We are writing in response to the parking review of Zone P Ladder Roads and Marshalswick south.</p> <p>We live at Clarence Road.</p> <p>Clarence Road was dangerously over crowded before the Council brought in the current parking restrictions . Since those restrictions came in, it has been much safer , as this busy road is much less over- crowded with parked cars.</p> <p>The proposals in your letter appear to be a massive retrograde step in relation to Clarence Road as you will allow public parking, so that it will become over - crowded again. The commuters will park their cars as close as possible to our driveway obscuring the visibility when you try and get out of your drive. Clarence Road is a busy drive through road so we will be back to ‘edging out ‘and hoping we don’t crash into anything as we can’t see the oncoming traffic. Our safety will be threatened by the proposed changes.</p> <p>The charges you propose are not set at a level that will deter commuters who are already paying over £4,500 P.A. to commute.</p> <p>It would make far more sense for paid parking to be on the quieter residential, roads like Gainsborough ,Blenheim etc where there is not a constant stream of traffic including buses, and so safety coming out of your driveway would not be an issue. We don’t understand why these roads get to keep residents only parking.</p> <p>We very strongly object to these proposed changes to our section of Clarence Road from a safety point of view</p> <p>As a result we are completely opposed to these proposals</p>
270	Beaumont Avenue	<p>I would like to make two points. The restrictions now in force &amp; the further proposed restrictions inevitably have the effect of transferring parked cars to nearby roads. Cars are often parked outside houses at the Hatfield Road end of Beaumont Avenue. If cars are parked too near to my driveway – 11 Beaumont Avenue – it can be dangerous driving out, as the parked cars restrict vision of oncoming cars.</p> <p>Beaumont Avenue has become a cut-through road used by coaches, lorries and many cars, some of which exceed the speed limit. I feel sure there is an accident waiting to happen.</p>
271	Not Provided	Can you also please answer the question regarding which streets I will be able to park in.
272	Not Provided	Enclosed photos taken today of Gainsborough (dead end road with imited cars and no terrible camber, not next to a school) and Park Avenue and yet the proposals are to make Park Avenue more parking accessible.

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
273	Seymour Road	<p>The problems here would not be so disastrous had the draconian decision to paint double yellow lines the whole length of Sandridge Road to the top of Seymour Road not been taken. This has unnecessarily restricted quite sensible short-term parking near the shops and furthermore greatly increased speeding. 40 mph is now the norm, 50 mph not uncommon, despite the presence of the school. Some lengths of these lines should be removed. Just on one side would suffice</p> <p>Lines on the corners of Watson Avenue are unlikely to make any difference. Nobody parks there.</p> <p>Lines outside the electricity substation are unacceptable. We have lived here for 50 years and seen no accidents or noticeable traffic problems. Also, the 2 spaces are invariably used by Infant School staff, or legitimate commuters, and never cause a problem. This is totally unnecessary. Has anyone been here to see the situation, or are you simply looking at maps? Has anyone physically consulted local residents?</p> <p>Why cannot the Infant School people use the spaces in the Junior School premises, where there seems to be ample room?</p> <p>Parking by quite large vehicles outside nos 3/5/7 dangerously restricts and often effectively prevents our exiting our drives with any certainty of avoiding an accident. Backing out is always hazardous, often impossible with any degree of safety, as occurred today, all day. Has this been considered?</p> <p>Why not a restriction to say any time except one hour at mid-day?</p> <p>Do you need to paint lines on both sides of Fontmell Close? Would not one side be enough?</p> <p>This supplements my email of 19th March 2019, and is of serious concern to us long-term residents.</p>
274	Not Provided	<p>I have received the letter dated 17 January covering the Council's proposed response to the review of the Zone P Ladder Roads parking scheme.</p> <p>There is one point in it which concerns me, although I may be misinterpreting it. Point 8 (on page three of the letter) states that to deal with the issues of private driveways being blocked, 'We propose to introduce shared use parking across this area as described under item 2. Further down it says that 'Public parking via Pay by Phone will be at the cost of £2.90 (to cover the restricted time of 2 hours per day)'. Currently on Stanhope Road parking for non-resident permit holders is limited to one hour during the 2 hour restricted window. My understanding from the above is that non-residents will now be able to pay £2.90 to park here for the full two hour restricted period. If that is correct then the primary point of the restriction (to stop commuters parking here all day) will be removed, as it will be much cheaper to park on the road and pay for two hours parking than to pay for a full day's parking in one of the station car parks.</p> <p>Please can you confirm exactly how this will work in the original Zone P, and if it is the intention to allow non-residents to park for the full two hours at a cost of £2.90 then can I please ask that you reconsider this, as the controlled parking zone will in that case serve no purpose.</p>
275	Marshall's Court	<p>I have just opened a letter with regard to changes to parking in Marshalswick South.</p> <p>While it is a robust suggestion and I appreciate the direct communications I have a direct concern about these new changes and subsequent charges.</p> <p>It concerns me greatly that it seems the majority of of the considerations for our specific road, Woodstock Road North, have been made to appease those already with a private driveway and none to support the residents that may are renting in the multiple blocks of flats at the top of the road.</p> <p>It seems unfair to me that a resident of the flats should have to pay to park their vehicle in the bays nearest their home, all because of complaints around “reduced visibility of private driveways”, when all the parking bays marked on the road for these flats, are in no way remotely near the private driveways of other residents or their elaborate and deliberately divisive front hedges.</p> <p>While I think the introduction of double yellow lines at the junction towards the top of the road is a sensible and considered idea, to blanket cover the rest of the road in paid for parking charges (when it is for the most part empty along Woodstock Road North and Jennings road) seems an unfair slight against those that aren't wealthy enough to afford a property that has private parking for three separate vehicles.</p> <p>I fully appreciate that these changes are across a wide area and that they may not have been deliberate, and that it is incredibly difficult to appease every person.</p> <p>I also can see and appreciate that these changes may have come into action to combat vehicles from other areas and specifically vehicles used for commuter parking on the roads of residents.</p> <p>However, I think it only fair that if the charges that will directly impact residents on this road should be waived and, or as a compromise, that all residents with an address on Wood Stock Road North should be given a free parking permit for at least 1 vehicle.</p> <p>It strikes me that way the residents who should be parking on the road to access their homes still can, and the traffic will still be reduced to hopefully offer all residents of the road a solution.</p> <p>I hope to thank you for your time in reading this email and also hope to hear your response.</p>
276	Not Provided	<p>I have still not received a response to this email, 2 months ago.</p> <p>Following the letter I have received today. Please can you confirm what Eaton Road would need to do to now opt in to the residence permits? Is it a certain amount of residents or a percentage of them that need to opt in? Having chatted to several neighbours I believe most would want to opt in as all the other roads around us will be.</p>
277	Not Provided	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b>1. The Ladder Roads are residential streets with no public amenities nearby. What is the justification for such widespread parking on the Northern Ladder Roads? 2. I don't understand the logic of why Sunderland Avenue, Churchill Road, Hamilton Road and most of Jennings Road are expected to take on extensive provision for public parking, but Gainsborough Avenue, Blenheim Road and western end of Jennings Road do not. They are all roads of similar character, of comparable distance to the station. Realistically, I would imagine all these roads could have been in the same zone. It also seems odd that York Road is having half the road marked out as double yellow lines, wiping out large amounts of parking, while other streets are being expected to take on more.3. I would like to know, following the expansion and revision of the zone, will there be additional traffic wardens? As previously raised with parking services, we have never seen a parking warden on our road since the scheme commenced on December 2018. This is despite myself and my wife being regularly at home in the daytime. 4. In addition to concerns about emergency vehicle access down the newly congested roads, we'd also be worried about parking for delivery vans, post vans etc. If all the bays are full, where are they to park? Surely this is asking for more problems. 5. Through traffic. Just likely Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road, the Ladder Roads are busy through roads. 6. Homes without driveways will be hugely inconvenienced. There are multiple properties on Churchill Road (and also Wickwood Court) without any parking spaces. It seems likely if public parking is allowed that the occupants of these properties will find it very hard to park for large parts of the day, probably until around 7pm in the evening once commuters return. Again, the local residents should be given priority over commuters. 7. I'd be interested to know when observations have been made. The spaces on Churchill Road are regularly used throughout the day, with cars coming and going as much as being parked all day. With these being residential family roads, many people who may be out in the day are returning by 4pm or 5pm following end of school days. These families would be the people worst effected by commuters using the bays into the early evenings. 8. I am worried about the long term impact of this project, for several reasons:9. If the council is determined to press on with mixed use bays (residents sharing with public pay-and-display), then I could support an amended scheme with reasonable compromises. Specifically regarding commuter parking, I believe station parking is currently £8.15 per day, assuming no season ticket. £2.90 per day is therefore a ridiculously cheap alternative to the station, so no deterrent at all to long term parking, saving a commuter approx two thirds of their daily parking cost. My suggestions are:10. You may recall that we discussed the truncated and unused bay at the end of Churchill Road, and you asked me to remind you about this. At the northern end of Churchill Road, eastern side, there is an undersized bay that was created when the parking restrictions were first introduced. The bay is of no benefit as it is only 300cm long (a small car such as Volkswagen Polo is about 400cm). Anybody who were to park here would be unable to fit a car fully within the bay, without overhanging the double yellow lines and the driveway entrance to the house on the corner.</p>
278	Not Provided	<p>Having seen the plans for our road, I can't help thinking that £2.90 for 2 hours parking will dissuade people from parking there all day. It is a small cost compared to all day parking at the station. Perhaps if there were two two hour restrictions (e.g. 9.30- 11.30 and 1.30 until 3.30) each charged at £2.90 the policy would be more effective.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
279	Marshal's Drive	<p>I have been discussing the implications of the latest incarnation of the ladder scheme with the vast majority of residents of Marshals Drive, and the overwhelming view, which will be reflected in a petition which will be submitted to you next week is both that Marshal's Drive needs to be included in restrictions of all day parking AND that the optimal way of achieving that is by the introduction of a 2 hour period allowing ONLY RESIDENTS' PARKING, and not by any other restrictions that can be circumvented by for example phone payment. This is, of course, a model already in place in many parts of the city.</p> <p>Allowing phone or any other means of payment to cover the two hours "prohibited parking period", does little to deter all day parking and actually encourages it by charging half the station daily car park rate, and thus is unacceptable as a solution. I understood that one of the original overriding principles of the ladder scheme was to be the provision of parking for residents and not as a money making plan...</p> <p>I can report that the petition, currently signed by about 80 of the residents of this road- has met with a 100% positive response: everyone approached has signed, with NO exceptions. All agree that the current proposals, which would leave Marshal's Drive as a free car park for those vehicles displaced by the ladder scheme, are ill thought through and as they stand totally unacceptable.</p>
280	Not Provided	<p>Thank you for sending the very detailed proposal for parking in the ladder roads. I hope that your plans will ease the congestion and solve the misery for so many people on the ladder roads. I live on Beaumont Ave, and as such I am quite worried about any further impact of the scheme. I wish to give you my comments as follows in three sections, Beaumont Ave, white lines and cycling.</p> <p>Beaumont Ave Beaumont Ave should have been considered in this plan. Adding a few more roads to the scheme will continue to push cars further out. Beaumont ave already suffers from severe congestion at both ends, especially the Sandpit lane end due to parking on both sides of the road. There are at least two vehicles, already, who are resident on a controlled parking road, who leave their cars on Beaumont to avoid a paying for a permit. Once the plan is extended to Woodstock, then more will just move to Beaumont. Many of the cars currently parked on the ladder roads will also move to Beaumont. The Verulam school pupils will walk a long way to avoid paying even a reduced amount, and as such they will park on Beaumont as the closest non-controlled road. When the last survey of parking was done, the Mt Carmel nursery was not in operation, so the impact of the teachers parking on Beaumont was not taken into account. They are now parking on the Sandpit lane end of the road adding to the congestion. I am in favour of allowing shared parking, as it is unfair to see so much empty space on roads such as Jennings (and it is still empty on the weekends, showing that the residents never had a parking problem there in the first place. But I ask that the scheme also includes Beaumont. If it does not include Beaumont, please address the issue of the ever increasing congestion at both ends.</p> <p>White lines As many of the driveways are narrow built for 1950s cars, it is important that white lines that go across drives are substantially wider than the drive, to allow cars to be able to turn in an out.</p> <p>Cyclists At present as cars are parked on both sides of roads and passing places are staggered, it is exceptionally dangerous for cyclists. Controlled parking bays need to be on one side of the road for long stretches and passing areas need to be larger than just one or two driveways.</p>
281	Not Provided	<p>Reference: Dental Practice at 32 Woodstock Road North, and your new proposed parking scheme extension. Have the location and particular circumstances of my dental practice been considered in the drafting of these new proposals? If not, why? I have been not short of comments to you for the past two years or more! You seem to have overlooked or ignored the needs of this local amenity altogether! With reference to the consultation document on extending the ladder road scheme to Woodstock Road North. I repeat yet again, that the congestion in my area has been entirely caused by the present scheme resulting in sixth form Verulam School pupils being unable to park in Jennings Road. This has already caused considerable problems for my patient access, especially the disabled, as our parking frontage becomes fully occupied by school pupils by 8:30 AM! If pay to park is introduced in Woodstock Road North this will have a further deleterious effect on patient access to my surgery, and pay to park would not be available immediately outside my premises (single yellow line restriction 11 AM to 1 PM). I repeat that I moved the surgery from 1, Brampton Road to the present address in 1974 as there was ample free parking access for six cars. There had been no parking or congestion problems here until the Ladder Road scheme was introduced! Adding additional double yellow lines to WRN would immediately further reduce the available parking space in my road, possibly further aggravating my patient access. Therefore, if you go ahead with implementing the scheme, I would respectfully request that you give consideration to 3 marked reserved parking bays for dental surgery patients as the solution to our difficulties. This was suggested by John Charlton, Gary Payne's predecessor, when the initial consultation about the Ladder Road scheme was circulated, and later abandoned. On the resurrecting of the scheme, Gary Payne later refused to consider it, as Woodstock Road North was "not within his remit" -- despite my predicting the consequences that we now see. In my humble opinion, if the school pupils need to pay £2.90 to enable them to park for a full school day, they will obviously elect to park in Jennings Road where there is, at present ample unused space close to the school. This, in turn, would eliminate the present pressure on Woodstock Road North. If the general public can pay £2.90, by telephone, to enable all-day parking, therefore, competing with the residents in the area, would this encourage station car parking in exactly the areas that caused the initial problems? (Telephone payment involves having a smartphone which not everybody can afford or cope with the complexities involved. This could be considered as discrimination) A corollary to this would be that the station car park charges would be undercut, probably resulting in multi-storey car park users preferring a cheaper option of local street parking! Worse than going back to square one?</p>
282	Woodstock Road North	<p>Woodstock Rd North is a residential through road with three road narrowing. As residents our view is that the object of the parking review should be to seek to deter excessive speed by through traffic while allowing parking by residents only. Multi car households are common in Woodstock Rd North and many residents are therefore forced to park in the road. The Council's proposals will increase traffic speeds and reduce available parking for residents not least by increasing commuter parking. Our detailed objections are described below.</p> <p>We object to the introduction of single yellow line parking restrictions in Woodstock Rd North. These restrictions will have the effect of increasing overall traffic speeds and traffic volumes whereas the existing road restrictions were introduced in order to reduce traffic speeds and volumes. These traffic calming measures were originally introduced following a planning inspector's enquiry as one condition for giving planning consent for the construction of a supermarket in Hatfield Road. The inspector required traffic calming measures because he anticipated increased traffic volumes to the new supermarket and he hoped through traffic could be deterred in order to seek to maintain the quiet residential nature of Woodstock Rd North. The second reason for objecting to single yellow lines is that they will reduce the parking spaces available for residents. This is particularly important because of the reduction in resident's parking opportunities that will occur if mixed parking is allowed in Woodstock Rd North. We have observed that at weekends, when commuters do not generally park, there is considerable residents parking particularly at the southern end of Woodstock Rd North.</p> <p>We object to the proposal that commuters will be allowed to park all day in Woodstock Rd North in those parts of the road that do not have single yellow lines and that this system is included for most roads of the Ladder Road Scheme. You must realise that by this arrangement the Council is competing directly with the station car park operators. A commuter will be able to save about £1200 per annum in after tax income by parking every day in a road rather than the car parks with the small inconvenience of a maximum fifteen minute walk to the station. This scheme could almost empty the station car parks while distributing commuter's cars through most residential roads near the station. This proposal would take us back to the situation before the ladder road scheme was introduced but the Council will have created a new income stream by charging commuters £2.9 per day rather than allowing them to park for free as before. The effect for Woodstock Rd North will be to maintain the present dangerous, inconvenient, polluting situation we have endured since the last changes were made. The Council will be earning some income from parking charges but we shall have to continue to endure the congestion and parking difficulties that we have now.</p> <p>We object to any P2 parking provision for residents of Brampton Rd who should only be issued with P1 zone permits. It is well known that some Brampton Rd residents regularly park in Woodstock Rd North and this may well continue in the future. This practice exacerbates parking shortages for Woodstock Rd North residents and should be discouraged.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
283	Churchill Road	<p>The purpose of this email is to respond on the current consultation with respect to the parking review for Zone P.</p> <p>The current proposals for a public parking option with a payment of gbp2.90 will simply result in Churchill Road (and other impacted roads) being the destination for mass commuter parking as the parking charge is much too low compared to Station Parking of c gbp8.90 per day. Commuters will simply park in Churchill Road and similar due to the price differential. We suggest that the public pay charge be increased substantially to circa gbp8.90 so that the above incentive is removed and an encouragement to use the currently unused 300 Station car park spaces.</p> <p>Due to the proximity of Verulam School we believe special consideration for Churchill Road needs to be considered re the dangers of young pedestrians and cyclists mixed with cars moving out of driveways with poor sight lines (because cars are parked too tightly to the driveways), the need for a clear road for the school pupils/ staff /buses/coaches which use Churchill and for emergency vehicles. Additionally for space for pick up and drop off before and after school, Jennings Road is significantly problematic at pick up time.</p> <p>Accordingly, we would propose a compromise solution such that Churchill Road would instead have one road side for resident bay parking and the other road side as mixed ie public and resident parking. Public Parking charge would be gbp8.90 equivalent to the Station Car Park so as to address Station commuter parking in Churchill Road.</p> <p>For safety (with mixed parking) we would also suggest that the lines be increased across driveways.</p> <p>York Road appears to be significantly underused. It is a quiet, wide road, with houses on one side only. The current suggestion is for parking on one side only (free parking 11-1, presumably for park users, mixed with resident parking). This looks ok but it makes sense to also have mixed resident/paying parking on the other side of the road, rather than no parking at all, as currently proposed.</p> <p>Lastly we would also suggest that the new arrangements when implemented will be reviewed again in say 12 months so as to ensure that there is an equitable arrangement in place.</p> <p>Proximity of Verulam School means we have a special case to argue re the dangers of young pedestrians and cyclists mixed with cars moving out of driveways with poor sight lines (because cars are parked too tightly to the driveways), the need for a clear road for the school pupils/ staff /buses/coaches which use Churchill and for emergency vehicles. And for space for pick up and drop off before and after school, Jennings Road is a nightmare at pick up time.</p>
284	Blenheim Road	<p>I live in Blenheim Road, and since the introduction of the residents parking scheme parking levels in the road have been reduced to more manageable levels. The road still has many parked cars as a good proportion of residents don't have driveways. It is also much safer for school children on their journey to/from school along Jennings Road West now that the junction with Blenheim Road is not obscured by parked cars.</p> <p>Therefore I support retaining residents only parking in Blenheim Road as your letter suggests.</p> <p>I would also like to say that SADC has committed to use its efforts to make the District net carbon neutral by 2030 and that the council agrees that this will require a modal shift from cars to other forms of transport. I see no discussion of this in the letter about parking proposals. There are many, many commuters who currently drive to the station who would cycle if there was adequate cycle provision. Rather than working out how to accommodate commuter cars I would welcome discussion of how to encourage and enable commuters to travel by other means.</p> <p>Space for cycle lanes rather than parked cars, more cycle friendly junctions, more and faster pedestrian crossings and better bus services should all be part of the parking review.</p>
285	Jennings Road	<p>We are very disappointed with the new proposal for the ladder roads and would like to object based on the below reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The £2.90 charge to park on Jennings Road makes us a very cheap station car park.</li> <li>2. Our street will now become a one way road making it very congested, dangerous for children crossing the road and walking to school and also dangerous when trying to get out of our drives as we will be forced to pull out 'blind'</li> <li>3. The original proposal failed as it simply flooded certain roads eg Woodstock Road and now this is moving the issue to Jennings and neighbouring roads, so ultimately this isn't fixing the problem just moving it</li> <li>4. Jennings Road is already chaotic particularly at the start and end of the school day and this will simply make the road worse.</li> <li>5. Why are roads like York Road and Gurney Court Road now residents only, surely there is scope for them to have some station parking on the road, given that they all have drives and there also aren't houses on both sides?</li> </ol> <p>Why is this parking situation being forced upon the residents of Jennings Road, when part of the reason for our decision to move here, and consequently the price paid, was that this was a quiet residential road that was safe for our young children and not a "rat run" or station car park?</p> <p>We look forward to your response.</p>
286	Marshals Drive	<p>we would like to make clear that as residents of Marshals Drive, one of the roads within "Zone P", we were not made aware of the initial Parking Consultation or the June 2019 review, and therefore we have not had any opportunity to respond to the implementation of what you are now seeking to change. Secondly (and more importantly), we strongly object to the current proposals outlined in the letter dated 17 January 2020. Marshals Drive (as well as Homewood Drive) is almost certain to become a displaced car park for those travelling to London or heading to the centre of St Albans. We are concerned that, to park FREE all day, people will simply displace to these roads - they can easily walk/car-share to the station car park, walk to work in central St Albans, or get on a bus at the nearby Quadrant to their destination. It is clear from the introduction of parking restrictions elsewhere in St Albans that people are always prepared to park for FREE further out than ever envisaged, to avoid paying for parking - which begs the question whether the Council might well be better looking at subsidising car park charges at the station and elsewhere in St Albans to reduce the number of cars parking on residential roads, which only increases safety concerns for pedestrians and drivers. We would appreciate knowing what the costs to-date of consulting on and implementing the Zone P parking scheme have been to-date, and the ongoing costs of maintaining and enforcing the scheme? Since the previous changes were made to Clarence Road and neighbouring side roads, we have experienced a significant and dangerous increase in the number of vehicles parking on Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road. It is obvious that this new proposal of 17/1/2020 will simply move the problem a few hundred metres further on to those roads (and junctions) which you propose to leave unchanged, namely Marshals Drive and/or Homewood Road.</p> <p>The Council has been well aware for some time that people were parking as far out as The Quadrant for the whole day to avoid paying parking charges, and that they were not put off by the walk to the station or into town (or car pooled to the station) - hence, the introduction of a limited length of stay to ensure that locals could access their shops in the daytime. It must be clear to the Council that Marshals Drive and Homewood Road will just become filled by those displaced from free parking elsewhere in Zone P and by the reduced number of overall parking places elsewhere under the current porposals. For these reasons, we ask that similar restrictions (a minimum two hour parking restriction, yellow lines and no-parking stretches) also be extended to Marshal's Drive (and to Homewood Road if the residents there so wish). This would mean that all roads within the Zone are treated equitably, and that these last two roads do not face excessive parking pressures and safety worries - created by the Council's failure to seek our views at the outset of imposing restrictions in all the other ladder roads.</p> <p>We would also ask that the Council take the opportunity to also consider traffic calming measures in planning any parking restrictions in Marshals Drive - even now, the double parking of cars does NOT slow down those speeding through, using the road as a short cut. The road is not wide enough for 2 lanes of parked cars and for traffic passing in both directions, with numerous driveways and the busy junctions making it difficult for residents to drive into or out of their properties safely.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
287	Cavendish Road	<p>I feel that the scheme to split Zone P as proposed is flawed, and that the issue could be addressed simply by adding a change in parking permit validity.The TRO from 2004 defines Zone P as follows : Albion Road, Camp Road nos. 1 to 47 odd, 2 to 28 even Cavendish Road Cecil Road Clarence Road, nos. 2 to 30 even Granville Road, nos. 7 to 15, 25 to 31 odd Hatfield Road, nos. 39 to 75 odd, 108 to 130 even, 144 to 176 even Laurel Road Stanhope Road, nos.26 to 68 even, 43 to 61 odd. From other SADC documents I estimate that this represents about 220-240 parking spaces (not including Blandford Road, which appears as part of Zone P in the 2019 document "Roads by Zone with spaces St Albans V2.xlsx" (Gary Payne 30 Apr 2019)). The original Zone P is often very overcrowded - the frontage of many typical small terraced houses in the zone is only 3-4m, smaller than (say) a 4.4m Ford Focus. As a result, parking close to one's house is sometimes impossible and one has to park a considerable distance away. The 2019 addition of ladder roads and extension of Zone P increases the number of controlled spaces enormously (from the "Roads by Zone"document mentioned earlier, approximately an additional 1109 spaces). This new area is under less pressure than the older Zone P, and amongst these 1109 spaces are spaces that are available to be used by residents when the original Zone P area was overcrowded. In the proposed new plan, the new Zone P appears to be even smaller than the original 2004 zone. The spaces at the south end of Clarence Road are lost to zone P1, and it is not clear from the maps what happens to the spaces on Hatfield Road and Camp Road but the text implies that they are no longer included. When Zone P is full as is frequently the case, if the P1-P3 spaces are no longer available to Zone P residents, there will no longer be the option to park north of Hatfield Road unless prepared for a 2 mile walk back home from somewhere in Marshalswick. I feel that residents of Zone P are being placed at a considerable disadvantage. (At this point I have to confess that I have not tried parking further down Camp Road, mainly because parking is not permitted on most of the length of the main road, and many properties such as Centurion Court and Dexter Close are flat developments with private parking). Regarding Point 6 in the letter : "The extension of the zone boundary allowed residents from the north of the zone to park closer to the station". I believe it is unlikely that many commuters, even those living at the Sandpit Lane end of Woodstock Road North, feel that it is a sensible idea to drive to Albion Road in the rush hour, and look for a very likely nonexistent parking space in order to cut 5 minutes off a 20 minute walk to the station. It seems to me that given the small size of Zone P as compared with P1- P3, a reasonable solution would be to make Zone P permits also valid in P1 and perhaps P2 (as they are at present). Even if Point 6 as mentioned above is perceived as a real issue, as long as the reverse is not true (for example, P2 permits are not valid in P or P1) the objective is achieved.</p> <p><b>** Additional points **</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If Zone P permits could be used in P1 / P2, then by the same token P1 residents could be given the option to use P2 or P3 for the same reasons.</li> <li>- Given the pressure on Zone P, in my opinion 2nd and 3rd permits here should be much more expensive.</li> </ul> <p>I hope that this all makes sense and can assist you in making the best decisions for all concerned when formulating the TRO,</p>
288	Gurney Court Road	<p>Response to Parking Review Zone P Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.There must be a clear strategy and well thought out objectives for parking management</li> <li>2.In the case of the schemes (both existing and proposed) subject to consultation, the Council appears to have no obvious strategy and objectives and has simply responded to a public demand (vote?) for a then unknown scheme</li> <li>3.There was / is no information about how these schemes are enforced. In reality they are not. They rely on the fact that most people abide by the 'rules'</li> <li>4.The correct objectives would appear to be manage limited parking spaces in certain streets to assist residents in those streets in finding parking space. There is also some need to limit road safety hazards</li> <li>5.The review of the existing scheme promised a serious rethink. All we have is an extended area for the same type of scheme</li> <li>6.There is only a case to manage in streets where there is serious conflict between commuter parking and residents needs</li> <li>7.These are just a few of the streets in the consultation area; those where houses have no off street parking</li> <li>8.Most streets have off street residents parking and ample on street space. There is no capacity reason to prevent non resident / commuter parking in these streets</li> <li>9.There may be a few locations where parking causes a road traffic hazard. These areas may require parking restrictions; but not a full scale management scheme</li> <li>10. In the remainder of the streets, car parking is an effective form of traffic calming. The parking space available is self-managing. Traffic movement works well as traffic speeds are slowed by the parked cars, which provide in built traffic calming. The passing places created by drive-way entrance positions allow for free movement, but at safe, slow speeds</li> <li>11.With the parking management proposed, many streets will become fast dangerous rat runs. This will be a serious safety concern for residential streets. What is the Highway Authority view on this? (copy to HCC Highways)</li> <li>12.A paid street residents parking scheme will encourage further hardening of front gardens for off street parking with adverse environmental and water runoff /drainage implications. This is very inappropriate for the times; and unnecessary given the substantial street space available</li> <li>13. The parking management scheme proposed must therefore be restricted to streets with no off street parking</li> <li>14.The existing traffic conditions should be reinforced with a formal 20mph scheme which would be beneficial to the environment, residential amenity and road safety and would be self enforcing</li> </ol>
289	Blandford Road	<p>I want to make a comment about the proposals for changes in controlled parking in zone P (Fleetville ladder roads). I am commenting both as a resident and as a volunteer who organises daytime education classes catering for retired adults through the WEA charity. Most of our members are in their seventies or eighties and we use venues on or near Hatfield Road (St Paul's and the Methodist Church) because they have good public transport links, but we also rely on accessible parking to allow our members to attend. Although the venues have some limited parking, we would like our members to be able to park for up to 3 hours to attend our 2 hour courses, running in the morning (typically 10-12) or the afternoon (typically 1-3). The current arrangements across the streets running off Hatfield Road (with the exception of Blandford Road) is to disallow parking for non-residents between 11am and 1pm making parking near these venues difficult, particularly for morning courses.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that, rather than aligning the parking restrictions across a large area, you consider varying the restricted time in adjacent streets so that parking for a few hours is always available somewhere in the local area, while all-day parking is still restricted. At present Blandford Road is the one street in the area that allows parking between 11am and 1pm, but the current plan seems to show that this will be changed to align with the other roads leading off Hatfield Road – making the problem of parking for a few hours during the morning or afternoon in this area more difficult still.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention and your efforts in enabling public consultation in this matter.</p>
290	Not Provided	<p>Having seen the latest amendments to the parking restrictions in Fleetville and noted that Burnham Rd is also to become part of the residents parking scheme it is obvious that Eaton Rd is going to take the brunt of everyone's overspill. We are a small Rd with no alternative for most of the residents other than to park on the road. It is imperative therefore that Eaton Rd needs to be included in the scheme.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
291	Marshals Drive	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposals to parking restrictions of ladder roads and Marshalswick South dated 17th January 2020.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the proposals will create a significant parking problem on Marshals Drive.</p> <p>With free parking now only being available on Marshals Drive and Homewood Road, I fear the previous parking pressures seen within the ladder roads and Charmouth Road in particular will simply be displaced to Marshals Drive. From Marshals Drive people can easily walk or particularly car-pool to the station car park, walk in to central St Albans or take a bus from the Quadrant.</p> <p>I understand in the past, limited time parking was introduced to the Quadrant car park to manage a similar problem of all day parking, thus proving the distance from the station will not put people off using Marshals Drive for similar purposes.</p> <p>With 2 young children, I am concerned about the increased traffic and careless parking that will likely be created on Marshals Drive, posing a safety risk to the many young children traversing on their walk to and from school and for my elderly neighbour trying to negotiate accessing her drive safely.</p> <p>I suggest the council propose a two hour parking restriction 12-2pm Monday to Friday on Marshals Drive and Homewood Road so that all roads within the grid are protected equally from the excessive parking pressures created</p>
292	Cavendish Road	<p>I have received your letter regarding the Parking Review for Zone P Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South, dated 17th January, and am writing to express my objections to the proposal.</p> <p>I am a resident of Cavendish Road, and so was not directly affected by the previous proposals extending the Zone P parking permit. However I am extremely concerned by your latest letter, which proposes changes that affect all residents of Zone P, and which I believe will be of significant detriment to anyone currently living in the zone.</p> <p>The parking on Cavendish Road is currently just about sufficient for residents only. There appear to be fewer parking spaces than houses, and I am often unable to find a space close to my house, sometimes resorting to parking on a parallel street. This is particularly inconvenient given I have a young child, and carrying his car seat and/or pram long distances back to my house is a challenge.</p> <p>The proposal to introduce shared use parking (Point 2 of your letter), and to extend this to Original Zone P areas (Point 4) would significantly increase the parking pressure on Cavendish Road, as it would allow non-residents to park there for a one-off daily charge of £2.90. This is significantly lower than the daily parking charge at the multi-storey car park by the main train station (St Albans Station Way Car Park), which charges £8.15 per day.</p> <p>As such I anticipate this new proposal will drive high volumes of commuter traffic onto all Zone P roads, as the price difference is extremely attractive, and our house is only a short walk to the station. Cavendish Road already suffers from increased traffic at peak times, due to the presence of the St Alban and Stephen Catholic Junior School at the end of the road, and because it is often used as a cut through from Hatfield Road to Camp Road to avoid the traffic lights.</p> <p>Offering up residents' parking bays as cheap parking for commuter traffic would make the situation even worse, and significantly affect the quality of life for all residents on Cavendish Road.</p> <p>I therefore object most strongly to the proposed changes to Zone P parking restrictions, and urge you to reconsider the changes to Original Zone P streets.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing the outcome of the next phase.</p>
293	Not Provided	<p>Firstly, the introduction of pay by phone for 2 hours during the day on Lancaster Road is an EXCELLENT idea. It is extremely stressful and dangerous trying to drive or walk up there as the road is entirely blocked every week day. I have seen dangerous driving on several occasions and it is especially bad on bin day (Thursday) when the bin lorry is trying to get down the road. Our children attend Little Steps nursery at the south side of Lancaster road. It can be extremely hard to see to pull out of the nursery due to how many cars park on the road for the train station. I know a lot of the nursery staff park on Lancaster Road so hopefully they will be given some of these permits?</p> <p>We are strongly in favour of this parking charge on all of the other roads too. Woodstock Road in particular is also very hard to drive down. I think it should be more than £3 though as station parking is a lot more than that per day.</p> <p>Having looked at the map of which roads will be added for parking charges, my next comment is that Beaumont Avenue is also becoming very dangerous at the north end where it merges into Sandpit Lane. I am wondering why every road in Fleetville except for Beaumont Avenue, Salisbury Avenue, Garden Close, St Johns Court and Eaton Road have been included in the extended area for 2 hours charges? I am very concerned about how much the displacement of parking is now going to move to the roads I have just mentioned, which remain within a 25 minute walk of the station and won't have a charge for parking. They are also very near to Veralum and Beaumont schools, which was previously causing chaos with parking on Woodstock Road. We are residents of St Johns Court where parking is already incredibly difficult. We are STRONGLY in favour of adding resident permits and the 2 hour day time charge to our road and Beaumont Avenue in particular. There are multiple building projects going on at the top end of Beaumont Avenue with many huge vehicles being parked there. A lot of people also park there for going to The Wick and for things like scouts etc. Today I witnessed a removal van unable to get up the road due to how many cars were parked at the top end. It is VERY hard at peak times for cars to get up and down the road safely and, as a pedestrian trying to cross from St Johns Court with children, it is extremely difficult. People become very angry when driving through there. It is also very hard to see when turning out of St Johns Court up to the Sandpit Lane. The junction of Sandpit Lane and Beaumont Avenue is also prone to flooding which makes it even more dangerous. I also recently saw someone who was struggling to turn right from Beaumont Avenue onto Sandpit Lane overtake the person in front of them trying to pull out, go into the WRONG side of the road and make a person turning into Beaumont Avenue have to slam their breaks on to avoid them. I could give other examples as I am out there several times per week witnessing all sorts!. The biggest problem of course is the high cost and unreliability of the buses. I catch them often to work from Hatfield Road/Chime Square and it would be wonderful if more people used them so they could become more reliable and cheaper. The new bus along Sandpit Lane from the new housing development doesn't seem well used at all. I often see it empty.</p> <p>Anywhere within a 30 minute walk of the train station really needs to have paring restriction to really encourage people to start using the buses.</p> <p>As you can see I have a lot to say on this subject! I would love a response or would be happy to reply in more detail on any of the points above!</p> <p>We look forward to receiving the next update.</p>
294	Arthur Road	<p>with the climate emergency declared by the council, I see no consideration for addressing the crisis. How will that be incorporated?</p> <p>- why was it necessary to waste so much paper providing this in letter form (single sided) to every household. This again us a waste of paper</p>
295	St Pauls, St Albans Church Blandford Road	<p>There is one aspect I, personally, and also as a church would like you to amend. This is the proposed change of the restriction time from 1.30 - 3.30pm to 11-1pm for Blandford Road. As a Church we do a lot for the community and our halls are used widely by both ourselves doing things for the community and also by community groups. So the proposed changes will hinder this and affect lot of people.</p> <p>This will adversely affect the following groups that are run at St Pauls:</p> <p>Lunch Club for the elderly, Tots, Tiny Tots. U3A - several groups each week. WEA (literacy class) - used to be supported by the council</p> <p>Carers in Herts. Family Group Conference. Fitclub Mobility class.</p> <p>All the above we could argue are community service groups, the last three are run by the council.</p> <p>Other regular bookings also affected: Oasis - Jolly Bookworms (pre-school) - Pilates - Baby Signing - NCT- Zumba - Adult ballet and tap - Baby Massage</p> <p>Computer Friendly (aimed at older folk), Plus occasional groups like safeguarding training etc which tend to finish at 1pm</p> <p>Funerals sometimes go beyond 1.30pm but most are catered for by the current timings as it allows time for a follow on at the graveside / Crematorium both of which tend to finish early. All the above groups would run into or over the proposed 11am-1pm window and many have elderly people or very young children where parking in the road nearly is essential for some of the group.</p> <p>So we would be very grateful if you would retain the current time for residents only parking in Blandford Road. It does help too that other roads have a different time for the events we run in the afternoon or all day.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
296	Not Provided	On the consultation documents for the ladder road scheme it shows the North side of Brampton Road, adjacent to Woodstock Road as P2 when the oppose side, and rest of Brampton, is P1. You also show this section of road as P1 in another document online which shows broad overview of zones. I assume this will be P1 when implemented or it will inevitably lead to a lot of confusion. Please could you confirm that it will be P1?
297	Lancaster Rd	We have serious concerns about the current plans for parking in Lancaster Rd, in particular that the restriction on parking between 11 and 1 can be circumvented by payment of a small sum of £2.90. The parking from commuters will thus carry on happening, with all the attendant difficulties for residents. We are away from home but other residents have had a discussion and will be communicating with you.
298	Not Provided	Neighbours on Lancaster Rd have been discussing this and have agreed that safety and environmental concerns need to be a priority, but it needs to be balanced with residents knowing visitors/builders etc can park on the street if needed. We agree that the orange zones will discourage all day parking, hopefully allowing less queueing (and therefore less pollution), but wondered if you could stagger the 11-1 restriction among our streets, so that it was half an hour for each street rather than the full 2 hours? This would allow more time for residents' visitors to park. In tandem with this, we would also suggest you reduce the speed limit to 20mph, for safety and air quality reasons. Also, would you be able to roll out the same restrictions on Jennings, Churchill, Gainsborough and York, in order to share out the parking? If this isn't possible we suggest turning half of the purple zones on our street into residents only parking, and raising the cost of parking substantially for commuters, to encourage them to park at the station. If you are unable to amend the proposals in at least some of the ways we've suggested, our biggest concern is that more and more people will pave over their front gardens, which would be a catastrophe for wildlife along our roads. In the long term, personally I feel we should move towards having a cycle lane down our road, but only once this issue of too many cars is resolved. That will only happen with a far better rail service from Harpenden, and regular electric or hydrogen powered buses throughout the district. A free electric shuttle bus servicing all the main arteries through SA with regular stops at 20min intervals would make a huge difference. Residents would then be able to reduce the number of cars they own, and we would have less commuter parking.
299	Battlefield Rd	The parking scheme proposed tho not perfect would seem to improve the current parking problems we experience in Battlefield Rd. We support them
300	Not Provided	Having to use the Northside ladder roads to get to Sandpit Lane safely (bypassing Woodstock Rd) it is obvious that the people living in these roads do not need a parking permit scheme as they are not using their roads for parking. I live in Eaton Rd and most of the residents have no alternative but to park in the road. The overspill from the parking scheme is making this nearly impossible and now with the addition of Burnham Road to the scheme there seems no solution to our problems other than Eaton Rd being added to the Residents Parking Scheme.
301	Charmouth Road	My main concern with the proposals is being allowed to pay £2.90 to bridge the 11-1pm. restriction. This is because, with Station parking currently at £8.00 per day, it is likely that many might find £2.90 per day more attractive, and move to roads near the station that allow such parking. Would this not, to a certain extent, put us back to where we are now?
302	Not Provided	The introduction of the controls around us have resulted in excessive pressure being placed on Woodstock road south continuously. Whilst we support being included in the controls, I do think a 2 hr period is inadequate for Woodstock road south which suffers from use by the locksmiths, vets, hairdresser staff and Greek restaurant staff for much of the day. We would suggest controls similar to York road would be more suitable given the high demand from local businesses and those that use them. It is also a concern that double yellow line parking is proposed to replace the single yellows on the western side of the road. Why is this necessary? Unless this is on the advice of the highway authority because of a safety issue this is unacceptable as this provides useful additional overnight parking for residents. I attach an image showing you that this is used on a regular basis. Once again, thank you for reviewing the controls. We very much support a zone similar to that on York road and any controls which allow us to park in reasonable vicinity of our home.
303	Eaton Road	I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed amendments to parking in Zone P and Marshalswick South. I am a resident of Eaton Road and it is my understanding that whilst our road is not to have any parking restrictions, the surrounding roads are. The parking situation in Eaton road has become noticeably worse since the previous restrictions were implemented, with more commuters who then walk to the station and local workers parking here. I can only assume this will get even worse when the options of parking in Woodstock Road South and Arthur Road, for example, are taken away. In addition, as a resident who will not be eligible for a residents parking permit, I suspect that there will be times when I am unable to park anywhere near my house as, if Eaton Road is full, we currently have to park on roads such as Woodstock Road South. Also, my house backs on to Arthur Road and access to my garden is from there, at times we need to park on that road in order to load or unload our car but again, we will be restricted. In addition to concerns about our ability to park near our house I am incredibly concerned about safety. Many people use Eaton Road as a cut through and for school drop off and pick up so it is often busy. When so many cars are parked, visibility is restricted and as only one car can pass at a time there is often a backlog of traffic. At busy times of the day the crossroads at Eaton Road, Woodstock Road South and Burnham Road is absolutely chaotic and can be really quite scary when I'm trying to take my young children to or from school. There are also often a number of young people walking and cycling to and from Beaumont and Verulam schools as well as the younger children and their parents heading to and from Fleetville and it seems to me that a serious accident could easily happen. I understand that you are aware of many of these issues and addressing them is the purpose of the amendments being suggesting but I feel that leaving Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue out of the plans and making them a 'free' place to park for commuters, local workers and visitors to our neighbours in surrounding streets which will now have restrictions, will just mean that an already difficult situation will get considerably worse. So, I feel that if the surrounding roads are to have permit restricted parking Eaton Road should be included. Thank you for taking the time to read this email, I trust that the information here clearly presents my concerns but if you do require any further information

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
304	Jennings Road	<p>I am a resident of Jennings Road, and live close to its junction with Clarence Road. We suffered hugely with the impact of station parkers until recently. This included the inability to get out of our driveway and turn in the direction we wanted to or to get out at all without making difficult manoeuvres, sometimes holding up traffic. These problems were caused by cars parked outside our house up to the edge of our dropped kerb together with cars parked on the other side of the road opposite our driveway (see attached photograph). Furthermore, there were road safety issues from poor visibility and traffic density, including traffic to and from Verulam School. There was a nasty road traffic accident a couple of years ago on the corner of Sunderland Avenue and Jennings Road.</p> <p>When the original parking consultation was launched, I had anticipated that the likely outcome would be to allow parking on one side of Jennings Raid only. We were a little surprised that the changes made were to restrict parking on both sides of the road, but the issues were indeed resolved.</p> <p>I understand that the changes have had unintended consequences for other roads and can see why you are again consulting. I am, however, astonished to see that you are now proposing to once more allow parking on both sides of Jennings Road. I do not believe this is compatible with the comment in your letter “we have balanced the needs of the residents with road safety and parking demand”.</p> <p>The introduction of ‘residents permit parking shared with public parking’ will lead to people gladly paying £2.90 to park on the road rather than £8.15 or £8.00 to use one of the station car parks, a saving of over £5 per day or £100 per month. People will obviously park as near as possible to the station to minimise their walk. This will lead to Jennings Road and the roads off it once more being choked with cars on both sides and experiencing exactly the problems experienced here previously and which you are now seeking to mitigate elsewhere - the inability to get in and out of driveways easily and safely, and issues of visibility and traffic density leading to serious road safety issues.</p> <p>Thank you for requesting comments and suggestions. Please can you explain why you are proposing that Jennings Road, Park Avenue, Sunderland Avenue, Churchill Road and Hamilton Road should allow parking on both sides when all other roads will have greater restrictions on one or both sides? Please do reconsider the approach and ensure that the impact of parking is shared fairly across all roads - this means “shared use parking” on, at most, only one side of any road.</p>
305	Marshal's Drive	<p>Following receipt of your consultation document on the Parking review in Zone P I have 2 comments.</p> <p>1.Why should residents who are having parking restrictions imposed on them, through no fault of their own, have to pay for the first parking permit. Additional permits yes but not the first.</p> <p>2.The only method of paying for parking is by phone. This will mean that commuters using the station will be able to park all day for a fee that is significantly less than station parking. A quick telephone call at 11 am validates their parking. Whilst this is a simple method the residents will be affected by having the significantly reduced number of spaces filled by commuters. I appreciate that the problems identified in point 1 is eliminated. Perhaps machines using card only could be considered. This would eliminate the 'all day' parking problem.</p>
306	Not Provided	<p>I just received a letter regarding the proposed proposed parking scheme for zone P.</p> <p>My only suggestion would be to increase the charges for second and third cars. I would charge at least £500 for a third car.</p> <p>Higher charges would reduce the number of car held by each household, making it easier for everyone to park. It would also help reduce pollution on the local roads if there were less cars, surely something the local council should be considering.</p> <p>All other proposals are sensible.</p>
307	Not Provided	<p>I understand there is to be a change to the parking situation in the area of and including Fleetville Road St Albans, with time restrictions being put in place.</p> <p>I attend an art class. (Calligraphy) at the Fleetville community centre Fridays between 12:45 and 15:45. Our class members are varied in age and mobility.</p> <p>Also, we have to carry in various pieces equipment each for our class. There are existing off-street parking spaces outside the Centre but we are not the only group attending on Fridays so these are often used by the time we arrive for our class, so we have to use the street too. The proposed restricted period of 11:00-13:00 overlaps our class and I don't know what yellow lines are planned.</p> <p>The community centre is a valuable and well used part of the local communmity, catering for people of all ages with all abilities and disabilities in a wide range of activities.</p> <p>It is vital that all the users have access to parking on Fleetville Road and from my understanding the proposals will make it harder for us all.</p> <p>Please consider the Community Centre and its many users when making your plans.</p> <p>Look forward to your comments</p>
308	Eaton Road	<p>Further to the email below. I am disappointed you have not yet responded to my query. I am therefore forced to formally object to your plans.</p> <p>In the unfortunate scenario that the plans go ahead, Eaton Road will need to be included in the Ladder road scheme and I request the plans are adapted to recognise this.</p> <p>I continue to await your response.</p> <p>Dear Gary,</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 17 January 2020 detailing the eight major issues caused by the introduction of your ladder parking scheme, and how you intend to resolve the issues by extending the issue laden scheme.</p> <p>I would like to register my concern that your “solution” will, rather than solving the problems, in fact extend the problem to other roads, i.e. repeat your Issue 5 “...displaced parking into other oversubscribed areas” (for example Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue).</p> <p>Before implementing and deepening the issues, please explain how a repeat of Issue 5 will be avoided?</p>
309	Not Provided	<p>My recollection of looking at the maps was that the opportunity for public pay by phone parking was limited to certain bays that had been shown to be made empty by the new parking restrictions eg (I think) Jennings road so it may, for example, allow some school parking in a limited area. I don't recall any of these pay bays being on Stanhope road as it is something I would have looked out for as it would lead to a situation exactly as you describe.</p> <p>The parking maps aren't where they were in the councillors room at the council when I checked yesterday so I can't be sure about this and I haven't got a zone P one electronically (only P1/2/3) so I am hoping that parking can confirm if my recollection/understanding is correct?</p> <p>On Sun, 26 Jan 2020 at 13:39, wrote:</p> <p>I have received the letter dated 17 January covering the Council's proposed response to the review of the Zone P Ladder Roads parking scheme.</p> <p>There is one point in it which concerns me, although I may be misinterpreting it. Point 8 (on page three of the letter) states that to deal with the issues of private driveways being blocked, 'We propose to introduce shared use parking across this area as described under item 2. Further down it says that 'Public parking via Pay by Phone will be at the cost of £2.90 (to cover the restricted time of 2 hours per day)'. Currently on Stanhope Road parking for non-resident permit holders is limited to one hour during the 2 hour restricted window. My understanding from the above is that non-residents will now be able to pay £2.90 to park here for the full two hour restricted period. If that is correct then the primary point of the restriction (to stop commuters parking here all day) will be removed, as it will be much cheaper to park on the road and pay for two hours parking than to pay for a full day's parking in one of the station car parks.</p> <p>Please can you confirm exactly how this will work in the original Zone P, and if it is the intention to allow non-residents to park for the full two hours at a cost of £2.90 then can I please ask that you reconsider this, as the controlled parking zone will in that case serve no purpose.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
310	Gurney Court Road	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised</b></p> <p>1. The Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination 2. Who is protected from discrimination It is against the law to discriminate against anyone because of age and disability. These are called 'protected characteristics'. You are also protected from discrimination if you are associated with someone who has a 'protected characteristic', for example a family member or friend. 3. Action against discrimination Taking positive action is legal if people with a 'protected characteristic' are at a disadvantage or have particular needs. 4. How you can be discriminated against Discrimination can come in one of the following forms:* direct discrimination - treating someone with a 'protected characteristic' less favourably than others.* indirect discrimination - putting rules or arrangements in place that apply to everyone, but that put someone with a 'protected characteristic' at an unfair disadvantage.* harassment - unwanted behaviour linked to a 'protected characteristic' that violates someone's dignity or creates an offensive environment for them.*victimisation - treating someone unfairly because they have complained about discrimination or harassment. we live at Gurney Court Road (Zone P 3 Area 2). My wife has an S M I (severe mental impairment) which is permanent and has been registered with St Albans City Council. I am her 24/7 carer and have been taking care of her for over 10 years. We have a blue badge and receive the full attendance allowance. How our residential road has been ruined by parking for commuters When the first parking proposals were introduced our road was transformed for the worse for some residents. Only about 25% of the southern end of Gurney Court Road was severely affected; the remaining 75% at the northern end was left virtually unchanged. Why was this? Commuters were banned from parking south of Sandpit Lane and these roads were almost empty of parked cars. The commuters crossed Sandpit Lane and parked in Gurney Court Road in the southern part of the road to have the shortest walk to the station. All possible parking places were filled and there was dangerous congestion at the bottom of the road. We have not been able to park outside our house during the working week. This has changed our lives and left us miserable and frustrated. Our friends, often elderly or disabled, cannot visit us; no one drops in to see us, because there is nowhere to park. We hoped that the review would improve the situation, but for us the new proposals will make this grim situation even worse. We have been selected on our side of the road as a long passing place which means that we will never be able to park in front of our house, whilst our neighbours on the other side of the road will have residents parking. There will be intolerable consequences for us. Every week we have health professionals who come to treat my wife to support her health and well-being. They need but do not have anywhere to park: a physiotherapist and a personal trainer who re invaluable to help her maintain her physical and mental health. There are others who also need to visit us from time to time: friends and family, our cleaner, a chiropodist, a hairdresser, tradesmen and a gardener. We are worried that we may lose these people because it is impossible to park. We feel cut off, isolated and victimised. None of our needs as people who share 'protected characteristics' are being met in these proposals. Every day it takes me several hours to get my wife up, showered and dressed, take her to the toilet, to give her her breakfast and daily medication. Our regular visits take place at about 10.30 onwards and may last until 1.00. People cannot park outside our house and, if they do, they are likely to receive parking fines.</p>
311	Fleetville Community Centre	<p>I would like to express my serious concerns regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Royal Road.</p> <p>We are a very busy community centre serving the needs of the local community from preschool age up to users in their nineties.</p> <p>We have people coming and going throughout the day and evening seven days a week.</p> <p>As we only have parking bays for fourteen vehicles, our users generally find a space on the road as there are no restrictions at the moment.</p> <p>We have a successful system whereby users block each other in the parking bays to make best use of the space but if double yellow lines are painted across all of our parking bays this will no longer be possible.</p> <p>The proposal also states that the road will be 'permit holders only' between 11am and 1pm. Many of our groups start and finish during that period so would then not be able to park here. As all of the surrounding rounds will have the same limitations, where exactly are our users expected to park?</p> <p>Many of our users are very elderly and come in for art classes, bridge classes and a variety of different activities which sometimes means that they have bags with equipment in, which they would not be able to carry for any distance.</p> <p>The problems that we have at present; our users vying with parents from the Infants' School and Nursery for parking spaces, will only be exacerbated by these restrictions.</p> <p>I appreciate that this is an ongoing, impossible situation but I feel that these restrictions will have a devastating impact on community centre users and thereby on the community centre itself.</p> <p>I hope you will reconsider these proposals. We would like NO double yellow lines across our parking bays and no daytime restrictions.</p> <p>Perhaps we could have a notice at the entrance of the road stating that parking for more than one hour is available to community centre and school users only?</p>
312	Jennings Road	<p>Further to recent correspondence I am responding as requested to these latest proposals.</p> <p>Whilst some `refinement' of the Scheme is undoubtedly required I do consider that these latest ideas simply return us to the position that existed prior to its introduction.</p> <p>The only thing that changes is that SACDC now generates an income from both Residents &amp; Commuters ( am I being too sceptical in thinking that was always the intention ? ) – but in terms of parking convenience we are back to Square 1 !</p> <p>The Commuter will simply bag every available space and be happy to pay £2.90 per day instead of whatever is currently the exorbitant charge at the City Station.</p> <p>That may not be the case in the outer reaches of Marshalswick South now to be part of the CPZ – but will undoubtedly be so for those roads within comfortable walking distance of the Station.</p> <p>Once Residents have departed in the morning on the School Run or whatever they will find their parking slot already occupied when they return. How do they retain any priority ?</p> <p>This leaves the whole purpose of the exercise completely compromised.</p> <p>Back to the Drawing Board I would suggest ?</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
313	Sunderland Ave	<p>Further do a brief discussion with Freddy Mohammed at the open session on Saturday, 1/2 I decided to check the utilisation of the station car parks to confirm figures a gentleman from Battlefield Road assessed last year. I'm sure you'll find this useful information.</p> <p>The figure of c300 available parking places at the station is accurate as at 10am today 4/2.</p> <p>Peak daily charges are Station Way £8.70, Victoria Street £8.00 (I checked neither the board nor the number of free spaces at Ridgmont Road).</p> <p>Victoria Street (Charrington Place MSCP) parking spaces empty per level were as follows starting from the top:</p> <p>H1 57 (all empty)  G2 26 (all empty)  G1 57 (+ 2 cars parked)  F2 54 (+ 1 car parked)  F1 46 (+13 cars parked)  E2 17  E1 3  D2 0 (full)  D1 2  Sub Total of free spaces 262  C2 0 (full) plus Disabled bays 11 free, 2 cars parked.  C1 0 (full)  B2 Premier Parking 15 free, else full.  B1 DD Reserved Parking 31 free, else full.  A2 12  A1 45 numbered, free</p> <p>Station Way car park was full with cars cruising in the vain hope of someone leaving, but 10 Premier Parking spaces were empty.</p> <p>Adding the 262 free spaces in the (H1-D1) upper floors of Victoria Street, the 25 free Premier spaces and the 12 free at A2 gives 299. One could research whether this could be increased if free spaces at levels B1 &amp; A1 could be re-allocated.</p>
314	Not Provided	<p>Thank you for sending out all of the proposals for the Parking Review (Zone P). Do you know if the Double Yellow Line will be extended to the narrow section of pathway between Battlefield Road and St Saviours Church please?</p> <p>I am forced to walk on the busy road daily with 2 small children, 2 dogs, often a buggy as are many families going to and from the schools due to drivers parking so far up on the can that no one can pass</p>
315	Eaton Road	<p>As has been pointed out by previously myself and other residents, the parking on Eaton Road is already impossible at certain times of day.</p> <p>The scheme as it has been implemented so far, in addition to the measures that are now being proposed, are simply going to cause drivers who cannot park on the roads where the scheme is in operation straight onto Eaton Road and others where no restrictions apply.</p> <p>There seems to be no plan in place to address what will be the entirely predictable result of Eaton Road, Salisbury Avenue etc being the only roads where non-residents can park unrestricted.</p> <p>What plans to the council have in response to this situation?</p>
316	Marshals Drive	<p>Let me start by registering the fact that as a resident of one of the roads within this defined "Zone P", I was not made aware that an initial Parking Review Consultation was taking place in June 2019, and therefore did not have the opportunity to respond to the proposal.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposals outlined in the above letter dated 17 January 2020.</p> <p>Since the previous changes were made to Clarence Road, we have experienced a significant and dangerous increase in the number of vehicles parking on Charmouth Road. It is obvious that this new proposal will simply move the problem a few hundred metres from Charmouth Road to Marshals Drive and/or Homewood Road.</p> <p>One of the main reasons given for the recent introduction of limited waiting time at the free Quadrant car park was to manage the problem of all day parking, clearly demonstrating that the area around Marshals Drive and Homewood Road is not too far to walk to the station and/or town. The new proposal will result in Marshals Drive and Homewood Road suffering the displacement of all those who simply will not pay to park at the station, town, or in the ladder roads.</p> <p>Further, as a resident of Marshals Drive with children of school age, I am hugely concerned that this proposal will increase traffic and thoughtless parking and thereby will result in increased danger to school children who traverse Marshals Drive on their daily journey to and from the many schools in the area.</p> <p>I fully support the introduction of yellow lines and no-parking stretches for safety reasons but advocate that the proposal should be extended to include the remaining 2 roads within the "Zone P", Marshals Drive and Homewood Road,</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
317	Not Provided	<p>Thank you for the latest update regarding residents parking in St Albans "Ladder Roads" (dated 17.01.2020).</p> <p>I can see that a great deal of thought has gone into the scheme, and there is effort to compromise, but I cannot support the revised scheme.</p> <p>My main concern is the watering down of current restrictions and the mass introduction of public parking on many of the roads within the scheme.</p> <p>It has been proven already that the traffic is being displaced onto roads including Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road. It seems obvious therefore that relaxing residents parking restrictions on several key roads (Churchill Road, Sunderland Road, etc) will cause inevitable problems for those roads. Exactly the same issues with inconsiderate parking, difficulty of emergency vehicle access etc are likely.</p> <p>£2.90 per day parking is exceedingly cheap for parking within a short walk of the station and the city centre, and is unlikely to act as a deterrent.</p> <p>It seems that residents will be left in the worst of situations - having to pay for parking outside their own homes, while struggling to find a space and facing more congested streets.</p> <p>It is unclear why pay and display parking is being considered. As currently proposed, it is clearly to the detriment of the local residents, rather than their benefit. If pay-and-display parking is deemed essential within the zone, then it should be restricted to a smaller number of bays rather than permitted across whole streets. Rather than a block policy of allowing public pay-and-display parking in the northern Ladder Roads, it would seem a better solution to allow a dozen or so pay-and-display spaces within the zone within less congested areas. Perhaps also/alternatively it could be restricted to one hour rather than two, meaning it is only used short term by visitors, instead of subsidising cheap commuter parking.</p> <p>I note that there are now plans to put double yellow lines at certain key points on Sandpit Lane. I am concerned that this could imply the remainder of Sandpit Lane to be unrestricted parking, whereas surely this busy road should be a no-parking zone at any time.</p> <p>Regarding the split of the zones, I can see why it makes sense for the northern and southern zones to be separated to avoid over-crowding the streets immediately around the station (original Zone P), but 4 zones seems excessive for a relatively small area.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these points. I am hopeful a workable solution can be found.</p>
318	Cavendish Road	<p>We recently received a letter from you dated 17th January, regarding proposed changes to parking restrictions.</p> <p>It is not clear from your letter and the attached plans, the extent to which they impact on Cavendish Road.</p> <p>We are concerned about the proposed plans, in circumstances where it is virtually impossible for residents to get a parking space on Cavendish Road with its current permit usage.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could confirm whether the proposed changes will impact on Cavendish Road and if they will, the extent to which we can object to them?</p>
319	Jennings Road	<p>As I understand from the letter I received recently, the restricted parking that you implemented just over a year ago is now basically going to be reversed. We live about a 12 minute walk from the train station and all the cars that use to park here will now return with the council taking £2.90 per day for the privilege of blocking up our roads. Charging cars £2.90 is not going to be a deterrent to stopping them returning considering I believe its about £8 per days to park at the station. The way the bays are laid means that when cars are parked both sides of the road I can't exit my drive and turn right, I have to turn left and then turn around.</p> <p>Could you explain to me what the difference is going to be from the way it was just over a year ago apart from the fact that commuters will now be charged to park?</p>
320	Marshals Drive	<p>I am writing in concern to the proposals dated 17 January regarding changes to the parking restrictions in ladder roads and Marshalswick South.</p> <p>Although I feel there is much sense in stopping parking which is dangerous or prevents home owners accessing their drive ways. I do not feel the latest changes will stop this. They act only to move the problem elsewhere.</p> <p>The introduction in 2018 of restrictions in the ladder roads (and the impact especially on Charmouth Road) has shown how far people are prepared to go to secure free parking. The latest proposals have left free all-day parking in only two roads in the entire grid, namely Marshal's drive and Homewood Road. I think it would be preferable to extend the two hour parking restriction to these roads, and so that these last two roads do not face excessive and dangerous parking pressures.</p>
321	Not Provided	<p>I have received your document regarding the problem of parking displacement from the station area.</p> <p>I feel the conclusions risk simply moving the problem slightly further away from the station, and onto Marshals Drive, where I live.</p> <p>Since the previous changes were made Clarence Road has been almost empty of parking, proving the point that the residents do not need this parking during the day. All that was achieved was creating a dangerous situation for both drivers and emergency services in Charmouth Road and the surrounding roads. The new proposals seem to simply move this problem further from the station.</p> <p>The assumption that drivers will not park a few hundred metres further away from the station, and that therefore Marshals Drive will not be affected is flawed, both because some commuters will simply walk further and because some will carpool - parking three or four cars further out and driving down in one car together to park at the station.</p> <p>In addition, I have observed that the station car parks now include areas for "Premier Parking" and also some areas marked out in red painted lines that are reserved - however few of the former and almost none of the latter are ever used.</p> <p>Perhaps the council could engage with the car park operators to understand why they feel this under-utilisation is, in any way, in the public interest and that they could make more profit by better utilisation?</p> <p>I note proposals in the documents you sent for drivers to pay for the right to park during the restricted hours in the new areas online. If this is adopted I assume this will be the same for all the roads surrounding the station, including Clarence Road etc? This would at least spread the burden across the area and provide the council with an income.</p> <p>Under the new proposals Marshals Drive would become the closest road to the station with free parking, this would create similar problems to the previous scheme, and the potential for accidents etc. that the previous scheme has caused.</p> <p>This would potentially create a legal liability for the council as the facts of the previous scheme are now known.</p> <p>I would, therefore, suggest Marshals Drive should also have a period, during the day, where parking is not allowed and that other roads, similarly affected by these proposals have the same.</p> <p>This problem can be solved by a coordinated approach between the station, car park operators and the council, combined with appropriate fees in all of the surrounding roads. It will not be solved by simply pushing the problem a few hundred metres away from the station</p>
322	Verulam School	<p>I am mailing from Verulam School Brampton Rd St Albans AL1 4PR.</p> <p>We have received notification about the changes to the parking restrictions around the school.</p> <p>How would we purchase parking permits and is there a special rate for schools?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back from you.</p>
323	Not Provided	<p>Classic example of why the parking is a problem - this is the edge of curb on my driveway - I now have no vision to leave the drive. I have this on a day to day basis at 6 Lancaster Road. It doesn't make me happy that I have to buy permits for visitors but this is so dangerous.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
324	Clarence Road	FYI - as to previous email (Photos provided)
325	Glenferrie Road	<p>We have spoken before about these restrictions. I live on Glenferrie Road and the introduction of the restrictions has been amazing - you can not underestimate how much better it is for us on our road. I am mightily relieved that there is no intention to remove these restrictions from us under this further consultation however there are two issues my neighbours and I have with the amendments as follows:</p> <p>1. At present the area between Hatfield Road and the Methodist Church is resident permit only or one hour parking. I believe it is the same on the other side. This works well and feels fair given that the church has a car park of it's own and there are plenty of 1 hour parking spots on Hatfield Road for both the church users and the local business users. I am disappointed to note that the proposal is to change this area to one hour parking only and not permit holders and we object to this change. Equally the other side will now not be one hour only so we will have the problem of people parking there for much longer periods of time. I would be grateful if you could come back to me about why this is proposed?</p> <p>2. When the signs/ yellow lines etc were put in for the restrictions we were disappointed to find that double yellow lines were laid all the way from the church to the first house on the right (no 2). I raised this at the time as did others as it seems unnecessary and we lose another few precious spaces which are so in demand (especially in light of the proposed amendment discussed above). Can anything be done about this?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you. I also draw your attention to the problem we have with people parking for Friday prayers on and around our street. Not only do they park illegally on double yellows/ no parking zones - they also park up and sit in their cars on our road before 1pm when the restrictions end. This means we have difficulty parking at a time when it should be fine. I am sure you are limited on resources but more traffic wardens on our road around these times would make a massive different - people have started to park illegally more and more because they have realised they are unlikely to get caught out.</p> <p>Many thanks</p>
326	Park Avenue	<p>Thank you for your letter.</p> <p>The scheme was originally brought in to stop our roads from being public free for all parking because we had in affect become free parking for station/city centre users.</p> <p>Since the introduction the scheme has worked well for users.</p> <p>As you are aware we are adjacent to a school, a narrow road and have a terrible camber on the tarmac.</p> <p>Many of our elderly residents can just about cope with the road as it is.</p> <p>Having reviewed the scheme we note that roads further away from the scheme are not pay by phone (Gainsborough, Brampton and others) and yet those roads (parts of if not all) are further away from the station/ city centre.</p> <p>This would inevitably mean that Park Avenue being one of the first public pay on street parking areas would again take the brunt of the cheaper parking.This is totally unreasonable and means that the Council may as well have not started the whole process in the first place.</p> <p>It is for this reason we object to the proposed changes and hope that common sense will prevail.</p> <p>We are also holding a residents meeting as everyone in the street we have spoken to is firmly against the proposed changes.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
327	Faircross Way	<p>I am writing in regard to the letter we received on 17th January 2020, and the proposed new ladder road parking scheme. We live at 52 Faircross Way, which is towards the Homewood Road end of Faircross Way, and the comments largely relate to our street, and The Park.</p> <p>Our feedback on the propose scheme is as follows;</p> <p>1. We are supportive of the double yellow lines on the junctions on Faircross Way, at all intersections. I assume also that these lines would extend to the "island" junctions with The Park too, which are not shown currently as having any restriction. We acknowledge that part of the frontage of our house will now have a double yellow line across it. The most dangerous stretch of road from the junction of Faircross Way and Charmouth Road, to the Sandpit Lane roundabout, will be greatly improved by the changes proposed.</p> <p>2. Given the overall changes to the parking scheme, we propose that it would be better to have shared public parking on both sides of the road outside our property. We see that logic stands for the whole of Faircross Way and The Park. Currently, we do not suffer with "commuter" parking outside our property, and the imposition of a yellow line will generate new problems. Specifically, because trades or visitors will not wish to move their vehicles, the parking bays will fill up faster, and overall, the available parking areas on Faircross Way and The Park will be dramatically reduced. By having more shared parking bays, this gives residents more flexibility. IF, you do as propose and relax some of the restrictions in some closer streets to the station, I feel confident that the parking bays outside our house, and indeed the remainder of Faircross Way and The Park will not get over run with all day commuters.</p> <p>3. Signage. We would like some reassurance that any signage needed to enforce the new parking restrictions are attached to existing lamp posts and are not erected thoughtlessly to what is otherwise a very attractive street. We lived in Clarence road when the yellow line was introduced near the York/Brampton Road junction, and a very unattractive post was put up in front of our property without any discussion.</p> <p>The reality for us, is that these parking restrictions are not a positive move for us. We do not suffer with commuter parking at the moment outside our house, on either side, and the 11am-1pm restriction will just disrupt our visitors. The antisocial parking we experience all occurs outside of these restricted hours, often in association with events at the Homewood Road Church Hall - usually in the evenings or weekends. The single line hours restriction will not prevent this occurring. Whilst it is a marginal improvement, more shared parking would be slightly preferable to the single yellow line. This leads me onto our final point which is that we would need clear white lines to mark our driveway entrances, as these are frequently parked over.</p> <p>Just to reiterate, the preference for more shared parking vs yellow lines is predicated on the rest of the proposal being implemented as suggested. If the streets closer to the station remain unchanged then we would be more supportive of the yellow line restriction to ward of all day parking.</p>
328	Clarence Road	<p>Thank you for your update on the review on Ladder Roads .</p> <p>I was unable to attend the open session last Saturday as I have been away but trust that my previous comments - some which seem already to have been included - will be taken into account .</p> <p>I attach another photo of the situation which still remain re markings outside my property and am sure , as to your documentation , that these will be made " right " as part of the update referred to ie double yellows only ( no tiny parking slot which one driver parked with the front of the car pointing into the road ) from the t junction to the parking bay , as was the situation re safety / access prior to the last changes</p> <p>Thank you .</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
329	Not Provided	<p>I attended the open forum on Saturday 1st February 2020 to better understand how the proposal would practically affect Marshalswick South and in particular Zone P3 area 2 where I live on Gurney Court Road.</p> <p>I found the explanations proved to be useful but I remain unconvinced that the Council's anticipated overall outcome will result in more evenly used parking spaces throughout Clarence and Marshalswick South Wards ie. an overall reduction in the Monday to Friday all-day visitor parking in Gurney Court Road and adjacent roads.</p> <p>The introduction of double yellow lines at road junctions to improve road safety is welcomed but this will probably displace several hundred vehicles that will park elsewhere on the local roads. I guess the Council have a good idea of these vehicle numbers and the car park spaces available at the two City Station car parks.</p> <p>I agree that some of these all-day visitors will baulk at the £2.90 all day parking fee (compared to free at present) but for many it represents excellent value compared to the £8.15 fee at the City Station. Therefore, I think many will continue to park in our local roads alongside residents with permits parking their vehicles on these roads. Therefore, there could be an increase in vehicles parked on both sides of the roads. If this happens the other safety issue from speeding motorists will continue to make it dangerous for residents to enter or exit their front drives, or for pedestrians crossing the road.</p> <p>I sensed that the Council has no plans to significantly increase the level of enforcement so I think that the number of parking infringements will be considerable thus undermining some of the key benefits of a ladder scheme.</p> <p>As explained to me the other safety issue of speeding vehicles is outside the remit of the District Council and needs to be referred Herts County Council. I am certain that this matter has been through our local Councillors but the issue is getting worse.</p> <p>Please advise when the Council will review the scheme once the proposed scheme is implemented eg. after 6 or 12 months with options to amend 'red' and 'purple' parking designations, the 2 hours lunchtime parking fee etc?</p>
330	Park Avenue	<p>Thank you for your letter.</p> <p>The scheme was originally brought in to stop our roads from being public free for all parking because we had in affect become free parking for station/city centre users.</p> <p>Since the introduction the scheme has worked well for users.</p> <p>As you are aware we are adjacent to a school, a narrow road and have a terrible camber on the tarmac.</p> <p>Many of our elderly residents can just about cope with the road as it is.</p> <p>Having reviewed the scheme we note that roads further away from the scheme are not pay by phone (Gainsborough, Brompton and others) and yet those roads (parts of if not all) are further away from the station/ city centre.</p> <p>This would inevitably mean that Park Avenue being one of the first public pay on street parking areas would again take the brunt of the cheaper parking.This is totally unreasonable and means that the Council may as well have not started the whole process in the first place.</p> <p>It is for this reason we object to the proposed changes and hope that common sense will prevail.</p> <p>We are also holding a residents meeting as everyone in the street we have spoken to is firmly against the proposed changes.</p>
331	Burnham Road,	<p>Thank you for the letter concerning proposed parking restrictions in my area.</p> <p>The proposed plan looks good and seems to have been well thought-out, taking into consideration the various interests of many people.</p> <p>I should, however, like to raise one important matter for consideration.</p> <p>Would the committee please consider imposing a LIMIT to the number of workmen's vehicles that can be parked in one road for ONE property at any one time.</p> <p>At the moment, there are often about FOUR or FIVE fairly large vans, one skip and a portaloo taking up parking spaces in Burnham Road for ONE SINGLE PROPERTY at the SAME time! This is continuing for a number of weeks.</p> <p>As this obviously SEVERELY restricts parking spaces for residents, I consider that such a great number of vehicles for one single property at any one time is totally unacceptable. Clearly workmen need their vans. However, I would request that a limit be imposed for the number of workmen's vehicles for each property. (It is also not unusual for workmen to be working on more than one property in a road, which obviously exacerbates the problem.)</p> <p>I should be grateful if this matter could be given serious consideration.</p>
332	Clarence Road	<p>I live in Clarence Rd, between Sandpit Lane and York Rd. The proposed scheme appears to take us back to square one with wall to wall commuter parking down one side of the road - exactly the situation the original scheme was set up to address.</p> <p>My questions:</p> <p>Are we right in thinking that a commuter can park first thing, then phone in to pay £2.90 to cover the two hour lockout? Or call from work later?</p> <p>As we are one of the closest roads to the station any commuter is going to choose to pay the fee - it's a fraction of what the station charges. And they'll park here rather than in Charmouth or Woodstock North as we are closer to the railway.</p> <p>Therefore residents are never going to be able to 'share' the marked bays. After the furore from the Charmouth/Woodstock residents, this proposal appears to simply push the problem back to us. So it's fine for us to live with the problems of commuter traffic/parking but not them?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you urgently as this is causing a lot of disquiet.</p>
333	Not Provided	<p>We would prefer to have 11 - 1pm requiring a visitor or residents permit, as it tackles the growing problem of commuter parking expanding across roads at an increasing distance from the station.</p> <p>This leaves room therefore for more regular use by the public for visiting residents, the park, cleaners and other kinds of practical contractor work etc, including better safeguarding of all residents due to better hope of finding the car owner as no car will be there long term with no hope of access to the driver should it need to be moved for any reason (even council access for any of the facilities, or problems like general maintenance urgent or not, together with being able to resolve inconsiderate parking near driveways, which is surprisingly common).</p> <p>I would highlight also that currently when we have needed to park our own car on the road, if I am gone for 20 minutes before 9 the space is gone when I return, and I have to park much farther up Charmouth Road, my worry with the proposal with this aspect is that as a result of the paid-for parking being full (I truly expect it will be) when the grandparents visit they will have to walk an unreasonable distance, including returning of course to put a permit on the car, - it's not reasonable, - and the reason that I believe the distance to park will still be significant is because the parking currently is so intense. I realise the planners are proposing opening up more of the roads in P2 to similar £2.90 parking, however they will fill, and those used to parking here will continue.</p> <p>In my opinion there's the issue of treating the residents and the general public (excluding commuters*) fairly on the one hand, and on the other recognising that the commuter parking problem does also need resolving, - but don't blend the two issues, - I sympathise with any commuters who park because they can't afford the station carparking, - in many ways if we could just provide cheaper parking for them it would not concern me, - but it's unworkable to means-test car parking, - most of the people who are blocking our road to go to the station are doing it because it's free, and it's likely they're valuing the walk it also gives them, therefore their habits won't change when you slap a £2.90 charge on top. But I think you definitely do need to find a solution for those commuters who can't afford the carpark, and many clearly wouldn't mind walking approx 1k for cheap parking.</p> <p>* I single out commuters from the general public here because the nature of how they park is an extreme version of parking.</p> <p>Note that the parkingrestrictions email came back as 'undeliverable'. I can't spot my typo in that email address at the moment!</p> <p>thank you, kind regards</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
334	Homewood Road	<b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> Shared resident and pay parking Monday to Friday with time restrictions is a good idea, and some existing commuter parkers may use the pay parking and park closer to the station as it is a more affordable option for them than the town centre and station car parks. This won't appeal to most of the commuter parkers who are looking for somewhere free to park as the cost of train travel is already prohibitive. The proposed parking scheme incorporates a larger area of roads which are currently used for unrestricted commuter parking, including Battlefield Road, Gurney Court Road, Lancaster Road, Charnmouth Road, Faircross Way, The Park, etc. If the proposal goes ahead hundreds of commuter cars will be displaced and looking for the next closest free alternative parking spaces. The knock-on effect of the recently introduced parking zone south of Sandpit Lane has changed the nature of Charnmouth Road and Faircross Way – a suburban area now feeling like an urban area. As a result, a large number of additional cars are now squeezed up to or over hanging driveways, some parked on the verges as the road is narrow when parked on both sides, parked on corners, limited passing places with incidences of road rage when the road gets gridlocked as a result. We note that the proposed parking zone does not extend to Homewood Road. Homewood Road parking is actually closer to the City Station than the northern end of Charnmouth Road, and closer than the furthest point on The Park, both of which are included in the proposed scheme. Therefore, any commuters will naturally end up parking on Homewood Road instead (along with all the problems discussed earlier) as it would be the closest parking to the station. Currently a lot of residents park on the south end of Homewood Road (the north end less populated). The parking issues will therefore be pushed to the north end of Homewood Road. Taking into account driveways, passing spaces, corners where yellow lines will be introduced, resident's cars already parked in the street, there is not sufficient parking on Homewood Road if the proposed parking restrictions are introduced for all the displaced commuter parking. The pavements on Homewood Road are narrower than Charnmouth Road and Faircross Way and we fear that cars will park up on the pavement curb to protect their cars from damage from passing traffic, making it dangerous for pedestrians. We not a parking experts but would hazard a guess that the commuter cars currently parking on Charnmouth Road and Faircross Way are in excess of 50 additional cars per day. This is not taking into account cars currently parked on Lancaster, Gurney Ct, Battlefield, Woodstock Road etc, which in combination would equal hundreds of commuter cars. We are fortunate that we have a driveway and off-street parking currently is not an issue for us, but our driveway is difficult to drive on and off as the drive is very narrow with poor visibility onto the pavement and kerbside, with a high brick wall and hedge on one side and conifer trees and hedge on the other. When cars are parked immediately opposite and hard up to the drive to the right-hand side of our driveway, it is very difficult to turn right off the driveway and even harder to reverse on to the driveway. If the proposed parking scheme is implemented, we would request that it is extend to the whole of Homewood Road, and we request that an access protection zone is painted on the road outside our driveway. If the zone is not extended to Homewood Road, we request that an access protection zone is provided outside our driveway as an absolute minimum to reduce the impact of commuter parking.
335	Faircross Way	Here are my comments/suggestions on the parking review. Overall I think the Parking Review has been well thought out. 1) On the proposed map Zone P3 Area 1, there are 2 islands at the junction of The Park and Faircross Way. These should be marked with double yellow lines to prevent vehicles parking there. I spoke to you at the Open Forum on Sat 1st Feb and you said this would be done but you said it was too fiddly to mark it on the maps. 2) The parking fee proposed at £2.90 should be higher to encourage commuters to use the station car park (currently £8.50 or £8.70 for the 2 car parks). Suggest it should be set at £5.00. 3) It's not clear where the street signs will be positioned, but I'm concerned that as my house (No 38 Faircross Way) has a low wall running along the front, putting a a sign post there will cause problems. Young children often walk along the wall with parents holding their hands and a sign post would make it difficult. It would also be unsightly.
336	Lancaster Road	I am receipt of your full update on the parking restriction consultations. This plan put forward for Lancaster Rd is acceptable, but I do question the Parking fee for non-residents of ONLY £2.90. I understand that it is now around £8 per day to park at the station and yet we are offering them the opportunity to park in Lancaster Rd for under £3 for the day. This does seem a trivial charge, whilst I acknowledge it should not be as much as the station I suggest £5 would be more appropriate.
337	Not Provided	We strongly OBJECT to the proposal based on the following points:  1. The proposal to allow commuter parking on our ( and surrounding ) residential roads will simply create cheap ( £2.90 for 24hr parking ) for commuters who will choose that option over the £8 per day parking at the station car parks. The station car parks will be empty and every space you allocate in our residential roads will be filled, all day , every day. They will pay by phone on their walk to the station, knowing they can leave the car all day for £2.90.  2. Holiday/Business trip commuters ( who are also now leaving their cars for up to 2 weeks in our road ) will simply ensure they pay by phone every day from wherever they are to avail themselves of this discounted holiday/business parking. I have seen at least 3 cars in the last 2 months do this and have been ready to contact the council/police for removal.. but of course, just before the 2 weeks limit is up, the car has gone.  3. It seems ridiculous that you do not have control over what NCP charge for station parking. It is an obvious profiteering exercise on the part of those running the car parks, and it seems St. Albans council wants to get in on the profit by using their poor planning as an excuse to turn our residential roads into a profit generating residential road car park. Why doesn't the council control the charges in the station car parks to make them reasonable for commuters?  4. Safety - I have now witnessed multiple incidents of damage to parked cars, accidents, threatening and abusive behaviour / language from commuters ( and through traffic drivers ) who seem to think we are not allowed to park/turn/reverse into our own driveways. It has at points been impossible to exit in one direction out of our drive due to cars parked right up to our driveway entrance and cars opposite. Multiple near misses when pulling out of our drive-way due to insufficient visibility and speeding traffic.  5. Our stretch of road has turned into a 'race track' as drivers attempt to get all the way through 200-300m of cars on either side with no passing places, in an attempt to get through before someone comes the other way! This creates a very dangerous situation. We now have cyclists moving at speed on the pavements as it is not safe on the road and we have witnessed accidents with cars pulling out of driveways with cyclists and scooters.  6. The only option as I see it now is to introduce a Permit controlled Parking zone in our roads with NO parking for commuters. This will ensure that residents, visitors and tradesmen can continue to use our road as before and bring back the safe residential status that the road has enjoyed for the 22+ years I have lived in this part of St. Albans - and the reason I chose to move to this road.  If you remove any of the permit controlled zones you have set up, it will have NO effect on our road, as commuters have now had FREE parking for over 1 year ( with a 15 minute walk to the station). Only a small proportion will go back to the other roads. They won't mind £2.90 for 24hr parking and a healthy walk to the station. People are creatures of habit. Now, with Social Media, everyone is sharing where they park for FREE, creating the very dangerous and difficult traffic situation we have now. It can never return to what it was without the introduction of Permit Controlled Parking zone in our road. NO parking for commuters.. NO double yellow lines ( apart from near road junctions ).  This whole situation has shown very poor planning on the council's part with regard to what effect the introduction of the ladder road scheme would have on the surrounding areas and the lack of consultation with those that would obviously

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
		<p>be immediately affected by the changes. It seems you then simply saw a way to profit from the situation by introducing commuter parking on residential roads that are very far from the station, which is ridiculous!</p> <p>We believe the only solution available to you now, for a return to a safe and healthy environment in our and the surrounding roads, is</p> <p>to introduce a Permit Controlled Parking zone and NO parking for commuters in the P3 area.</p>
338	Woodstock Road South	<p>We are residents of Woodstock Road South. Parking is extremely challenging, especially since parking restrictions were introduced on neighbouring ladder roads.</p> <p>We are supportive of parking restrictions on Woodstock Road South But we have two suggestions.</p> <p>1. We do not feel the the proposal of restrictions 11-1pm is sufficient as while this will prevent station goers it will not stop those parking for the restaurants and shops on Hatfield road which is a major issue for us. We would suggest a similar parking permit as York Road which has permits from 8.30-18.30. Woodstock Road South experiences higher parking volumes than other ladder roads due to the numerous amenities, shops, coffee shops and restaurants on Hatfield Road.</p> <p>2. We also do not agree with the proposal to have double yellows on the opposite side of Woodstock Road South. This single yellow line provides needed parking for visitors outside peak hours. It also allows local residents to park overnight and means there is less stress on overall parking capacity of the road.</p> <p>We would be happy it discuss this further and we hope you take local residents views into account prior to implementing this new scheme.</p> <p>Very best,</p>
339	Arthur Road	<p>I have just had a look at the parking charges and i cannot believe what iam seeing we have to pay £70 per year for the privilege of parking in our oen road for 2 hours when we didn't have to pay I think residents should get it free it's ridiculous why I'd this road not residents parking only it's madness £70 a year I've lived here 35 years abd suddenly it's going to cost me this amount why do we have to pay.</p>
340	Charmouth Court	<p>I enclose a revised map of the restrictions you propose for the Charmouth Road/Charmouth Court road junction. My suggestion is that the Double Yellow Lines in Charmouth Road should be extended by at least 5 metres north and south to provide a clearer view of traffic in Charmouth Road approaching the Charmouth Court exit.</p>
341	Battlefield Road	<p>I have informally represented some 50+ residents of Battlefield Road for several years in trying to get the Council to implement proposals to restrict excessive public parking and make the road safer.</p> <p>I would like to make the following comments and positive suggestions on the parking proposals.</p> <p>1. The proposal to spread commuter and local worker parking throughout the wider area is appreciated but it is disappointing that the scheme will not ensure most of such parking is at the Station and Town Centre where it should be.</p> <p>2. Most residents are concerned that the proposals effectively allow all day commuter parking at minimal cost, which could well exclude residents parking particularly in areas such as Battlefield Road that are nearer to the Station and Town Centre.</p> <p>3. Many objections throughout the whole area might well be satisfied with a compromise on the existing proposals to allow Resident Only zones as well as combined Residents and Public zones. 4. In Battlefield Road for instance most residents are likely to accept an adjustment to the present proposal whereby the Residents Permit and Public Pay waiting zones between 11am and 1pm were allocated to Residents Only on one side of the road and combined Residents and Public on the other side of the road. 5. The £2.90 charge effectively for public parking for the whole working day is generally not considered much of a disincentive for commuter or town workers to park in residential roads. Residents would prefer a higher charge of say £4 to be considered. In addition, there is quite a lot of holiday parking throughout the area which should not be permitted at all.</p> <p>6. There are concerns in Battlefield Road about parking and deliveries for Clare Lodge, Town Centre parking as well as commuter parking and parking for St Saviours Church services and events. Presumably some 8 staff at Clare Lodge could be issued with residents permits and deliveries should be done from Yellow Line parking outside the no waiting period. Most St Saviours overflow parking might avoid the no waiting times but I assume you are discussing this with the Church. Residents are in favour of double yellow lines being installed outside St Saviours Church in Sandpit Lane but parking there will put more pressure on Battlefield Road.7. Most residents consider it important that a comprehensive scheme should cover the whole area and probably include Homewood Road. 8. Residents are desperate for the Council to implement a scheme right away and avoid prevarication.</p> <p>The Council now needs to be decisive in finalisation a scheme and getting it implemented. No doubt there will continue to be objections, but most residents should be provided with safe roads and priority parking arrangements. I believe that the majority of residents throughout the wider area want to work with the Council to get a reasonably suitable scheme implemented promptly. Gary Payne in particular continues to address residents' concerns in a professional manner, but the Council should ensure his department is properly resourced.</p>
342	Monks Horton Way	<p>It appears you have omitted Monks Horton Way from restricted car parking unlike other nearby roads, WHY?</p> <p>You must NOT allow Monks Horton Way to become a "free car park" for commuters to use as this will cause endless of problems . The road is narrower then other roads and parking cars in this quiet road will prevent visitors, deliveries and emergency vehicles gaining access.</p> <p>Therefore Monks Horton Way must be included within the parking restriction zones.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
343	Monks Horton Way	<p>As a resident of Monks Horton Way (MHW) I acknowledge the letter of 17 January 2020 from SADC setting out proposals for street parking in our area and inviting comments by 28 February 2020. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>I understand that this will basically mean there will be restricted parking in all nearby roads, with the exception of MHW and The Dell, where there are no proposed restrictions at all.</p> <p>I am aware that residents from MHW attended the open forum on 1st February 2020 where Mr Gary Payne, Specialist Officer (Parking), could offer no explanation as to why MHW (or The Dell) has been omitted. The obvious implication and consequence of this is that MHW will effectively become the only road in a wide area where cars are able to park freely, and hence will dramatically affect the road for the worse.</p> <p>If other roads are being considered for parking restrictions to prevent all day parking or parking during specific times then I feel that MHW should also be a contender in this, further justified, particularly from a Health and Safety perspective, for the following additional reasons to those outlined above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MHW is some two metres narrower than "ladder roads" such as Churchill Road for example (5.4m compared to 7.4m)</li> <li>- I understand that parking bays would be approximately 2.05m wide, dramatically impacting the remaining road space for vehicles to negotiate through</li> <li>- with MHW being a cul-de-sac this is likely to further accentuate traffic issues as cars manoeuvre up and down the road, often with little regard to residents living there, pedestrians or other road users. Many of the nearby roads have access from both ends of the road; MHW has a single point of entry and exit, which means traffic from those trying to benefit from free parking down it could cause further snarl-ups and cause further danger for pulling off and onto Sandpit Lane</li> <li>- I believe that this encouragement of 'free parking for all' will greatly reduce parking for MHW residents (and their visitors), as well as restricting access for all emergency vehicles, delivery lorries, refuse collections, tradesmen etc</li> <li>- there is also likely to be restricted access/vision for access to and from MHW driveways, as well as for pedestrians and other road users, with additional consequences of possible parking on pavements, further aggravating blockages</li> <li>- this is of particular additional concern to me, not just for the adults but also for the number of children who live down the road who would not always have clear visibility behind obstacles when crossing the road or using their bikes up and down the road</li> <li>- as a resident of MHW I know that I am not alone in believing, very strongly, that the safety of our residents is of paramount importance and therefore feel that action should be taken to prevent MHW from becoming a traffic/pedestrian/resident hazard and car park disaster zone</li> </ul> <p>I trust you will keep me apprised of further developments in these proposals. Please note that, whilst I am happy for my comments to be used, I do not give permission for my name to be published alongside these comments should they be used for public consumption.</p>
344	Gainsborough Avenue	<p>Your letter says that I can find more information by looking at <a href="http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/troconsultations">www.stalbans.gov.uk/troconsultations</a>. I have tried to access this site about 10 times and it does not work, all you get is a message saying the site is not available. I have trawled through other likely sounding St Albans council parking sites but to no avail. My comments below are therefore solely based on the information sent to me.</p> <p>1. Your letter states (point no.5) that you propose to change the existing residents only parking to the north of Verulam school to shared use parking. When I studied the maps it is obvious that this proposed change is not just to the north of the school (ie Jennings Road) but to all the roads in the ladder road area north of Brampton Road. In effect this is equivalent to removing the the residents parking scheme in these roads altogether as anyone will now be able to park there for the sum of £2.90. As the cost of parking at the railway station is far greater than £2.90 the ladder roads will once again be turned into the unofficial station car park.</p> <p>2. I live in Gainsborough Avenue which is not yet shown to be included in the "shared use parking" scheme. However, with the introduction of the P2 parking zone I expect all the people that will now not be allowed to park near the station (as they will not have a zone P permit anymore) will now park in Gainsborough Avenue. These are the people living to the north east of the scheme as mentioned in your letter point no.6.</p> <p>Also the residents from all the ladder roads north of Brampton road will now be parking in the zone P2 roads to the west of Clarence Road (such as Gainsborough Avenue) because when they come home from shopping/taking the kids to school/returning from work etc they will not be able to park in their own roads due to the influx of train station parkers.</p> <p>3. Your letter talks about "underutilised" parking to the north of Verulam School. Whilst during some times of the day there are available spaces in Jennings Road East I suggest you go and have a look at this road at school closing time. The road is packed with cars and buses collecting school kids plus all the children themselves on bicycles. Allowing station users to park near the school will cause havoc again, it is bad enough as it is currently. With all the parking spaces taken there will be parking on zig zag lines, double parking etc and it will be dangerous for the children.</p> <p>4. By removing the residents only parking scheme you will be causing a lot of grief and we run the risk of the whole area returning to the awful station overflow carpark scenario that we had a few years ago.</p> <p>Looking through the letter it does rather smell of an ill thought out scheme that is being implemented solely to raise money for the council whilst making the residents lives a misery again. I hope this is not so.</p> <p>5. Some of the points in the letter are good. Passing places and sensibly placed yellow lines could improve the area.</p> <p>As you can tell I have strong reservations about the proposed scheme. What we have now is not perfect but it is a lot better than what is being proposed. By all means introduce new safety changes etc but leave the rest of the scheme as it is, it works.</p>
345	Salisbury Avenue	<p>As a resident of 12 Salisbury Avenue, I would like to object to the current proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. By not including Salisbury and Beaumont Avenue in the proposal you will push the parking issue onto our streets. As it is, we often struggle to get off our drive as cars park opposite or either side of our drive.</p> <p>2. The cost of £2.90 to cover the restricted time of 2 hours per day is not going to deter commuters from parking on those streets, especially given that the alternative is paying £8.15 at the station. As a consequence, I think the station car parks could become even more under-utilised and leave the residents of the ladder roads unable to park their cars near their homes.</p> <p>3. If the parking problem does get pushed onto Salisbury Avenue, I think it poses a danger to life. Salisbury Avenue is narrow and heavy parking along that road could prevent access to emergency services.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would confirm receipt of my email.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
346	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> 1. The plans to place double yellow lines outside my house and that of my neighbours This is entirely unnecessary. At the moment there are double yellow lines on the other side of the street (which are justified as they are on a corner) and this allows for motorists to pause in the space to allow oncoming cars to come through. I have lived here for more than 20 years and this is not a safety issue. 2. The plans to place double yellow lines outside 24 and 26 Woodstock Road South This is unnecessary, as there are double yellow lines on both sides of the traffic calming give way system here and it works well. It will cause the loss of another two car parks in a crowded street. 3.The plans to place double yellow lines outside 7 and 9 Woodstock Road South instead of the current single yellow lines This is unnecessary and will cause the loss of a further two/three car parking spaces in a crowded street. 4.The plans to place double yellow lines outside numbers 2 and 4 Woodstock Road North This is also unnecessary and will remove valuable parking spaces for a high demand area. There is no safety issue here as the double yellow lines over the road allow for adequate sight lines. If it was felt that the driveways at numbers 2 and 4 need better sight lines then reducing the number of cars which can park there from two to one by use of double yellow lines would be a compromise that would be acceptable to me. 5.The plans to place double and single yellow lines in Woodstock Road North This will lead to a huge reduction in parking in an already high demand area and, although there are some safety issues, judicious placing of some double and single yellow lines at bottlenecks would be acceptable but there should be further consultation as to their placement. The scale currently proposed is too onerous and will reduce the parking too much. This, combined with the plans to allow cheap public parking in Woodstock Road North (see below), will make the parking issues worse, not better. 6.Splitting Zone P into zones P1 and P2 I object generally to this proposal, as the split in zones is arbitrary and does not take into account the scarcity of parking in Woodstock Road South, Arthur Road and Burnham Road which are closer to most parts of the proposed zone P2 than most of P1. It will also lead to more pressure on Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue which are outside the proposed parking scheme. All the local parking should be in one zone. The separation into two zones will deprive the residents of Woodstock Road South the use of any of the parking on Woodstock Road North which has been a useful overflow area for us, given the lack of parking in our own street. . 7. Bargain basement prices for commuter parking in Zone P2 The proposal appears to be (the consultation document is very unclear) that members of the public can park in zone P2 for a daily rate of £2.90 (which will cover the restricted part of the day). This is significantly cheaper than parking at the station and will have commuters flocking to our streets in large numbers. That, together with the double and single yellow lines you propose, will increase the issues rather than reduce them. 8 It seems the scheme still applies on public holidays. 9. I feel that this may help alleviate the issues as I have seen many park inconsiderately but given that it will be expensive, I sugges that you trial this plan in several streets first to see if it is worth the additional cost. 10. Knock on effects of Eaton Road and Salisbury Avenue</p>
347	Woodstock Road South	I agree with (Comment number 346) and submit it on my own behalf too
348	Woodstock Road North	<p>Thank you for your correspondence dated 17.1.20. I have considered the proposed solutions and cannot agree.</p> <p>As a resident of Woodstock Road North I am constantly faced with people parking too close, over the entrance to our driveway or directly opposite and often all three together. This obscures our view and creates dangers.</p> <p>The solution would be to reduce the parking on our road however, the proposal will increase it and residents will be financially penalised in the process.</p> <p>As a shift worker I need 24 hour access to the road the proposal will do nothing to improve my egress as there will still be cars parked directly opposite and encroaching my drive at all hours of the day and night.</p> <p>Please find an appropriate solution.</p>
349	Not Provided	<p>We want to register our objection to the parking proposal proposed by the Council viz their letter dated 17th February 2020.</p> <p>Woodstock Road North is part of a busy AND often dangerous "RAT RUN" between Hatfield Road and Sandpit Lane, with many residents now feeling that the road narrowing are ineffective. Our particular segment of WRN (Brampton to Jennings) is unique in that it lies between the 2 roads serving Verulam School, as well as being a feeder route for Fleetville Juniors/infants. As a result we experience a high intensity of traffic flow and parking which the Council's proposals seem likely to exacerbate. There are 3 sets of colour coded parking restrictions marked on the Council Map.</p> <p>1.PURPLE LINES.</p> <p>The proposal will create Nose – to – Tail marking on both sides of drives will increase the difficulty and danger already faced by residents exiting and entering their properties, especially when combined with faster through traffic speeds.</p> <p>2.ORANGE LINES.</p> <p>Single yellow lines add significantly danger on our road, creating faster and more erratic traffic speeds,. This effects not only residents, but also, cyclists, pedestrians and school children criss crossing the road en route to school.</p> <p>3.YELLOW LINES.</p> <p>Residents/visitors/other parking spaces, however will be significantly reduced. Adding to the above effects.</p> <p>4.BLUE LINES.</p> <p>WRN will suffer displaced parking from commuters/local businesses etc unable to park all day in WRS.</p> <p>We therefore, feel the Council's proposals will remove up to half our parking capacity: ADD significantly to demand for these fewer spaces :require us to pay for a service we may frequently be unable to use: while heavily subsidising non-residential/commuter parking throughout. Ram-packed parking accompanied by faster traffic will worsen an already hazardous situation, conditions which the Council's review were relieve/eliminate, rather than exacerbate.</p>
350	Faircross Way	<p>I am a resident of Faircross Way and I thank you for your communication of 17 January 2020 concerning the consultation on the Ladder Roads scheme and proposed changes.</p> <p>I support your proposal fully and in particular that there should be shared use parking or single yellow lines throughout zones P2 and P3, as indicated in your proposal documents.</p> <p>I would like to add a further suggestion that the public parking by pay phone should be set at a level higher than the proposed £2.90 per day, in order to make it more in line with the cost of parking at the station. It would not be appropriate to create a cost incentive for motorists who currently pay to park in the station facility to consider parking nearby on the street. I would suggest a more realistic rate of £5 per day.</p>
351	Churchill Road	<p>I am against the new parking proposals and can confirm I am in agreement with the consensus response being submitted by the Churchill Road residents.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
352	Not Provided	<p>we came to the ladder roads consultation on 1st February; thank you to you and your colleagues for organising the day</p> <p>You suggested that if we got a consensus opinion in our road that could be helpful to the cause. Is there a specific format for that consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a letter physically signed by all those in agreement,</li> <li>• an email submission, indicating the residents that agreed</li> <li>• a submission s with the same wording from each house agreeing to the consensus</li> <li>• something else</li> </ul>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
353	Woodstock Road North	<p>We are contacting you to express our dissatisfaction with both the present parking situation in Woodstock Road North and the proposals that have been suggested.</p> <p>As we hope you are already aware, Woodstock Road North is a busy road which links Sandpit Lane to Hatfield Road and it is used by many persons at all times of the day. It has had traffic calming road narrowings for many years in order to slow the traffic down and ensure that the road is safer. Since the parking restrictions were introduced in the 'ladder' roads, there are significantly more cars parking on both sides of Woodstock Road North from Brampton Road to beyond Jennings Road which has meant that cars are unable to pass each other on that stretch. It is difficult to come in and out of both Jennings Road and Brampton Road safely as vision is impaired by parked vehicles and it is also difficult for the residents to drive in and out of their driveways safely for the same reasons. It has been stressful and dangerous and we have had many near misses since the restrictions were introduced in December 2018.</p> <p>We do not see how the Council's proposals set out in the recent letter and at the meeting we attended on February 1st are going to improve the situation.</p> <p>The parking capacity on Woodstock Road North will be reduced, as residents will be competing with each other/visitors/Verulam School pupils/commuters (the parking fee is significantly cheaper than a day ticket to park at the station car parks) for these and they are likely to be in constant use. Residents who buy the permits will be paying for a service that they may frequently be unable to use. The single yellow lines will create faster and more dangerous and erratic traffic speeds which will affect pedestrians and cyclists (many of these are school children) and residents as well as other drivers.</p> <p>Parked vehicles combined with faster flowing traffic along this stretch will make an already hazardous situation much worse. These proposals were meant to improve the situation, not make it worse.</p> <p>This was never an issue before controlled parking was introduced in the 'ladder' roads. Please reconsider the situation</p>
354	Eaton Road	<p>It is with deep concern and reservation that we have received notification of the parking restrictions about to take place In all of the roads leading up to our road ( Eaton Road )</p> <p>We already have a problem with parking issues caused by commuters / businesses and school drop off / pick up causing congestion / dangers to pedestrians and a general nuisance to the residents of Eaton Road.</p>
355	Not Provided	<p>I live in Homewood Road and can foresee that we are going to be petitioning the council, as did Charmouth Road, because their parking restrictions are causing single-file traffic and difficulty both driving along the road and accessing our driveways. At the moment we have difficulty driving down the road from the Sandpit Lane end and accessing our driveways in this part of the road (nearest the station) due to the use of the Homewood Road Church and Church Hall. This use is limited, if the commuters park in Homewood Road the problem will last all day, every weekday.</p> <p>I would have hoped the council would have looked at the problems they have caused already with this policy and may have rethought this strategy.</p> <p>At the very least, we require lines forbidding parking too close to our driveways. When there is parking for the church, to reverse into my drive, I have to blindly pull into the middle of the road - due to the parked cars, unable to see on-coming traffic from either direction, in addition there is traffic coming from Faircross Way. The cars turning into Homewood Road from Sandpit Lane will be blocking Sandpit Lane as they wait for the single file traffic waiting to exit Homewood Road.</p> <p>Why has Homewood Road not been included in the parking restrictions? The council appears to be moving the parking problem from one road to the next.</p>
356	Jennings Road	<p>Re: Parking Review (Zone P) Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane).</p> <p>I disagree with the idea of charging non-residents for parking in Zone P. Basically it will turn the zone P roads into a large car park. Cars will then park as they did before the ladder scheme was instigated, thus defeating the object. Non-residents will have to pay for parking and the council will need to administer the scheme.</p> <p>Enforcement will be difficult, mobile phones can't print tickets so traffic wardens will need up-to-date lists of vehicle registration numbers. Has the technical solution for this scheme been evaluated?</p> <p>Setting the price for parking will be difficult. Setting the price too low will empty the station car parks, exacerbating the congestion and causing conflict off interest with the car park operators.. Setting the price too high will mean seven of the eight problems itemised in your letter dated 17 January will not be solved.</p>
357	Jennings Road	<p>The latest proposals for shared parking in this section of Jennings Road are regressive and will simply encourage the return of day long parking by St Albans station commuters and the problems associated with that last time around.</p> <p>As you know, the proposed fee of £2.90 per day compares with the £8.15 per day currently extorted at St Albans station. So you don't have to be much of a mathematician to work out that parking areas within walking distance of the station (like this section of Jennings Road) will become attractive for commuter parking once again.</p> <p>As such , I cannot support these proposals unless residents are adequately protected by ensuring that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. permitted parking is confined to bays that do not obstruct exits, or the view from exits, of residential drives</li> <li>2. there are sufficient resident only parking bays provided , consistent with the number of permits issued and with an allowance for residential visitors</li> <li>3. there is proper enforcement against vehicles parked outside of bays</li> </ol> <p>If you fail to ensure the above, you will return us to the situation of a couple of years ago where commuters were parking everywhere all day , obstructing residential drive exits , preventing residents from parking near their homes and turning sections of the road into one way traffic with all the issues around road safety for the significant number of school children and other pedestrians using the street. Commuters were regularly disregarding the advisory white lines across drives and you won't be able to prevent that behaviour continuing under this new scheme unless you have proper enforcement.</p> <p>This does need to be thought through carefully to avoid revisiting the problems of a couple of years ago and to counter the charge that all the council will have been able to achieve with these latest proposals is the monetisation of what was previously free parking without making it any better for the council tax paying residents who live here.</p> <p>Do we really need to encourage more traffic onto the residential streets of St Albans in this way? Is the traffic in the city not bad enough already?</p>
358	Charmouth Road	<p>Towards the north end of Charmouth Road, the current proposal contains a no wait area in front of numbers 78 and up (near the junction with Charmouth Court), and a parking bay area opposite those houses. I would like to point out that the buildings 78 and a few numbers up from that do not have driveways like the houses opposite them. It would appear more optimal to put the parking bays in front of the even-numbered houses to maximise the number of cars that fit in the parking bays, as well as from a safety point-of-view of the cars pulling out of the driveways at the odd-numbered houses.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
359	Not Provided	<p>1. I am puzzled by your proposals!! Surely allowing people to purchase a parking permit for £2.90 will be attractive to many commuters as it is significantly cheaper than the station car park. Commuters cars were blamed for much of the original problem: Are we not going back to square one??</p> <p>2. The existing ladder area is well marked out and controls where cars may be parked safely: many of the early complaints relate to blocked driveways and inconsiderate parking. Would it not be worth lifting the existing parking restrictions and see what happens? I predict that by allowing parking, by paying, we will be returning in certain areas to square one.</p> <p>3. I do not believe that your statement “ This proposal is intended to share parking across the entire section of individual roads” , could ever happen in practice. There will always be more parking requirements close to key activities ( station, school, etc)</p> <p>4. I like the marked out parking areas and would welcome this being extended. Several of the roads in the area are rendered single carriageway by virtue of parking on both sides of the road: marking the road can ensure that there are adequate passing places</p> <p>5. I still believe that the” Park and ride” approach is the best long term solution.</p>
360	Monks Horton Way	<p>We are very concerned that with the introduction of the restricted parking in all the roads adjacent to us, our road (Monks Horton Way) will be used by commuters for all day parking for the station. Our road is narrower than most other roads nearby (5.4m wide) therefore increased parking on the road would make it difficult for emergency vehicles to get through. It would also restrict our vision when coming out of our driveways and restrict our access to our driveways. It is already dangerous when people park at the entrance to our road, as there is a blind spot for people turning in and out due to the line of trees.</p> <p>We would therefore like Monks Horton Way to be included in the parking permit scheme to avoid these problems. If restrictions were enforced for just one hour during the week, this would alleviate the problem.</p>
361	Not Provided	<p>I have recently been informed of the council plans to introduce further restrictions for parking in Royal Road, Fleetville, St Albans.</p> <p>I believe this to be a mistake and submit that the plan should be cancelled for the following reasons;</p> <p>*The Fleetville Community Centre and Fleetville Primary School are located on this road.</p> <p>*The Fleetville Centre is a vital hub for social and educational events.</p> <p>*It is in daily use, providing a meeting place for all ages of the local residents and for others from further afield.</p> <p>*Removing car parking spaces would make it impossible for the Centre to continue since many visitors travel by car and are not able to use public transport.</p> <p>*I have taught Calligraphy and also Art Classes in the Centre for many years to students in the mid to senior age range and they like countless others have benefited enormously from the classes and services provided by Fleetville Community Centre.</p> <p>*My students and I have to bring equipment and heavy items to use in my classes which cannot be transported by bus, or carried by hand. Other groups, or events have similar problems.</p> <p>*There are a limited number of parking spaces outside the centre, which are certainly not adequate for the number of people using the Centre at any given time.</p> <p>So I would ask the planning department to answer the following questions..</p> <p>1. Where does the Council suggest the users of the Centre leave their cars whilst they unload and reload?</p> <p>2. If users have travelled from outlying districts that are not accessible by public transport, where can their cars be parked whilst classes and events are in progress?</p> <p>I appreciate that residents of Royal Road may find it difficult but they chose to live there knowing that they had to share the space with a school and a community centre used regularly by hundreds of people of all ages.</p> <p>Placing yellow lines and restricting parking in this road will destroy this wonderful Community Centre and deny hundreds of people the pleasure it provides.</p> <p>Please rethink and cancel the plans.</p>
362	Salisbury Avenue	<p>1. Although you are not proposing to implement restrictions on our road, our concerns are that cars will flow onto Salisbury Avenue as it's ‘free’ parking. Fold-away bicycles are common now and we see people parking here and cycling to the station. It's also still walking distance to the station and other local shops. Employees of these local shops need to park nearby and Salisbury Avenue will be easy parking.</p> <p>2. Salisbury Avenue is much narrower than other roads being considered in the Ladder roads scheme. The width of those other roads, eg Woodstock, Burnham, Harlesden, Homewood, Jennings etc, allow cars to be parked on both sides of the road and have enough room for an ambulance or fire truck to drive down them.</p> <p>Salisbury Avenue does not have that facility. If you were to park cars on both sides of Salisbury Avenue, a SUV, delivery van, 4x4, ambulance or fire truck will not get through. This will bring risks to households on the road.</p> <p>There are also slight cambers on the road which mean cars don't park tightly against the pavement.</p> <p>As it is, we currently experience driving/parking issues on Salisbury Avenue, eg. drivers park their cars haphazardly on both sides of the road, often leaving little room between them, and one has to weave your way through. We believe the proposed Ladder Roads Scheme will bring more cars onto our road which will worsen this existing problem.</p> <p>Please note, we are not in favour of adding restrictions to Salisbury Avenue. We would instead like to see the Scheme allowing wider roads that have ample off street parking for resident, such as Jennings Road, being more flexible in allowing cars to park.</p>
363	Hamilton Road	I am responding to the consultation about revision of conditions for this zone. The proposal to charge 2.90 a day by phone would encourage commuter parking as it is less than half the price of the station car park and so I would not support this.
364	Clarence Road	<p>. I do not wish for this to be changed for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. If all day parking is to be allowed again, this will reduce visibility exiting my driveway due to vehicles parking to the north of my driveway. It is very difficult seeing cars approaching from the north when there is solid parking along the road. It can be dangerous.</p> <p>2. Parking on the road has been more considerate since the current rules were put in place. This leads me to conclude that all day station parkers are in a rush and end up parking too close to driveway exits making visibility for residents emerging from driveways even more difficult.</p> <p>3. Something not mentioned in the proposal letter that concerns me is the parking allowed at the south end of Clarence Road by the traffic lights alongside Clarence Park. When entering Clarence Road from the south, if the traffic light is red for leaving Clarence Road, it can be impossible to pass the parked cars until the lights change due to queuing cars at the red light. It would improve safety if the parking there started further along the road and not so near the junction.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
365	Sandpit Lane	<p>As there is no mention of Monks Horton Way or the Dell in your parking notification, I assume you agree that these two roads are not suitable for parking other than for residents.</p> <p>However, as a resident of Sandpit Lane but backing on to the spur of Monks Horton Way, I would like to reiterate that this road is far too narrow for any form of parking as there must be access for tradesmen, emergency vehicles and refuse collection. It is also essential that the turning circle opposite my garage is reserved as such except for the occasional local short-term parking. I have already notified the police when an unrecognised car was parked there for a week last year.</p> <p>If anything is required a simple notice saying RESIDENTS PARKING ONLY should suffice.</p>
366	Lancaster Road	<p>I have taken a look at the parking changes proposed for South Marshalswick. I live on Lancaster Road so am aware of the impact on parking since some of the roads south of Sandpit Lane were made permit only.</p> <p>Whilst I agree that something needs to be done to make the roads such as battlefield/Lancaster/gurney/charmouh less hazardous, I would suggest that a change is made to the proposal.</p> <p>As the proposals stand, parts of the road would be permit only (or pay) from 11-1 whilst parts of the road will be no stopping 11-1. My main concern with this is as follows:</p> <p>- residents on certain parts of the road won't be able to park outside their own homes at certain times (11-1). Whilst most of the houses on the affected roads have adequate parking, not all of them do. So, for example, outside my house, I wouldn't be able to leave my car but would need to leave my car outside somebody else's house (assuming I bought a residents permit, or paid to park on my own road, and assuming that commuters hadn't taken up all the spaces.). And if I had visitors for lunch they would have to park on a different part of the road as my drive isn't very big (with a visitor permit from me, again assuming there was space).</p> <p>So my suggestion would be, rather than have some parts of a road permit/some parts no stopping at all, the same aims would be achieved by scrapping the no stopping between 11-1. Instead these parts could be permit only between 11-1 (with no option to pay). Doing this would create adequate passing points as the vast majority of cars parked on the affected roads belong to commuters, and so would disappear once the parts of the roads become permit only between certain times, especially during rush hour times when passing is at its trickiest. I feel that no stopping at all is unnecessarily draconian, given that the introduction of these measures will no doubt create more passing points naturally, especially on parts of the road like the top of Lancaster where passing isn't currently too much of a problem as the commuters start to thin out.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>
367	Gurney Court Road	<p>1. PROPOSED PARKING SCHEME The proposed mix of residents permit/pay by phone (red line) and restricted parking (single yellow) seems like it should offer some relief if the commuter traffic parks on the residents/pay by phone (spots). However, if the residents use these spots then the commuter traffic will be forced to move further out. Those who do not have sufficient off-road parking or for reasons of convenience choose to park on the road, will not want to park on the single yellow lines to avoid moving their cars every day between 11:00 and 13:00. This may simply result in migrating the problem further out.</p> <p>I appreciate the double yellows on the corner of Harptree Way as Harptree Way has become a bit of a long-term parking lot in recent months and cars parked on the corner don't help access or transit. However, more subjectively perhaps (as we live at No. 71), the double yellow lines proposed outside our house opposite Harptree Way (covering Gurney Court Road Nos 69-75) seem unduly restricting once the double yellows on the corners of Harptree Way are implemented. There has never been a problem here previously and I believe a resident-permit holders only restriction would be adequate.</p> <p>Finally, why should local residents have to subsidise this both directly through Council Tax and indirectly through resident's parking permits. To "balance up" this injustice, I suggest each affected local residence should be issued with one/two free residents parking permits. As an aside – the parking proposal doesn't address the postman parking outside our house or the countless builder's vans on the street - where are they to park - will they all have to move at 11:00 for two hours?</p> <p>2. FUTURE PARKING PROVISION AND LONG TERM PLAN FOR STATION PARKING</p> <p>As the consultation, implementation, policing and maintenance of the proposed parking scheme will require a considerable outlay and ongoing cost (How much?) this leads to an extended burden for both council and residents with no perceivable benefit in respect of addressing the central issue, which from your earlier missive appears to be over-priced parking at the station resulting in overspill into unmetered local streets. Rather than passing on the cost to local residents shouldn't the District Council oblige or persuade the station owner (Network Rail/Department of Transport/Thameslink?) to adjust parking charges to increase the fill rate and alleviate the issue?</p> <p>Perhaps if the station owner focussed on encouraging people to park at the station rather than seeking to maximise returns through sub-letting "premium parking" and substituting parking for retail we might have some confidence we were all working toward the same goal.</p> <p>Recent developments on the Oaklands college site and the proposed Hatfield/Symondshyde development will inevitably lead to further loading on the station will inevitably lead to further load on the parking resource and future developments as part of the St. Albans district plan will exacerbate the problem. While there is still capacity it is time to seriously consider and plan for alternative transport to the station. For user travelling longer distances this might include Park and Ride, enhanced public transport, new cycle routes and facilities etc. Users with a shorter distance to travel should be encourage to walk, cycle, scoot etc. Access to the station could be improved to support this, for example a non-vehicular access route across Clarence park with a tunnel leading from the park, where the ramps are, into the station area.</p>
368	Stanhope Road	<p>Thanks for your full explanation of the proposed changes dated January 17.</p> <p>We have lived at Stanhope Road, part of Original Zone P, since 2004 and have one car and a single permit. Parking has become more difficult in recent years in this area. We have two questions/concerns that we would like you to take into account:</p> <p>1) we worry that the new more restrictive Zone P will not have sufficient provision for Zone P holders given the impossibility under these plans of "spillover" into new Zone P1, notably Clarence Road, which we increasingly have to use when Stanhope, Granville and Camp Rd resident parking is full.</p> <p>2) we again ask for a more restrictive limit on non-resident parking on Stanhope and Granville roads. Despite the two hour restriction from 1.30pm to 3.30pm on Stanhope Rd all spaces are often occupied before 6pm with cars also parked on double-yellow lines between the marked bays. We fail to understand why the same restriction applied to the Hatfield Rd end of Clarence Rd (8am-6pm) cannot be applied to Stanhope Rd.</p>
369	Charmouth Road	<p>The problem is due to commuters' cars not being parked at the station. Why not? Your proposal does not address the problem. It will instead penalise local residents/voters/pensioners financially and physically. Do you even know why commuters do not park at the station? We demand that the proper question is asked of those causing this problem in roads close to the station and the clearly identified problem is addressed without the need to impose parking permits.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
370	Not Provided	<p>I am responding on behalf of my wife and myself to your letter of 17 January 2020. Our main concern is the impact of your proposals on Woodstock Road North (WRN) between Jennings Road and Brampton Road, and, in particular, on the stretch of road between Brampton Road and the first chicane north of Brampton Road. But I will also comment on your proposals more widely</p> <p><b>The impact on WRN of recent parking restrictions on Brampton Road and the ladder roads.</b>  Since the changes, the parking situation on our stretch of WRN has become intolerable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More vehicles from elsewhere park on the road, often for days if not weeks on end. Some may come from Woodstock Road South or Brampton Road, but others would appear to be from further afield.</li> <li>• We have seen more of what I would describe as commuter parking on the road; that is arriving often before 8.00 or 8.30 and not leaving until late afternoon or evening. And drivers depart with brief case or rucksack – clearly going to work.</li> <li>• Around 10.30 or so in term-time, we get an influx of cars belonging to Verulam School pupils (or their parents).It seems that these cars are parked in Jennings Road by the school until morning break time and then moved elsewhere just before the 11.00 to 13.00 restrictions start to apply.</li> <li>• And there is overflow of vehicles from Brampton Road and the ladder roads.</li> <li>• The results are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Serious congestion all along this stretch of Woodstock Road North. There are few places that afford space for vehicles to pull in to allow oncoming traffic through.</li> <li>◦ At times, at the junction of Woodstock Road North, Woodstock Road South and Brampton Road, there can be grid lock particularly around the time when schools finish.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>The challenge of getting into and exiting drives</b>  Our house has a drive which can take two vehicles. Given the congestion, we have to reverse into our drive since it is too dangerous to reverse out. Reversing in can be a real challenge when cars are parked opposite our drive and, on our side, are tightly parked on either side of the drive. At times, a 7-point or even 9-point turn is needed to get into the drive – and this often has to be done while cars are waiting to drive up or down the road.</p> <p>Driving out of the drive forward can be dangerous owing to inconsiderate drivers who park right up to our drive, often with SUVs or vans which, because of their size, seriously block vision up and down the road.</p> <p><b>Your proposals only really address these issues in part.</b>  We would welcome the single yellow line with no parking over the restricted 2-hour period if it applied to both sides of the road. But your proposed “solution” of a mix of some restrictions and public paid parking by phone at £2.90 to cover the 2-hour restricted period would only make matters worse. As explained above, a significant factor in causing congestion on WRN is that of people who park all day on the road. Given that £2.90 is around the price of a bus ticket and is considerably less than the cost of parking in the station car parks, the number of people from outside Zone P parking in Woodstock Road North is likely to increase substantially.</p> <p>Did it not occur to you that people from around St Albans who currently park at the station or who take a bus into town will inevitably decide that it’s easier or cheaper to park in Woodstock Road North or surrounding roads and walk to the station – a very pleasant walk up Brampton Road and through the park?</p> <p>Our preference, as I indicated above, would be for single yellow lines on both sides of Woodstock Road North with a no waiting restriction from 11 am to 1 pm for all except those with resident parking permits. And we would argue that the resident parking permits should not be those for the whole of Zone P but only for a very restricted zone beyond WRN eg along Brampton Road to Hamilton Road and no further.</p> <p>What I don’t understand is why, if you felt you had to offer public parking by phone, you did not apply it to the whole day rather than the 2-hour slot from 11 am to 1 pm. Residents would need all day or 2-hour permits and parking by phone would be costed at the length of the stay. So, at, say, £1.50 per hour, parking from 9 am to 5 pm would cost £12 This would be a deterrent to all day parking while also making the station car park competitive.</p> <p>Further, given the problems that residents who have drives face because of inconsiderate parking, I would propose that the access protection lines should be particularly generous. The aim of those lines is to give a sight up and down the road to enable safe exit. But the preponderance now of large SUVs and work vans means that to get a decent line of vision up and down the road those access protection lines</p> <p>now need to go significantly beyond the immediate edge of a drive. This in my view is a real safety issue.</p> <p><b>The wider Zone P proposal</b>  What I have said above about the public parking by phone in some ways applies even more in the roads closer to the station. Your proposals for roads such as Jennings Road, Sunderland Avenue, Park Avenue etc for an 11 to 1 restriction with the option of parking by phone will essentially make those roads a cheap extension of the station parking. £2.90 in effect for the day as opposed to £8.50 at the station car park would seem to many to be a very attractive option even with a 10 minute walk to the station.</p> <p>I think there needs further work on these proposals before they can really address the current problems.</p>
371	Monks Horton Way	<p>In response to your letter dated 17 January 2020 from Gary Payne.</p> <p>I'm a resident of Monks Horton Way, and it looks to me as though Monks Horton Way has been inexplicably wholly overlooked from this review.</p> <p>We appear to be a 'parking restriction free' island (along with The Dell, although they are a private road), in a sea of other parking restrictions in all directions.</p> <p>This looks to be a very clear oversight. Looking at the full range of proposals detailed, it would seem to me as though we should be treated in the same way as Charmouth Court off Charmouth Road. Infact I would suggest our location makes us much more likely to be adversely affected by unrestricted parking following your current proposals than Charmouth Court would have been had they been omitted like we have.</p> <p>We are a narrow cul-de-sac, where currently should a vehicle park on the road it becomes a bit tight on any case. The width of the road already prompts parking up on the pavement in many cases.</p> <p>I request that the apparent omission of Monks Horton Way be addressed and I look forward to seeing a revised proposal and the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposal. I'm against the 2 hour restriction that can be paid for, as it doesn't seem to be much of a deterrent</p> <p>Please consider this as a formal response to your proposals. I would be happy to provide any clarification of my response if necessary or useful.</p> <p>Are there any on going discussions exploring the provision of a park and ride scheme in St Albans?</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
372	Jennings Road	<p>I live in Jennings Road and know that the proposed shared use parking zones will be used by commuters not wanting to pay the extortionate fees for parking at the station. Clarence Road and Jennings Road are the roads nearest to the station with shared use parking so these will fill up first. Residents and people visiting will be unable to park in the resident parking bays because commuters will be parked there. As a resident I will be paying for permits and still be unable to park anywhere near my house.</p> <p>With regards to Jennings Road in particular, there is access to school on the road and many children walk to school along Jennings Road. Before the parking restrictions were introduced there were road traffic accidents on Jennings Road where school children were knocked over. It is much safer now so I don't understand why commuters should be encouraged to park there. Having a road with a school on with fewer parked cars improves traffic safety which is one of your stated remits. The proposed scheme would make Jennings Road less safe.</p> <p>I agree that the parking on surrounding roads that has resulted from the initial introduction of the ladder road scheme is not acceptable, but extending restrictions onto those roads should be enough to mitigate the situation. The roads surrounding the station should not be provided as pay parking for commuters. Maybe the provision and cost for parking at the station needs to be addressed. We should also be looking to improve the provision of local public transport so that commuters do not need to come by car which would be a more green solution to the current problem.</p> <p>I trust that these points will be fully considered when making recommendations.</p>
373	York Road	<p>Thank you for giving residents the opportunity to comment yet again on the Zone P and Ladder Roads parking situation.</p> <p>I am a York Rd resident and as far as I can see, the only change is to allow public parking once again on a Saturday, which is welcome news. York Rd will continue to be under-utilized Monday - Friday as, as I have repeatedly commented, two hours is not long enough to allow visitors to walk to town and back or take children to the Park.</p> <p>The only part of York Rd that is regularly parked on now is opposite the nursery, by people with Zone P stickers. If these are nursery staff, then we will continue to have nursery parents parking on the double yellow lines outside the nursery and adjacent houses as apparently it is too dangerous for them to cross the road or walk a few meters up the road to a free space, and they know the Traffic Wardens do not patrol regularly at that time.</p> <p>If, however, they are residents of the new zones P2,P3 or P4 the situation may improve, but if not it remains a dangerous situation.</p> <p>Considering the role of traffic wardens: it is obviously essential that the streets are patrolled randomly and when/where there are breaches of the rules, as the absence of monitoring leads to a dangerous situation as described above.</p> <p>Painting yellow lines, as you propose, makes very little difference.</p> <p>However, it is NOT sensible to ban parking at the same time across the whole of a zone in order to make life easier for the Parking Officer, who patrols perhaps once in six months, while making it impossible for anyone in the area to invite visitors for that time, or for people outside the area to visit the local independent shops on Hatfield Rd.</p> <p>Ideally, one side of each street would have controlled parking say from 10-11, the other side from 1-2. Or alternate streets could have different times. That way there is always somewhere available for short term parking. Remember, the aim of the project was to stop all day commuter parking, not to inconvenience residents.</p> <p>And the idea of letting people pay to park in the ladder roads during the controlled times just undermines the whole scheme. The price is a fraction of paying to park at the station, so there will be commuter cars parked all day as before - and the Council will be accused of making money.</p> <p>Making residents pay to have a white line painted across their driveway is unfair also, when others have yellow lines for free. And how would the white line be monitored? Can a resident park across their own driveway?</p>
374	Not Provided	<p>In response to your new proposals for Zone P , published on 17/01/2020, as a resident of Woodstock Road North, I would like to make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposals for Woodstock Road North are too numerous and will take a lot of enforcement for them to operate as planned.</li> <li>2. The shared -use of residential parking permits and a 'pay by phone' scheme for non-residents is not a good option. The charge of £2.90 to cover the two hour restricted period will, in effect, allow people to park for up to 24 hours at this charge. Many commuters will see this as a good opportunity to park in these areas, rather than pay £8.15 daily to park at the station. It will also allow people to park over an extended period of time eg while they take the train to Luton or Gatwick airports for a holiday, provided they phone in each day to pay the charge. A lot cheaper than airport parking.</li> <li>3. I agree that double yellow lines should be laid on all sides of the junctions of Burnham Rd /Woodstock South and Brampton Rd/ Woodstock North, despite the fact that this will reduce parking spaces. These are difficult junctions to negotiate, and with clearer sight lines afforded by the double yellow lines, should be less hazardous, and safer for both car drivers and pedestrians. This would be particularly helpful to the many school children in the area who have to cross the road at these junctions. They will also create a 'safe haven' for cars to pull in to allow traffic to pass. Woodstock Road North will continue to be a 'rat run' between Hatfield Road and Sandpit Road, so anything to mitigate against that would be welcomed.</li> <li>4. I do not think it is necessary to have as much of Woodstock Road delineated by single yellow lines, some of this could be given over to resident parking bays, while still allowing the passage of traffic to flow more freely than it does at present . Also, the proposed restriction is only during the period from 11am-1pm, and unless this is effectively enforced, commuters are likely to take a risk on parking there, as will commercial vehicles.</li> <li>5. I think some residents of Woodstock Road South, many of whom own more than one car, will be almost permanently seeking parking in other permitted P1 areas if the whole of the western side of the road is delineated with double yellow lines, with no waiting at any time. Double yellow lines would , however, increase the safety and flow of traffic in the road which is much needed.</li> <li>6. The parking problems are only likely to increase within this part of St Albans, as more residential building takes place. For example, the apartments being built in Hatfield Road, (Montague Place), do not have any car parking spaces planned, nor does the proposed residential development at Fleetville Post Office.</li> <li>7. Overall, I do not think that this revised Parking Review will be advantageous to the residents of the area. Although there will be some relief on the traffic flow and safety in a few areas, there will be huge reduction in the parking capacity. Residents will be paying for permits and may well find they are able to find a parking space at some times of day.</li> </ol>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
375	Monks Horton Way	<p>We are writing to express our horror at SADC's latest parking proposals, received in a letter dated 17th Jan 2020. It appears that, along with The Dell, our cul-de-sac Monks Horton Way has been omitted, leaving us open to become a free all day car park for those using the station, Verulam School and Homewood Road church. This raises huge safeguarding issues along with health and safety issues for our very narrow road, which it is the responsibility of the council to address immediately.</p> <p>Monks Horton Way is only 5.4m wide meaning that if it were to become a free car park, with cars parking on both sides of the road, as in neighboring roads such as Churchill Road (which is 2.00m wider) then allowing 2.05m per car (the ladder parking allowance) this would reduce the road to 1.3m wide. This is a huge safeguarding issue, along with health and safety issue, as this, not only blocking the road for residents, blocks access for all emergency vehicles, ambulance, paramedic, police and fire. It also blocks access for delivery vehicles, refuse collections, workmen and builders.</p> <p>Restricting the width of the road is also a huge safeguarding issue for the residents, especially children and the elderly by allowing access to a large number of extra vehicles each day. It also would become a safeguarding issue for residents having a restricted view when accessing and leaving their own drives, or even blocking their drives which would cause further health and safety issues should access be required in an emergency.</p> <p>If cars using the road choose to park on the pavement or partly over the pavement in order to leave more of the road accessible, this will cause enormous safeguarding issues for all residents using the already narrow pavement, forcing residents pushing wheelchairs or prams into the road putting them in terrible danger.</p> <p>Your lack of attention to Monks Horton Way is a grave omission which must be addressed immediately for the safety of all residents. The council has a responsibility for the safeguarding of all its residents, this situation cannot be overlooked any longer. A simple yellow line along the edge of the entire road, with double yellows at the corners, plus three or four signs on the lamp posts warning 'no parking Mon – Fri 11.00am – 1.00pm' is all that is required. It cannot be denied that this is an inexpensive and quick solution to a problem which, if not addressed, will leave all residents in extreme danger and the council failing in their duty of safeguarding the public.</p> <p>We look forward to your urgent response as a council to this serious omission and a speedy, safe resolution for all the residents.</p>
376	Woodstock Road South	<p>Further to my previous email, I have now considered further implications to the proposed scheme. I live close to the junction with Woodstock Rd north and Brampton Road and frequently have to park in those roads. Although not disabled, I am 76yrs old and do have health problems which mean I cannot carry heavy shopping etc very far. Surely it would make sense if those of us on the cusp of the parking zones should be allowed to park in the ones adjacent to us.</p> <p>Woodstock Road South appears to be losing several current parking spaces which is going to make parking near me virtually impossible.</p> <p>It does seem this scheme should be rethought. There are considerable flaws, not the least that commuters will be able to use some of the roads to park for considerably less than at the station.</p>
377	Churchill Road	<p>I agree with the consensus view being submitted for Churchill Road with this addition.</p> <p>I request residents' parking on both sides of Churchill Road at the Sandpit Road end. On the West side, underneath the Cedar trees, it is not safe to park as the trees drop their branches in snowy or windy weather.</p>
378	Burnham Road,	<p>I wanted to confirm I support the Ladder Roads proposal. Critically the restrictions proposed on Burnham Road must go ahead to reduce the current nightmare.</p> <p>Regardless of any delays and additional consultations regarding the rest of the scheme, the restrictions on Burnham Road must be introduced as soon as possible.</p>
379	Churchill Road	I am writing to inform you that I agree with the consensus view being submitted on behalf of Churchill Road in relation to the proposed changes to the parking scheme.
380	Churchill Road	I am writing to confirm to you that I agree with the consensus view being submitted on behalf of the residents of Churchill Road in relation to the proposed changes to the parking scheme.
381	Arthur Road	<p>I would like to express my concerns regarding proposed parking restrictions in Arthur Road. I feel that incurring a parking restriction between the hours of 11am and 1pm would be of little benefit to the residents. The bulk of the parking problems are caused by local shop workers and tradesmen involved in local projects. Approximately sixteen vehicles stem from the shops alone! In my view they will merely be inconvenienced by having to move their vehicles for two hours in the middle of the day! Whereas residents returning home from work will still be unable to find a parking place.</p> <p>My further point is that the restrictions do not cover Saturdays when the opportunity to park in one's road would be appreciated.</p> <p>Hoping that my thoughts will be considered.</p>
382	Monks Horton Way	<p>I have just returned from holiday to see your proposed details for parking restrictions. I live in Monks Horton Way where no restrictions are shown! Monks Horton Way is less than 5.5m wide with a number of bends and a cul de sac.</p> <p>Lancaster Road, where there are currently no parking restrictions is about 7.3m wide with cars parked on both sides causing a lot of restriction to through access. If Monks Horton Way had no restrictions, it would be impossible for local residents to get through, let alone the weekly refuse collection! I hope you will therefore consider this when making final decisions.</p>
383	Marshals Drive	<p>You will have read a letter from a Mr ' ' of Marshal's Drive, on which I have been copied.</p> <p>I should like to confirm my support for the points he makes.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
384	Sunderland Ave	<p>Please find below the unanimous response from Sunderland Avenue. It also includes two houses in Jennings Road who have driveways on Sunderland Avenue.I have pasted the response into this e-mail but added it together with the full contact details of the residents as a word document.</p> <p>Please note that the residents contact details are provided purely for verification of this objection and must remain confidential.</p> <p>I would also please ask that you acknowledge receipt . (on behalf of the Sunderland Avenue residents), Objection Sunderland Avenue residents whose names and contact details appear below believe that there should be no change to the existing arrangements in our road. You should note that this is a unanimous response. We set out below our reasons for this objection: Safety. Sunderland Avenue was designed and built as a residential road with casual on street parking. It was not designed for commuter parking. It is already extremely difficult for residents to exit their drives safely where there is double parking which happens occasionally under the current scheme with contractors and delivery vehicles etc. This would be greatly exacerbated with the inevitable double sided commuter parking under the proposed scheme.The road is adjacent to Verulam School and is used by School buses, BeauSandVer mini buses and for parent drop off and pick up. Double sided parking and an absence of parking spaces for parents morning and afternoon will increase congestion and safety risk (as has already been experienced to a lesser degree in Charmouth and Battlefield Roads for example).It also seems unreasonable in respect of Sunderland Avenue that roads such as Gainsborough Avenue and York Road which have no through traffic and in York Road's case fewer driveways, will have no non-resident all day parking under the current proposal. Parking demand, Capacity and Competitive advantage You refer in your letter to parking demand. One of our residents conducted a detailed survey of the Station Road and Victoria Street (Charrington Place) carparks on 4 February 2020 (as emailed to parkingrestrictions@stalbans.gov.uk FAO Gary Payne on 4th February). This established that whilst the Station Road carpark was full there were 299 free spaces in the Victoria Street carpark. This supports the figure of around 300 spare spaces used elsewhere. Any parking demand is therefore purely economic and not one of capacity. Simply put many commuters do not want to pay for off street parking. Under your proposal a daily charge of £2.90 is derisory and the short walk from Sunderland Avenue is likely to prove highly attractive to commuters and if anything will increase displacement from Station parking.This will only become worse when the new development at Oakland Grange comes fully on-stream as it is outside reasonable walking distance. The Solution, We are very strongly of the view that as far as Sunderland Avenue is concerned there should be no change as for us the existing arrangement is working well. Concern over displacement to roads to the north could easily be resolved by extending the existing scheme to the Marshalswick Lane/Beechwood Avenue Ring thereby making on street parking unattractive to commuters and forcing use of Station car parks (where there is demonstrably adequate space). Should the Council insist on some form of paid on street parking then the fee should be set at £8.70 and adjusted appropriately to remove any competitive advantage for on street parking so Sunderland Avenue should only ever be used when the off street parking is at capacity. In implementing any form of paid on street parking the Council also need to allocate a defined number of spaces for residents only and to ensure the safety of residents by not positioning the parking bay lines up against the edge of driveways, this is not our preferred option.</p>
385	Marshal's Drive	<p>There can be little doubt that the two existing station car parks have insufficient capacity to meet current demand, let alone provide room for future growth. This shortfall is worsened by the prohibitively high charges for commuters who use these car parks. Many are so desperate to avoid paying these, they would rather suffer considerable inconvenience to park elsewhere, ironically sometimes leaving a few empty spaces in the furthest station car park.</p> <p>I would like to ask what investigations the Council has undertaken to establish the actual demand for station parking, were it affordable and to predict future growth, based on their expectations regarding (amongst other factors) Government policy on providing new homes. Has the pattern of commuter parking in the so-called ladder roads and surrounding area been surveyed in any way? Has there been any attempt to understand where these commuters live (perhaps with some help from DVLA), how many they are and whether they car-pool, or walk to the station from their chosen parking spot? There is no information on this in the consultation papers sent out and it seems to me that previous parking restriction measures and indeed the ones currently proposed are based entirely on guesswork. Surely we could do better than this trial-and-error process?</p> <p>If we could understand how many station car parking spaces are needed, perhaps the Council could then look at ways of satisfying this level of demand close to the station. It may be optimistic to hope that the original multi-storey car park was constructed with capacity to add a few more storeys, but if it was, this might help to meet demand. Alternatively the site of Verulam Point, the adjacent office building, could be acquired using compulsory purchase powers and a substantial additional multi-storey car park could be located there, using the existing access arrangements. Has the Council looked into these or any other options? Has the cost of subsidising this parking from the Council's budget been considered, such that the ticket price could be reduced to say, half its present level, to make it widely affordable? Why is there no information in the consultation papers on other options which the Council has considered? Perhaps a park-and-ride scheme would offer an effective solution, but again we have been given no details of any research into alternative ideas such as this.</p> <p>I'm fairly sure that one objection the Council might have to my suggestions above is that the cost would be prohibitive. However, let's not forget the huge increase in Council Tax revenue which will flow from all the new houses being built, not to mention the planning-gain contributions which the developers will almost certainly have had to pay. Add to this the ongoing costs saved by not needing the proposed on-street parking restrictions and it's hard to see the financial justification for inflicting all this parking misery on a vast swathe of local residents.</p> <p>In summary, this proposal to extend parking restrictions throughout a further, substantial residential area is an admission of failure by the Council to properly address one of the many consequences of permitting extensive "housing only" development around St Albans over several decades. We need a bold and imaginative solution to remove the scourge of on-street commuter parking, so that our traditional suburban areas can become pleasant places to live once again. This is the least we deserve and until the Council provides it, perhaps we should demand a moratorium on new housing development over the entire District.</p>
386	Not Provided	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 17 January providing details of the Councils proposals.</p> <p>My overall view is that the proposals go too far and that changes to the parking restrictions south of Sandpit Lane should be carried out which will alleviate the problems on the northside of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>As your letter states, since the introduction of the ladder scheme it has been more difficult for vehicles to use some of the roads north of Sandpit Lane, I have personally noted this on Charmouth Road between Sandpit Lane and Faircross Way. However the number of cars parked on the road causing the problem is probably only in the region of 20, which is a small number as compared with the potential parking that is available south of Sandpit Lane. I am aware that there is a similar number of vehicles causing a problem on Battlefield Road and Gurney Court Road.</p> <p>I presume that a survey has been carried out of the vehicles using the streets mentioned and that the majority of drivers are either using the station or Verulam School. Whilst I haven't carried out a survey of the parking available south of Sandpit Lane I believe that a mix of Residents only parking and free parking could accommodate the vehicles which are currently creating a problem and at the same time not create a nuisance for the residents living south of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>If your proposals were to go ahead there will of course be a significant cost in both the capital cost of introducing any scheme, road markings, signs etc and operational costs in administering the payment system and policing the parking areas with traffic wardens. I think that it is very unlikely that these costs will be offset by the potential revenue from parking fees and therefore will be an unnecessary cost to St Albans council tax payers.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to attend the open forum on the 1st February but I trust that my objection to the proposal and my suggested alternative will be taken into account.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
387	Eaton Road	<p>Having received your report Parking Review (Zone P) Ladder Roads and Marshalwick South (North of Sandpit Lane) I would like to ask that Eaton Road be also included in the new area where parking permits are to be introduced. I am a resident on Eaton Road where parking can already be a challenge. The new proposal is going to make it almost impossible to park near our house: the proposed introduction of permits on Royal, Arthur, Burnham and Woodstock Roads will push yet more people onto our road as they become unable to park on others.</p> <p>A a resident, I see our road becomes busy with people parking for school drop-offs, to go to work at local businesses on the Hatfield road, but also to commute to the station. I appreciate we are some distance from the station but our own choice to live here was due to the fact that the commute was a manageable distance, so I am not surprised others feel likewise and try to park here as it is currently permit-free.</p> <p>If we are not included in the new scheme we will be unable to park on any of the roads around us, and also suffer from the additional pressure with those displaced by the new permit zone.</p> <p>Please can we ensure that Eaton Road is considered for inclusion in the parking scheme going forward? I know this is a view shared by many of our neighbours.</p>
388	Woodstock Road South	I have one concern about your proposals - if your are going to allow drivers to pay by telephone in the restricted period 11am to 1pm, what is to stop them parking all day and phoning from their workplace to cover that period of time. You might just as well have no restriction on parking!
389	Monks Horton Way	<p>We refer to your communication dated 17 January regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane) and are concerned regarding the omission of Monks Horton Way from these proposals.</p> <p>All residents are concerned that these restrictions will encourage commuters to park in Monks Horton Way, therefore greatly reducing parking space for ourselves, visitors, carers, refuse collectors and tradesmen, etc.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving your views on this situation in due course.</p>
390	The Park	<p>Clearly for narrow roads, without large driveways, residents parking and/or other restrictions may be necessary.</p> <p>The houses in much of the Ladder Road scheme (eg those roads listed above) have large driveways and access wide roads, with numerous yellow lines to protect sightlines of drivers.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst Clarence Road is a fairly busy through road, roads such as York or Gainsborough are cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>In my view therefore, the current scheme is a completely unreasonable solution, driven by a relatively small number of households around Clarence Park, who simply did not want cars parked in their area (rather than by road safety concerns or the inability to park), and ignoring the impact on road safety and reduced accessibility which the scheme has created.</p> <p>The 8am-6pm Mon-Sat restrictions on parking in York Road are particularly absurd, and stop those with children or aged relatives properly enjoying Clarence Park, and other local facilities (e.g. St Albans FC, the local shops and cafes, and Mosque). Whilst your new scheme may address some of the road safety issues which the current scheme has so obviously created, it does so by further reducing accessibility within the District and at huge cost to both householders (and presumably also the Local Authority). It is also likely to continue to lead to gross under-utilisation of parking in the Ladder Roads, as the current restrictions continue to apply in the vast majority of cases.</p> <p>The optimum solution to would be to revert to the situation before the Ladder Road restrictions came into force. However if the council is insistent in retaining and extending the Residents Parking area, there should be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Many more telephone pay bays near to Clarence Park (especially in York Road and Gainsborough)</li> <li>2.Reduced restriction hours in areas such as York Road to improve legitimate access to local amenities</li> <li>3.Much lower parking fees in Marshalswick South than on the residents of the Ladder Roads area (as the reduced road safety, and thus potential parking restrictions in our area, are purely a response to the Ladder Road scheme)</li> <li>4.A review of the cost of introducing the unnecessary (existing and planned) schemes. I would also be very interested to hear the views of my local councillors on this issue. I do very much feel that a few 'bad neighbours' in the Clarence area have managed to blight our area (with assistance from St Albans DC)</li> </ol>
391	Woodstock Road South	<p>I have a number of concerns.</p> <p>My first is loosing 3 or 4 parking spaces at the T junction of Brampton Road/Woodstock Road opposite Brampton Road. This is frequently used by Woodstock Road South cars overspill. I have never been inconvenienced by people parking here and don't consider it a danger as the traffic is either stopped or going slow prior to entering the Woodstock Road South junction between Brampton and Burnham Road where it is a single car section. May I point out that in the identical junction Jennings Road/Woodstock Road North you haven't given it double yellow lines.</p> <p>From Burnham Road to Hatfield Road we are losing parking which we presently utilise Sundays and bank holidays as well as in the evenings up to 8am. The small section that we were able to park is frequently utilised without causing in my experience any inconvenience to traffic flow.</p> <p>Prior to the ladder scheme Woodstock Road North was mainly utilised when Woodstock Road South, the first sections of Burnham Road, Eaton Road , and Brampton Road were fully occupied. I don't consider the parking of cars in Woodstock Road North needs to be out of bounds for Woodstock Road South residents. Could the section up to Jennings Road be included in the parking permit P1 scheme?</p> <p>May any of the parking restrictions be lifted on bank holidays and school holidays?</p>
392	Charmouth Court	<p>Thank you for discussing the above matter with me the other day. I was pleased to hear that I will not have to pay for a residents' permit given that I have a blue badge. I would also like to add that I am pleased that yellow lines will be painted at the entrance to Charmouth Court - these have been long needed as it is often difficult to clearly see approaching traffic from either direction when waiting to drive out.</p> <p>On the subject of the residents' permits, which will be required to park in Charmouth Court between 11 and 1pm, I sometimes have visitors who park their cars in the areas to be covered by the restrictions. Please could you confirm that it will be possible for residents to have visitors' parking permits for use by their visitors during the restricted hours and that we will not have to pay for those either? In case it is of interest, my daughter lives in an area with parking restrictions and there, residents are entitled to two reuseable visitors' permits in the form of rear view mirror hangers, making for an environmentally-friendly way of dealing with this issue.</p>
393	Sunderland Ave	<p>In addition to the unanimous objection from Sunderland Avenue may I please make the following points, generally as mentioned to Freddy Mohammed at the forum on 1st February:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Double yellow lines will be required on the whole of Sandpit Lane or displaced parkers will go there. An adequate sanction will be required to prevent parking on the Sandpit Lane Wastes and service roads. If the (unenforced) bylaw on the sign opposite the end of Lancaster Road which proscribes parking on the Bernard Heath Wastes is not enforceable then an order is required to provide a sanction to prevent such parking on both Wastes.</li> <li>2) The consultation maps do not highlight the St Albans Green Ring cycle route. If we are to be serious about this cycling initiative then the cycle route needs to be marked on the maps and parking restricted appropriately. That is, on the whole of Jennings Road, the section of Woodstock Road North south of Jennings and Woodstock Road South only single sided parking should be allowed. When cars are parked on both sides leaving only a narrow channel even an experienced cyclist like me feels very vulnerable. The parking regime proposed for York Road ought to be applied to the Green Ring roads.</li> <li>3) The double yellows at the Clarence/Jennings NE corner need to extend further (past the two drives) as the curve of the road and speed of traffic on Clarence makes 15m an inadequate sight line.</li> <li>4) A short section of York Road adjacent Clarence Road ought to provide a 20 minute limit to facilitate nursery pick-up. Parents currently park inconsiderately on the pavement and double yellow lines near the junction as there are often no close parking places.</li> </ol> <p>Please may I enquire when the next review and implementation dates are proposed to be?</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
394	Not Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Highway code section: Waiting and Parking (238-252), Rules 242,243 and 244. Application of these rules by Police/Parking Wardens could have restricted some of the issues arising in this and previously affected areas.</li> <li>•Lack of provision and affordable parking at the station seems a major cause of this expanding problem.</li> <li>•Surely Thames Link/Govia have some responsibility to increase the station parking, e.g. another story on the existing station car parks on both sides of the station?</li> </ul> <p>Cover the cost of the additional load placed on the Council Tax payers budget by their inaction and insistence on high parking charges?  Change the timetable (again) reverting back to trains stopping at Harpenden so these commuters do not have to drive and park in St Albans?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Dedicated cycle routes would encourage more cyclists to use the additional racks that are being installed at the station.</li> <li>•Maybe the County Council could set up a Park and Ride on the proposed site for the unpopular Rail Freight development. Alternatively they could facilitate a station mini bus service that followed a circular route and ran continuously in both 'rush hours'. Costs met by the rail companies of course!</li> <li>•What provision is being made for the (say 50% of ) house owners on the new Oaklands development and those from the new Beaumont development, who will be London bound commuters driving to the station? Not to mention any future 'new village' development between St Albans and Hatfield.</li> <li>•Ours is one of the houses that will have a double yellow line outside. We have lived here for over 40 years and are not aware of any issues arising over that period due to lack of lines. It is only the new parking restrictions that will change this.</li> <li>•Painting expensive lines on roads in an ever increasing radius around the station will not solve this problem. Other options need to be considered and actioned.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your time in reading this. We very much hope some of the residents ideas will be considered and developed for the future before this once lovely city becomes even more of a London dormitory town.</p>
395	Churchill Road	We are writing to state that we are wholeheartedly in agreement with the consensus proposal submitted by residents of Churchill Road in regard to changes currently being considered by the Council.
396	Churchill Road	Hi I want you to know I agree with the consensus view being submitted for Churchill Road Sent from my iPhone.
397	Marshal's Drive	<p>Thank you for your comprehensive letter of 17 January.  My concerns are as follows:  (1) With the exceptions of Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road, it appears that most of the roads South of Marshalswick Lane are within the parking scheme. The inevitable consequence is that Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road are going to become blighted with displaced parking. Surely it would be better to include these two within the scheme but with some special consideration given for those who use The Wick eg dog walkers.  (2) I live at " Marshal's Drive which is the first house on the South side of the Drive. Now that parking restrictions have been introduced at The Quadrant, cars regularly park all day at the entrance to Marshal's Drive. If vehicles are parked on my side of the road, the view is blocked making it impossible for me to reverse safely as I cannot see vehicles turning in from Marshalswick Lane. This is worst at morning rush hour as Marshal's Drive has become a 'rat run'.  I suggest a yellow line is required at the entrance to Marshal's Drive stretching up to ", especially if your Parking Review is implemented.</p>
398	Eaton Road	<p>Having received your report Parking Review (Zone P) Ladder Roads and Marshalwick South (North of Sandpit Lane) I would like to ask that Eaton Road be also included in the new area where parking permits are to be introduced.  I am a resident on Eaton Road where parking can already be a challenge. The new proposal is going to make it almost impossible to park near our house: the proposed introduction of permits on Royal, Arthur, Burnham and Woodstock Roads will push yet more people onto our road as they become unable to park on others.  A resident, I see our road becomes busy with people parking for school drop-offs, to go to work at local businesses on the Hatfield road, but also to commute to the station. I appreciate we are some distance from the station but our own choice to live here was due to the fact that the commute was a manageable distance, so I am not surprised others feel likewise and try to park here as it is currently permit-free.  If we are not included in the new scheme we will be unable to park on any of the roads around us, and also suffer from the additional pressure with those displaced by the new permit zone.  Please can we ensure that Eaton Road is considered for inclusion in the parking scheme going forward? I know this is a view shared by many of our neighbours.</p>
399	Woodstock Road North	<p>Sorry to further labour a point.  As you know, Verulam sixth form pupils block up Woodstock Rd, North with their parked cars during school days.  I append five photographs taken on the first day of the half term holiday at about 2:30 PM on Monday, 17 February. They show Jennings Road, Woodstock Rd, North looking North and South, all taken from the vicinity of my dental practice.  (On the second, third and fourth pictures below: The large frontage with the laurel hedges and small white noticeboards requesting parking consideration, which are ignored by drivers of the school cars).  Empty roads! This is not rocket science!  The conclusion is obvious to us all! Open Jennings Road to free parking within the marked bays to allow school parking, but I expect that the Council will have difficulty with this suggestion, but I do not think you sell many residents' parking permits for Jennings Road! This will Immediately return Woodstock Rd, North to a freely usable condition at no cost other than notice changes in Jennings Road.  Before the introduction of the ladder Road scheme there were absolutely no problems with parking or traffic in Woodstock Rd, North.  If the latest extension plan goes ahead as indicated then my patients will have severe problems attending my dental practice which is already suffering under the present regime. Ironically, the parking facility (six car spaces) outside " Woodstock Rd N. was a major reason for moving the practice here in 1974!  If, however, you do go ahead without further consideration of my problem, I am hoping that you will provide three dedicated surgery parking bays outside the practice if the parking scheme goes ahead in Woodstock Rd, North, to allow me to continue to provide a dental service for my patients. This was originally suggested by John Charlton, the Council parking officer during the initial consultation.  I spoke to Councillor Chris White on the Saturday consultation, and he said he could see no objection to my request for three dedicated parking bays.  Thanks for your attention and consideration.</p>
400	Charmouth Road	<p>Thank you for your letter of 17th January and also thank you for arranging the consultation at your offices on the 1st February.  As a resident of the top half of Charmouth Road, I am pleased that you are addressing the current unacceptable situation.  Personally, I am in agreement with the principles of your proposals and the proposed pricing level, AS LONG AS the proposals are replicated South of Sandpit Lane as well. When we discussed the matter at the consultation, I was assured that it would be - and I see that in your letter you confirm this for 'all roads ..... between Clarence Road through to Woodstock Road.....' Does this also include the roads on the other side of Clarence Road - ie between Clarence Road and the railway - or to the West of Clarence Road? I very much consider that it must do as there is significant available space for safe parking in these 'non-through' roads.  Also, as a point of detail, I ask that you reconsider the parking restrictions on Charmouth Road in the area of Charmouth Court. I believe that the area of Charmouth Road - East Side (ie Charmouth Court side) just North of the junction with Charmouth Court should be available for residents parking - ie coloured purple. This short length of road is sufficient for 8 or so cars - as there are no drives there. If the Charmouth Court residents are not able to park there, they will be parking in front of the houses opposite and taking up parking spaces in front of 8 or so houses - ie a much greater length of road which will create significantly more disruption and, no doubt ill feeling!</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
401	Arthur Road	<p>I received a letter about restrictions in the areas of Woodstock road and marshals wick ladder restrictions I don't understand about this so I have been trying to contact someone to explain. I am becoming increasingly worried as it has no mention about residents parking or otherwise for Arthur road, life is becoming unbearable in this road since the houses being built I counted 20 vans on the road vans parked on the double yellow lines daily making it difficult to get out as there is a very tricky turn around area at the end as people park at both ends, since the two restaurants we have there cars and customers and the florist leaves her van in the road all weekend . I am concerned if you put restrictions in the roads surrounding Arthur road then if we can't park on our road we won't be able to park anywhere else and if people can't park in surrounding roads more people will park in our road as it will be the only one without restrictions. It really needs someone to come and look at this road over a few weeks it's unsafe and you mentioned it being unsafe on marshalswick but come and look at this road. Delivery drivers stop in the middle of the road I waited 20 minutes once. The builders arrive at 7.30 8 and shout and park selfishly one builder told me he would set fire to my car because I said I will have to sort this situation out. I urge you to take this seriously and would appreciate a response.</p>
402	Churchill Road	<p>For Churchill Road, the new proposal using pay by phone on 11-1pm bays at £2.90 will provide cheap station parking and will leave residents paying for permits with no benefit of safe roads or protected parking, and is unacceptable. Primary issue of Road Safety with access to Verulam School, kids on foot and bikes, school related cars and buses, and particularly the influx at drop off and pick up (for Churchill Road and Jennings it used to be utter chaos and very dangerous). Also, with emphasis on the environment, to make roads safer for cycling and walking to the station, avoiding parked up single tracks. More emphasis on local needs, making provision for - school, shops and other local services by splitting the resident only bays into two time bands, for example some bays with 10-12 restriction and other bays with 12-2 (extra cost of patrolling covered by pay by phone bays). There needs to be sufficient resident only bays on all roads, and particularly where there is greater need with higher density housing and fewer driveways (eg Churchill Rd at the Sandpit Rd end). [With the reduction in zone size and available parking spaces presumably the permit prices will go down.] Less emphasis on station parking (there are spaces at the station), keeping pay-by-phone bays to a minimum and in areas where cars parked all day have minimal impact on traffic flow (particularly) at peak times. All pay by phone bays need to apply for enough hours to make the fees equivalent to station parking. Manage the streets to avoid parking close to junctions or driveways - yellow lines for morning and evening traffic, and long enough driveway white lines. Speeding was also mentioned at the meeting - introduce 20mile/hour limit on residential streets.</p>
403	Churchill Road	<p>I live in Churchill Road and write to say that I agree with the consensus view being submitted for Churchill Road with regards to the proposed car parking arrangements. I particularly want to highlight the fact that we have no private driveways as we are in the terrace block at the Sandpit Lane end so should the places be available to public use, we would most likely have no spaces left for us. Churchill Road is actually very busy with school traffic at mornings and afternoons and the queuing tail stretches far as joining Sandpit Lane is slow. Not to mention the buses that drive through this junction to school. Children are often dropped or collected here as parents avoid the crowded Verulam School end of the road so, allowing public parking spaces would not only be unsafe for the traffic and the pedestrians but would also add to the already congested scenario. I trust your decision would take these issues into consideration.</p>
404	Faircross Way	<p>Thanks very much for your letter explaining the Council's proposed response to last year's initial consultation on parking in these areas. I was one of the many residents who input to that consultation and I am pleased to see the Council is being responsive and seeking to address the issues that I and many other residents raised. I do think your proposals will reduce the safety and congestion problems that were caused in my street (Faircross Way) and particularly in neighbouring Charmouth Road, which was the worst affected by the late 2018 changes. I welcome that. In general your adjustments on both sides of Sandpit Lane make good sense to me. For Faircross Way specifically, I support the following in your proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Double yellow lines at the road ends for safety reasons</li> <li>• Mixed use/resident parking (11-1, Mon-Fri) along much of the main part of the street</li> </ul> <p>In addition though I have two suggested tweaks that I think would improve the impact of your proposal.</p> <p>1) I believe you should increase the charge for public parking across the whole of the zone from £2.90 to, say, a round £5. The intent of the charge is clearly to discourage somewhat the numbers of parkers preferring the local streets to the station carpark, but I fear the gap from £2.90 to the price of parking at the station is still too big to discourage significant numbers. A price of £5 would narrow the gap sufficiently to sway a significant number away from the streets, which is clearly your intent.</p> <p>2) On Faircross Way, I think going with a yellow line "no parking Mon-Fri 11-1" is a step too far, and these areas should be made mixed use/resident parking like the rest of the street. With the yellow line approach, I fear there will be a concentration of builders traffic and others into the mixed use sections, or alternatively even a safety hazard at 11am as they all rush to move away from the yellow line areas at 11, and maybe back at 1. Generally residents recognize that people have building work, and sometimes parking stretches beyond the affected property. But if that all concentrates into half the street, I think it's more likely to cause irritation and resentment. Therefore I strongly suggest just stick with the mixed use/resident parking.</p> <p>I anticipate that with your proposals, and these tweaks, you will resolve the issues in our street and nearby streets without creating significant new ones and I appreciate your consideration.</p>
405	The Park	<p>I am extremely disappointed yet again having received the results of the parking review for the Ladders Roads. The issues on Charmouth Road and Faircross way have been caused by the parking restrictions put in place on Clarence Road, York Road etc. The detailed new parking restrictions will now move the problem again - most likely to Marshals Drive and then there will need to be another review of the Parking problems caused. No where in the consultation have you identified the number of a cars causing the issue - it is in the order of 20 cars in the Charmouth Way/Faircross way area. In over 20 years of living in the area, there were no issues previous parking/traffic issues. The issue thats needs to be addresses is allowing parking without having to pay £8 and day which is out of reach for s lot of people on top of the train fares. The whole character of historic city of St Albans is being changed because adequate parking is not being provided - address the actual issue and not the problems caused by the displacement resulting from by ineffective solutions being put in place. I have not seen a review of the impact the will occur when the proposed restrictions are put in place. An impact review of the parking restrictions put in place on Clarence road would have predicted the displacement to Charmouth Road. The solution proposed suits neither residents or those wishing to use the train station.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
406	Woodstock Road North	<p>We wish to congratulate you on coming up with a pragmatic and imaginative solution to the current chaos caused by the implementation of the original scheme.</p> <p>As residents of Woodstock Rd N, we have endured months of misery due to the sheer volume of displaced cars being parked in the road and we feel that the proposed scheme will totally transform our daily lives for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- including Woodstock Road North in the new scheme solves the problems in one fell swoop as we will no longer be at the 'end of the ladder'.</li> <li>- with alternate parking bays and yellow lines along the road it will open the road up and prevent the single track that currently occurs.</li> <li>- by putting Woodstock Road North in Zone 2 whilst South and Brompton are in Zone 1 it will stop cars being left in our road for weeks by residents from Zone 1 roads.</li> <li>- the parking charge seems reasonable enough and should not be seen as 'unfair' to the school pupils as the cars they drive do not suggest financial hardship and will encourage them to use public transport or walk/cycle.</li> <li>- The painting of parking bays outside our house will stop people from blocking our drives and prevent us having to phone the police to ask for the offending vehicles to be moved. The police have better things to be doing than chase thoughtless students and commuters for their lack of parking skills.</li> </ul> <p>The only thing we think would improve things further would be a 20MPH speed limit to dissuade traffic from driving too fast up and down the road.</p> <p>We are counting down the days to the implementation of this new scheme and thank you once again for coming up with an excellent plan.</p>
407	Lancaster Road	<p>I am in favour of your proposals as it does answer our needs of reducing all day parking on both sides of the road and thereby creating a better flow of traffic using Lancaster Road.</p> <p>Obviously at times there will be parked vehicles on both sides, but hopefully only for short periods – such as morning and late afternoon when parents are dropping off/picking up children attending the nursery at number 1 Lancaster Road..</p> <p>The only issue that I do have relates to the proposed charge of £2.90 for the Pay by Phone parking. The number of spaces where residents and their visitors may park at any time on the road has been cut in half. What space is available will more than likely be taking first thing in the morning by commuters and people that work in St Albans – and all for £2.90! I suggest that you raise the parking charge to either £5 or £6. This increase may act as a deterrent and encourage people to seek other forms of transportation; not to mention it will generate more revenue for the Council.</p> <p>Whilst I am in favour of increasing the 'Pay by Phone' parking charge, I do not recommend any charges to the Residents Visitors Permits – this to remain, as you have suggested, at £1.30 per visit.</p>
408	Monks Horton Way	<p>I am writing in response to the letter (dated 17th January) that I have received, setting out proposals for street parking in the 'Clarence Road/Sandpit Lane area' and nearby parts of St Albans.</p> <p>Restricted parking is to be applied in our area and nearby roads – but not, it seems, in Monks Horton Way (nor in 'The Dell').</p> <p>No explanation has been given as to why Monks Horton Way has been omitted – and the danger here is that it will become overcrowded and congested as a 'free parking' area for anyone wishing to use it, especially those commuting to London via the train station.</p> <p>I am fully aware of the problems and expense of parking at the station, having daily paid to do so for almost 16 years (until late 2018).</p> <p>Some would prefer not to have parking restrictions in our cul-de-sac – to allow free spaces and movement for friends, family, neighbours and deliveries - but the omission of the very narrow and restricted Monks Horton Way in the proposed new scheme will have the effect of reducing spaces available for residents. This might not only be for car parking but also possibly pavement areas. Some unc0-operative neighbours already habitually use turning areas to park long-term.</p> <p>Since I live at Number one, in the narrower 'arm' of the cul-de-sac, parking congestion could event prevent me from getting out of my home.</p> <p>I trust that the Council is aware of these implications and will take steps to avoid Monks Horton Way becoming a free all-day car park.</p>
409	Eaton Road	<p>I'm one of the residents that originally wanted us to be included in the parking restrictions on my road. Since the introduction of parking restrictions now in force on the neighbouring road, such as Brompton road etc. the problem has only just moved up the road, it has a knock on effect. I have seen an increase in parking along Eaton Road and I'm find it very difficult to park on most days now. Below is what some of the things I have noticed that is currently happening happening on Eaton Road.</p> <p>Since my last email, I noticed that Eaton Road (only 25 houses) is only 1 of 2 roads not included in the new scheme, that is out for consultation. I believe Eaton road &amp; Salisbury Avenue are drawing up a petition. The scheme proposed will have a massive effect on Eaton road, if not inc. in the scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I have witness parents parking along Eaton Road to drop their child off to school, leave their car all day and leave once they have collected their children later in the afternoon.</li> <li>2. This also applies to people using this road to park all day and commute to &amp; from St Albans Station.</li> <li>3. Car Dealers, have been using the road to park cars they are selling for long periods of time sometimes spanning into weeks.</li> <li>4. Residents in neighbouring roads i.e.. Woodstock South/North etc, that can no longer park in their roads or roads that would of normally been available for parking spread crossing neighbouring roads, are all now only able to park on Eaton Road.</li> <li>5. Knock on affect that residents on Eaton Road, now parking in other roads to compensate, thus pushing the parking problems further up the road.</li> <li>6. I have seen people park all day to go to their place of work on Hatfield Road.</li> <li>7. There are now plenty of parking available on Brompton Road (permit zone), so previous vehicles now parking on Eaton Road.</li> <li>8. Residents further on Salisbury Avenue are purposefully parking 1 vehicle in spaces that normally would take 2 cars in-between drives to stop other cars parking.</li> <li>9. Bad Parking on corners etc. due to lack of spaces (in Salisbury Avenue &amp; Eaton Road) . Causing traffic &amp; possible accidents as your view is obscured turning in to these roads or no seeing on coming traffic.</li> <li>10. We do not use our car to commute to the station (along with other neighbours) we walk from here.</li> <li>11. Houses on Eaton Road - no's 5 &amp; 6 that I am aware are renters??</li> <li>12. If not included in the scheme, we will no long be able to park on neighbouring roads as they will be permit zones.</li> <li>13. Also it has been a haven for dumped cars. Currently one remains on our road, with mould and weeds growing around (these vehicles do no belong to any resident on Eaton Road).</li> </ol> <p>I would like to see the Council to introduce a Scheme, where just for a few hours a day would deter people from parking all day.</p>
410	Sherwood Ave	<p>I am not a resident of the area covered by these proposals so have only just heard from friends who are residents that there were going to be changes and extension of the area covered. Having read your letter to residents on the website, I am concerned that a lot of people, especially older people do not have smart phones. A number of people, especially those who have retired, take part in various activities in the area (in my case in Clarence Park) during the 11.00 to 1.00 period. Currently we can can park out side the current CPZ area and walk or use the pay and display machines to park in parts of Clarence Road - will this still be available? If not, those without smart phones will be unable to continue these activities. Will they be able to purchase parking vouchers in the same way as was used in other parts of St Albans.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
411	Not Provided	<p>The impact of the current proposal on the south end of Homewood Road Residents between Sandpit Lane and Faircross way is unacceptable.</p> <p>Many of the aims as stated in your previous, already implemented document December 2018 need to be upheld with this future proposal also: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reduce instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking</li> <li>o Improve visibility at road junctions and property entrances</li> <li>o Reduce congestion</li> <li>o Improve road safety</li> </ul> <p>Your current proposal does not achieve these and, as such, needs to be amended. I would strongly argue that the lack of road markings on the south end of Homewood Road is already a significant problem that needs to be addressed and does not currently conform with the above even before your proposal is implemented. However, your proposal will make it much worse.</p> <p>The letter dated 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020 is the first time that any detail of a proposal has been shared to with us on Homewood Road. Your previous letter last year was asking for views on the already implemented restrictions, which had not impacted Homewood Road as it is sufficiently far away and with Roads between which had no restrictions on them (eg Woodstock Road, Charmouth Rd and Faircross Way). However, your current proposal brings moves the issue of car parking to our door, hence this is the first opportunity to raise objections and concerns.</p> <p>All the points 1-8 on pages 1 to 3 of your letter 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020, are also true for the south end of Homewood Road and, as such, need to be addressed.</p> <p>We already suffer regularly with cars blocking the road on both sides, inconsiderate parking with the inability to safely exit drives if at all, and considerably reduced visibility at the road junction, which is well known as an accident hotspot, all caused by parked cars resulting in safety issues. This occurs frequently as Homewood Church is used by many community groups.</p> <p>I have attached photographs to highlight some of the issues. In one photo, you will note that a cyclist mounted the pavement a few moments earlier due to congestion. Once he cleared all the vehicles, he returned to the road. Also of note is vehicles parking on the pavement. Unlike all the other roads in the immediate vicinity and proposed scheme, Homewood Road does not possess grass verges. This gives us less viewing space onto the road and we are reliant on cars on the road to exercise caution as we are not able to see traffic approaching due to the volume of vehicles parked blocking our view as we exit our drives. Again I have attached photos to highlight this. Finally,</p> <p>vehicles parking on the pavement (as there are no grass verges) are damaging paving stones and causing a narrower walkway for pedestrians, some of whom are very elderly and for which broken slabs, are a likely cause of tripping accidents.</p> <p>Some of these photographs were taken on Saturday 1 February 2020 when Woodstock Road and Jennings Road were practically clear of parked cars. Photographs of these two streets on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2020 are attached.</p> <p><b>Significant Safety Issues</b></p> <p>The junction, intersection between Sandpit Lane, Homewood Road and Woodstock Road North already has an appalling safety record and this proposal will make matters even worse because Homewood Road would be blocked up by displaced cars from Woodstock Road. Sensibly, there are already parking restrictions, double yellow lines on Woodstock Road North on both sides as you approach the junction. The same should be implemented on Homewood Road. The road design is the same and, as such, so are the safety concerns. We have seen many cars damaged at this junction and have heard of many accidents. Point 3 on page 2 states that a double yellow line review is in progress - can you ensure that this is captured for both consultations.</p> <p>With the proposal of having all the roads up to, but not including Homewood road, with restrictions on them will result in cars parking on Homewood Road, particularly the south end (up to the Faircross Way junction) as it is nearest the school and railway station. It is closer to the railway station than roads such as The Park, the east end of Faircross Way, most of both the North ends of Charmouth Road and Gurney Ct Road on which you are proposing to put restrictions. The residents of the south end of Homewood Road, if not the whole road, should have the same protection granted to them – see map below.</p> <p>Homewood Road is not wide enough to have parking on either side without significantly impacting traffic flow and visibility when exiting a drive and sometimes it is not even possible to exit the drive.</p> <p>With the very busy lights on Sandpit Lane with Beechwood Ave, there is always a backlog of traffic during peak time which often means that Homewood Road is used as a cut through.</p> <p>I attended the consultation on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2020 when Mr Payne confirmed that Homewood Road would be brought into the scheme and we look forward to seeing a proposal that considers the residents of the south end of Homewood Road and everyone who uses the junction.</p> <p>Insofar as the current proposal is concerned, and as it may affect Homewood Road, could the council possibly consider a scenario where parking is free for a limited period of time , say 2-3 hours so that church users and community groups can still benefit from a particular resource without adverse consequences? It is not this use of parking which is causing difficulty and dangerous conditions on our roads.</p> <p>I would also suggest that £2.90 as a parking fee for the whole day would be wholly inappropriate. There should be a punitive element to parking for a period of time that allows train commuters to park all day. I understand that up to 300 car parking spaces are not used in the train car parks. Given that Thameslink has reduced the service from Harpenden, more commuters are driving to St Albans to take the train. To be allowed to park for £2.90 with the reduced train fare from St Albans would seem wholly unfair when the parking situation is becoming untenable for St Albans residents. Some people parking on our roads have been seen to park and then take bicycles from their vehicles and cycle to the station.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your confirmation that Homewood Road be included in the scheme and that a parking scheme is fair and safe for all.</p>
412	St Pauls Church	<p>I am writing in response to your consultation letter of 17th January , regarding the above roads and specifically the reference in paragraph 7 to restrictions between 11 am and 1pm, Monday to Friday.</p> <p>St Paul's Church is on the corner of Hatfield Road and Blandford Road, and currently we have parking restrictions in Blandford Road between 1.30 and 3.30pm.</p> <p>Whilst your letter does not directly refer to these restrictions, I am not clear whether there is a proposal to change all restrictions in Blandford Road and the other ladder roads to 11am – 1pm.</p> <p>Any such change would have a severe impact on the community activities that take place at St Paul's throughout the week, but especially during the morning/ lunchtime period. These include number of activities for vulnerable or less mobile groups (such as a lunch club for the elderly, a Fitclub Mobility class, Computer Friendly classes for the elderly) or for young children (our own toddler groups on Thursday and Friday mornings, plus a preschool group, baby massage and baby signing, NCT etc.). People attending all of these groups are likely to have significant problems if they have to park at a distance away, affecting the viability of these valuable community activities.</p> <p>Can you please confirm that there will be no changes to the timing of restrictions in Blandford Road and the other ladder roads.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
413	Monks Horton Way	<p>We are extremely concerned that our road (Monks Horton Way – MHW) appears to have been overlooked in the above Review. There is no indication on the enclosed maps that any restrictions are being proposed for MHW (for The Dell also) even though parking restrictions are proposed for all surrounding roads. As a result MHW would, if things were allowed to stand as indicated in the proposal, allow 24/7 free parking which undoubtedly would be taken advantage of e.g. by rail commuters and Verulam School parking. The omission of MHW in the Review therefore clearly needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In a recent email to us Gary Payne says -</p> <p>"I can confirm that Monks Horton Way was originally omitted for various reasons. However, we are currently reviewing the proposed restrictions and it is likely that the road will be included in future proposals. We will keep residents updated".</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, we believe that it is imperative that MHW is included within the present proposals (not in any unrelated future proposals) and that the following are some of the important points that need to be considered. That MHW is a cul-de-sac with a convoluted road layout and is much narrower than the ladder roads referred to in the Review needs to be addressed. Very important is the affect that additional parking would have on access for Emergency Vehicles which could result in serious H&amp;S issues. Parking difficulties for visitors, deliveries, refuse collection, tradesmen, and for residents using their off road parking facilities also needs including. In addition increased parking would impact on both drivers and pedestrians. For example because of the configuration of the Sandpit Lane footpath and the close vicinity of trees both of which restrict vision, extra care is already required by pedestrians crossing MHW and by drivers exiting or entering MHW. The problem is exacerbated by nearby parking</p> <p>We trust that these and other issues will be given careful consideration and we look forward to receiving updates in due course.</p>
414	Not Provided	<p>Having received your letter dated 17th January 2020, I would like to feedback a major concern with the proposed changes;</p> <p>Public parking via Pay by Phone will be at a cost of £2.90 (to cover the restricted time of 2 hours per day). This proposal is much cheaper than parking at the station, currently, £8.70 per day so I believe this will mean that once again people will park within Zone P and walk to the station. We will therefore be back to the situation before the permit parking restrictions were put in place. This will in turn mean that despite people paying to park outside their homes, they won't be able to park during the week which is unacceptable. It could also mean cars are parked overnight and people are able to pay over the phone for subsequent days.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider</p>
415	Homewood Road	<p>We live in Homewood road. Homewood road already becomes severely congested whenever the church on the corner with sandpit Lane has an event (weds evening and Saturday morning are routinely ridiculous). We think this is the right opportunity to address that issue.</p> <p>In addition, the proposals seem highly likely to push the existing parking issue onto homewood road and Marshall's drive. Consequently we believe the restrictions should be extended to those roads</p>
416	Not Provided	<p>As a resident of Park Avenue within zone P, I am writing in response to your consultation paper. There is much in the proposals with which I agree. Clearly it is necessary to extend the current residents permit scheme to the North of Sandpit Lane as the unintended effect of the introduction of zone P was to lead to the displacement of non-resident parking to the North of Sandpit Lane. Equally the splitting of the enlarged zone P into segments appears to be a positive move. However, as residents of Park Avenue we do have a major concern, and that is over the introduction within zone P of shared use parking , pay by phone at a cost of £2.90 to cover the 2 hour restrictive period per day. The basis for our concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The shared use parking is in reality commuter parking by those not willing to pay the effective daily charge of £7.50 at the station car parks, together with some displaced parking from Verulam School.</li> <li>•Based on past and current experience the commuters are looking for the nearest available on street parking to the station [currently the southern end of the roads North of Sandpit lane and pre zone P roads like Park Avenue].</li> <li>•The proposed 2 hour charge of £2.90 would effectively allow commuters to park all day for that amount, and being pay by phone could be arranged from their desks in London.</li> <li>•The demand for on street parking is not due to the lack of available parking at the station. Each week day there are several hundred vacant parking spaces at the station car parks. The demand for on street parking is purely driven by the desire of commuters to avoid the high cost of station parking..</li> </ul> <p>Whilst these factors affect other roads, we feel particularly vulnerable in Park Avenue. We would be the closest road to the station where non-resident parking would be possible, consequently the first street that commuters would try to park in, in order to reduce their walk to the station. Additionally the close proximity of Verulam School causes two concerns. Numbers of pupils walk or cycle to school each day and use Park Avenue as a conduit, this combined with parents trying to pick up children causes severe safety concerns when the road is crowded with parked commuter cars.</p> <p>We also have two or three residents with blue badges and limited mobility who require access to and from their properties. I am one of these, and as a result of significant walking difficulties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Receive regular weekly visits from my physiotherapist who would be unable to park when the road is full of commuter cars.</li> <li>•Require easy access for twice weekly trips to and from a specialist neuro gym and medical appointments.</li> <li>•Have a large/ long car, capable of carrying my electric wheel chair which requires clear access to our drive.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, if Park Avenue is not removed from the shared use parking arrangements then it will revert to the same position as before zone P was introduced in December 2018, with the street completely filled with parked cars, inappropriate parking, poor visibility at property entrances or blocked driveways. In short it will be congested and unsafe contrary to current regulations.</p>
417	Not Provided	<p>I am in receipt of your document dated 17 th January 2020 which seeks to find a solution to the problem of parking displacement from the station.</p> <p>In this proposal you identify Marshals Drive as not requiring any action, but you put restrictions on the surrounding roads. - Ladder Roads.</p> <p>Marshals Drive is already used for casual all day parking especially near the Wick by drivers who are now unable to use the Quadrant Car Park for all day parking due to restrictions and cameras.</p> <p>As a resident of the Drive for over 40 years, I feel it should be included in the Zone P - Parking Review with a two hour restriction in the middle of the day Monday to Friday. Homewood Road should have similar restrictions.</p>
418	Faircross Way	<p>We live in Faircross Way and understand the current parking situation needs review and changing.</p> <p>Double yellows around all junctions would solve the overcrowding of Charmouth Road and prevent it from being pushed into other junctions.</p> <p>We do question the need to over regulate the parking as detailed in your proposal. Why not allow restriction free parking on one side of the roads in the review, staggered if need be to aid traffic calming and the other with single yellow restriction thus allowing commuters and residents the freedom to use the parking in these roads as required.</p> <p>It would be more helpful to commuters to avoid the high costs of station parking and allow them to park in all the roads stopping the current congestion points. It would also prevent the costs and hassle of resident parking permits.</p> <p>We do not see the need the have single or double yellow lines outside our house, if all roads have their share of parking we cannot see it as necessary.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
419	Clarence Road	<p>We list below comments on the proposals which most nearly affect us as residents of Clarence Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The general idea of allowing some paid-for parking in addition to parking by residents' permit has some merit, where this can be achieved safely, as it balances interests and raises some much-needed revenue for the Council (unless the idea is that the new scheme would be privately run?). We do not think it a sensible proposal for Clarence Road which, particularly at peak periods, is used by a large volume of through traffic, as well as residents.</li> <li>2. We believe that this is far from being the case on the section between Brampton Road and Sandpit Lane. It is highly likely that the proposed arrangement would result in vehicles being regularly parked on both sides of the road, which is exactly the situation which caused so many objections in the past before the current scheme was brought in. The road is very heavily used at peak times and parking on both sides restricts visibility and manoeuvrability. Given the proximity to the station, it is inevitable that most slots would be filled by early morning, as happened in the past. Then there were real concerns about safety, with vehicles travelling too fast for the conditions or resulting in long tailbacks down to the traffic lights at Hatfield Road. Many residents, including ourselves, found great difficulty in exiting and entering our drives. The presence of large vehicles such as refuse collectors, large coaches and building contractors caused mayhem which we recall to this day.</li> <li>3. At key times this section is heavily used by schoolchildren as well as people visiting Grasshoppers Nursery, which has recently increased its numbers. In addition, since the first consultation the road has become a bus route for the S6 bus, adding to the volume of traffic. Traffic in our area is much increased as the development on Sandpit Lane is extended. It seems inevitable that this growth will continue. Computer parking on Clarence Road would exacerbate the problems by creating a single lane when both sides have parked vehicles.</li> <li>4. Our views are based upon the evidence of our experiences of the difficult conditions at peak times before the current parking arrangements were made.</li> <li>5. We consider that the same negative consequences described above also apply to Woodstock Road which also serves as a through route and has coped badly under its current parking arrangements. Day-long commuter parking will worsen traffic flow and the convenience of residents.</li> <li>6. We would urge a reconsideration of the proposal to permit computer paid commuter parking on Clarence and Woodstock roads, based on our experience of past and present traffic flows.</li> </ol>
420	Park Avenue	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 17 January 2020 re the above and thank you for speaking to my husband and me at the Open Forum on 1 February. I set out below our thoughts on the Council's proposals.</p> <p>As a resident of Park Avenue within zone P, I am writing in response to your consultation paper. There is much in the proposals with which I agree. Clearly it is necessary to extend the current residents permit scheme to the North of Sandpit Lane as the unintended effect of the introduction of zone P was to lead to the displacement of non-resident parking to the North of Sandpit Lane. Equally the splitting of the enlarged zone P into segments appears to be a positive move. However, as residents of Park Avenue we do have a major concern, and that is over the introduction within zone P of shared use parking , pay by phone at a cost of £2.90 to cover the 2 hour restrictive period per day. The basis for our concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shared use parking is in reality commuter parking by those not willing to pay the £7.50 effective daily charge at the station car parks, together with some displaced parking from Verulam School.</li> <li>• Based on past and current experience the commuters are looking for the nearest available on street parking to the station [currently the southern end of the roads North of Sandpit lane and pre zone P roads like Park Avenue].</li> <li>• The proposed 2 hour charge of £2.90 would effectively allow commuters to park all day for that amount, and being pay by phone could be arranged from their desks in London.</li> <li>• The demand for on street parking is not due to the lack of available parking at the station. Each week day there are several hundred vacant parking spaces at the station car parks. The demand for on street parking is purely driven by the desire of commuters to avoid the high cost of station parking.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst these factors affect other roads, we feel particularly vulnerable. We would be the closest road to the station where non-resident parking would be possible, consequently the first street that commuters would try to park in, in order to reduce their walk to the station. Additionally the close proximity of Verulam School causes two concerns. Numbers of pupils walk or cycle to school each day and use Park Avenue as a conduit, this combined with parents trying to pick up children causes severe safety concerns when the road is crowded with parked cars. We also have two or three residents with blue badges and limited mobility who require access to and from their properties.</p> <p>In summary, if Park Avenue is not removed from the shared use parking arrangements then it will revert to the same position as before zone P was introduced in December 2018, with inappropriate parking, poor visibility at property entrances or blocked driveways. In short it will be congested and unsafe contrary to current regulations.</p>
421	Not Provided	<p>With reference to proposed changes in parking restrictions for zone P.</p> <p>As a matter of interest I took a couple of hours last week to walk around the roads affected and to see if there might be an obvious solution. 52 cars were parked on Charmouth and 50 on Gurney with the majority parked towards Sandpit Lane. There was a lot of free space on the upper half of both. Only 9 were parked on Homewood Road. Brampton was still by far and away the most congested road with 105 cars parked and only space left for a handful. Park Avenue had 26 ( unusually high ) but several were displaced from Brampton Road residents and 1or 2 from Blandford I think.</p> <p>For me one of the big successes of the parking restrictions has been the more fluid and efficient picking up of children from school at the end of the day. When I drove passed the school at 3:00 ( Jennings ) only 4 cars were parked and they may have had nothing to do with the school. I returned to watch the 10 minutes either side of 3:30 and counted roughly 100 cars coming to pick children up. Connecting roads were also used. When they parked all that I saw turned their engines off and by 3:40 most had cleared the area. The stretch from Hamilton to Woodstock only had 2 parked cars in that time.</p> <p>When parking restrictions were not in place parents would begin to arrive an hour early to search for a place to park and would often end up parked on double yellow lines and across drive ways with engines idling in case approached by an angry home owner or traffic warden. I have suffered from asthma all my life and have noticed a significant improvement in air quality now this no longer happens. I am very anxious that the improvement in my condition continues.</p>
422	Jennings Road	<p>Further to my mail below and after discussing the situation with Mr Freddie Mohammed, I'm following up with some images of the problems I have when trying to exit my drive because of where the parking bays are situated so close to my driveway.</p> <p>Several times I have had very near misses with oncoming cars because I cannot see approaching traffic when exiting my drive because my view is blocked. I know my neighbour has had the same issues nearly colliding with a cyclist. Its only a matter of time before there is a collision.</p> <p>My other point with regards to your proposal is that its just going to reverse the parking disbursement with commuters understandably, parking as near to the station as possible and then parking further away when there aren't the available spaces.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
423	Marshals Drive	<p>I received a letter about these proposals just prior to going on a holiday and downloaded some of the survey results both on the original proposal and the more recent larger scale questionnaire. I am concerned that the tables and maps are no longer available and yet the date for responses is Friday 28th February. Surely you will need to make the information available again and extend the time for consultation.</p> <p>From the information that I did download the original ladder road consultation went to 1080 addresses, and received 787 replies with 384 saying that they didn't have a problem with parking and 371 did. There was also a figure that stated 1231 cars were normally parked at the property of those that responded but 1024 could be parked on the properties. It appears that based on a minority view a lot of work was carried out marking out roads and introducing signage when there was no need.</p> <p>I believe that the main concern was road parking which restricted access to drives and not to road parking itself. This could have been easily resolved by white lining in front of drives and further restrictions were unnecessary.</p> <p>The result of the initial restricted parking zone was to leave many of the roads virtually empty during the day and this remains the case. Traffic was displaced, much to the North, causing problems in particular to the section of Charmouth Road below Faircross Way which is a bus route. This should have been simply resolved with single yellow lines and restricted times for parking.</p> <p>As a result of understandable objections to the original displacement you conducted a much wider survey. My notes show 3181 surveys issued and 1093 returned – less than one third. Your proposal is to introduce residents parking in many more roads and to restrict parking at a much greater distance from the station. This will clearly cost a lot of money and residents will be expected to pay through permits, payments for parking and no doubt enforcement notice income, probably through a private company. How do the survey results justify this?</p> <p>I accept the proposals for double yellow lines at junctions, some single yellow on bus routes and for white lining in front of drives that are closest to station traffic but this proposal goes much further and will create a lot of difficulty and cost for 100's of residents who did not previously have a problem.</p> <p>I believe that the analysis needs to be reviewed and further public consultation undertaken and urge you to consider this.</p>
424	Not Provided	<p>Serious Safety Warning</p> <p>As you are probably aware, the junction of Homewood Rd and Sandpit Lane is one of the most dangerous junction in St Albans and the site of numerous serious accidents. Your new plans will significantly increase the hazards at this junction, at the junction with Faircross Rd and along the full length of Homewood Rd and will inevitably result in accidents and most likely a serious injury or death.</p> <p>The church on the corner of Homewood Rd currently has numerous events (and does not have sufficient parking) resulting in major overspill onto Faircross Rd and all along Homewood Rd. This happens several times per week and already creates major issues in the area.</p> <p>Your proposals will be significantly worse, are foolhardy and would represent serious negligence and disregard for safety on behalf of the county council. Homewood Road is far narrowed than Faircross Rd, Marshalls Drive and many of the other local roads, some of whom are already suffering from the previous ill-conceived changes. Homewood Rd is already a busy cut through for motorists wishing to avoid the traffic lights on Sandpit lane and for those travelling to the popular Marshalswick shops.</p> <p>A far better solution would be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Allow controlled free parking in sections of all the existing parking zones (instead of the paid spaces) such that hazards are not created but some sensible free provision is provided.</li> <li>2.Do apply the yellow lines on corners to keep these open and safe as there are many inconsiderate and drivers ignorant of the hazards they are creating</li> <li>3.Do not extend the existing parking scheme until 1&amp;2 have been implemented to minimise unnecessary cost and waste</li> <li>4.Work with Verulam School to create some free parking spaces for boys who do have to drive to school (the catchment is wide of this school) as it is unrealistic to expect all students to use public transport unless it is easily accessible, reliable and cheap – which it is not. The school could organise car sharing and other enticements to minimise the number of places required.</li> <li>5.If the above do not improve the existing issue sufficiently then and only then (after a reasonable trial period), extend the parking zone but do include Homewood Rd and Marshalls Drive but include free parking space on these roads too.</li> <li>6.Remove the idea of paid parking on the road. We are not London and its not needed - it just downgrades the whole area.</li> </ol>
425	Not Provided	<p>Serious Safety Warning</p> <p>As you are probably aware, the junction of Homewood Rd and Sandpit Lane is one of the most dangerous junction in St Albans and the site of numerous serious accidents. Your new plans will significantly increase the hazards at this junction, at the junction with Faircross Rd and along the full length of Homewood Rd and will inevitably result in accidents and most likely a serious injury or death.</p> <p>The church on the corner of Homewood Rd currently has numerous events (and does not have sufficient parking) resulting in major overspill onto Faircross Rd and all along Homewood Rd. This happens several times per week and already creates major issues in the area.</p> <p>Your proposals will be significantly worse, are foolhardy and would represent serious negligence and disregard for safety on behalf of the county council. Homewood Road is far narrowed than Faircross, Marshalls Drive and many of the other local roads, some of whom are already suffering from the previous ill-conceived changes. Homewood Rd is already a busy cut through for motorists wishing to avoid the traffic lights on Sandpit lane and for those travelling to the popular Marshalswick shops.</p> <p>A far better solution would be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Allow controlled free parking in sections of all the existing parking zones (instead of the paid spaces) such that hazards are not created but some sensible free provision is provided.</li> <li>2.Do apply the yellow lines on corners to keep these open and safe as there are many inconsiderate and drivers ignorant of the hazards they are creating</li> <li>3.Do not extend the existing parking scheme until 1&amp;2 have been implemented to minimise unnecessary cost and waste</li> <li>4.Work with Verulam School to create some free parking spaces for boys who do have to drive to school (the catchment is wide of this school) as it is unrealistic to expect all students to use public transport unless it is easily accessible, reliable and cheap – which it is not. The school could organise car sharing and other enticements to minimise the number of places required.</li> <li>5.If the above do not improve the existing issue sufficiently then and only then (after a reasonable trial period), extend the parking zone but do include Faircross Rd and Marshalls Drive but include free parking space on these roads too.</li> <li>6.Remove the idea of paid parking on the road. We are not London and its not needed - it just downgrades the whole area.</li> </ol>
426	Park Avenue	<p>Whilst I have signed up to the common Park Avenue Residents Association response on this issue, I also wanted to raise an issue that is specific to a few houses only on the street, including mine at number ".</p> <p>The surfacing of the road has been layered on over the years in the centre of the road, but the gutter edges remain un-tarmacked, which results in very large dips when crossing into driveways. The dip outside number " is amongst the largest and, when I moved into " in 2013, I was unable to get my car into the driveway at all and always parked on the road.</p> <p>When residents parking was first mooted several years ago, Councillor Chris White intervened to have the footpath relaid to lesser the angle on one side of the dip, but was unable to do anything about the road itself. This change means that I am now able to drive in / reverse out of my driveway but I remain unable to do the much safer reverse in / drive out manoeuvre. Were we to see a return to a street with congested parking, exiting the driveway backwards between parked cars with very limited sightlines would be dangerous. If non-residents parking is to be made available, the condition of the road surface also needs to be addressed so that we can safely enter and exit our driveways.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
427	Monks Horton Way	<p>We met you at the Open Forum you held recently regarding the street parking plan for St Alban's. We live in Monks Horton Way and expressed our surprise that MHW was not included in the plan.</p> <p>The main concerns for many of the residents are -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* With all the restrictions planned for the streets around us, MHW will become an "open car park" for all.</li><li>* MHW is a narrow road, 2 metres narrower than nearby Churchill Road</li><li>* There are currently issues of access when cars/lorries are parked in the road. There is little space between driveways for parking, leading to great difficulty in entering and leaving drives when a vehicle is parked.</li><li>* Carers at a number of houses need access 24/7.</li><li>* Parking spaces would not work in the narrow road.</li><li>* If the charge for parking between 11am and 2pm were introduced, this would open it up to all day parking, anyone can pay by phone from wherever they are, having parked 1st thing in the morning.</li></ul> <p>There are possible solutions for incorporating Monks Horton Way into the street parking plan. Impliment Residents Only parking, with provision for trade visitors, or No Parking between 11am and 2pm, which is already in force in some roads.</p>
428	Woodstock Road South	<p>Please let me know the date to expect some progress regarding the parking situation on Woodstock Road South. As you are aware I have been raising concerns for over 12 months now with very limited response or progress other than a proposed change, which doesn't actually solve the issue.</p> <p>Again today I have had to walk from half way up Brampton Road, in the rain, carrying a two year old and holding the hand of a six year old. I've left my shopping in the car and it's simply defrosting as I cannot physically carry that distance as I need to hold my sons hand to cross the road. There are numerous builders vans parked, local business vehicles left all day again and it's causing significant stress. Furthermore, I had my ankle clipped by a car aggressively trying to get passed as I leaned into my car to fasten my sons seat belt. I'm not hurt but I'm simply furious.</p> <p>Upon checking the letter from yourself it details no further further dates for the proposal or outcome date. Please can you provide this to me, assuming all feedback is received by 28th February.</p>
429	Jennings Road	<p>I have lived and worked in St Albans since 1971 and have not been moved to write to you until now.</p> <p>I have lived on Jennings Road since 1996 and currently also work at home.</p> <p>I have a resident's permit to park on the street under the current scheme.</p> <p>Your consultation claims to propose shared-use parking north of Verulam school (paragraph 5), but the map (P2 Area 2) shows BOTH SIDES of Jennings Road (and others) as shared use. (with the only exception of school access and junction bans.)This I object to most strongly on the grounds that there are so many London workers looking to leave their car near to the station for their daily commute that ALL pay-by-phone spaces WILL be taken up by commuters. This is not sharing.</p> <p>The result will be that both sides of the road will be parked solid every weekday, just as it was before the current scheme was introduced, and therefore :</p> <p>If I go out in the morning I am very unlikely to have a space to return to.</p> <p>There will be nowhere for visitors to park.</p> <p>Even callers will have nowhere to pull in, and may "chance-their-arm" on the double-yellows at the junctions, increasing the risk of accidents..</p> <p>As there will only be a single lane left in the middle of the road, two-way traffic will be impossible. The road will become a chaotic scene of drivers trying to get past oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Obviously the road gets extremely busy at school start and end times. As it will be already parked solid it will then become grid-locked.</p> <p>It will be completely UNSAFE for cyclists, not just for residents who cycle (including myself) but especially for the many bike-riding school students.</p> <p>The school bus will have nowhere to pull in, if it can even get near the school.</p> <p>School-trip coaches will have no space.</p> <p>Emergency service vehicles will have appallingly bad access.</p> <p>Imagine if there were a fire, or a road traffic accident. We've had both since I've been here, and the likelihood of collision will be increased if the proposedscheme is implemented.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is very dangerous.</p> <p>So, in order to leave some room for residents and their visitors to park, for delivery drivers and school parents to park for a few minutes, for the safety of the school children, and for opposing traffic to have empty spaces to pull into so that they can actually get past each other, and avoid all of the above problems:</p> <p>please DO NOT ALLOCATE MORE THAN 30% OF THE SPACE to Pay-by-Phone parking on any of these roads near the school.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
430	Homewood Road	<p>Thank your letter and clear explanation of the new proposed parking on the road which have been affected by earlier parking restriction in the Clarence Ward. After attending the consultation day and speaking with both officers and councillors, I wanted to express my concerns regarding this issue.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the need for improvement in the Clarence ward area, the approach taken has proved problematic for other areas.</p> <p>Due to the lack of any all day free parking in any road in both Clarence ward and the new proposed area, I believe Homewood Road, Marshals Drive and other surrounding roads will become a car park, in a similar way the roads immediately outside the Clarence ward are now. These roads have been blighted with cars parking both sides leaving single traffic only routes, my car was involved in an accident, as resident could not see my car as they reversed out side their drive. I would like Homewood Road to be included in the parking zone if there is no reconsideration of introducing some free car parking in all roads affected. It is my belief motorist want free parking and they will walk an extra few minutes to save money. Local car parks have had to introduce all day parking restrictions in order to avoid people leaving their cars all day and then one member of their group driving them to the station. Clearly commuters, people working in St Albans City, 6th formers and residents living in zone parking areas not prepared to pay, want free parking and are prepared to go to extreme lengths to get it.I wanted to express that perhaps the sixth formers at boys school should be given help with parking outside their school in Jennings Road as unlike other schools in the area their catchment area is extensive and pupils travel some distance and can't walk or cycle safely as officers and councillors suggested. I gather this group currently park in Woodstock North, but recently when the road was temporarily closed many parked at the top of Homewood Road which was hazardous.</p> <p>Safety concerns for Homewood Road are :- The junction with Sandpit Road is very busy and dangerous also there have been numerous minor and major accidents there. This road is already a cut through with traffic wishing to avoid traffic lights in Sandpit Lane to go to Marshalswick area and the very popular shops.There is a church at the junction between Sandpit Lane and Homewood Road which rents out various hall/rooms to very large groups throughout the week which already caused traffic problems in the area often only leaving a single route for traffic. Residents requesting help with this matter with the church has failed, the church does not caused any problems for worship just it's other more commercial ventures through the week.</p> <p>Homewood Road is not as wide as Faircross Way and does not have wide grass verges where people can see and be seen. It is very difficult to get in and out of driveway safely if motorist leave their cars in every available space all day. As mentioned earlier Homewood Road has already had experience of this when the church hall is rented out to large groups.</p> <p>So in short, please reconsider and provide some free spaces in safe locations in all roads mentioned in the parking consultation but if you can't please include Homewood Road in the parking scheme so it does not suffer the same consequences as neighbouring roads after the introduction of parking restrictions in roads near the station ie every available space on residential roads been used in the weekday, leading to single lane traffic only and very dangerous unsafe conditions.</p>
431	Not Provided	<p>I am getting calls from residents on Hall Heath Close asking why they are not included in the proposals - I have to admit, I hadn't realised.</p> <p>I know you have a lot of responses to be looking at, can I just add this in as something to be considered. Hall Heath Close is already a bit of a nightmare as it narrow, and I know the refuse collections vans already have to drive onto the verges to get up the street to collect bins. I think it should be wrapped into the scheme proposal at some point.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
432	Charmouth Court	<p>Thank you for discussing the above matter with me the other day. I was pleased to hear that I will not have to pay for a residents' permit given that I have a blue badge. I would also like to add that I am pleased that yellow lines will be painted at the entrance to Charmouth Court - these have been long needed as it is often difficult to clearly see approaching traffic from either direction when waiting to drive out.</p> <p>On the subject of the residents' permits, which will be required to park in Charmouth Court between 11 and 1pm, I sometimes have visitors who park their cars in the areas to be covered by the restrictions. Please could you confirm that it will be possible for residents to have visitors' parking permits for use by their visitors during the restricted hours and that we will not have to pay for those either? In case it is of interest, my daughter lives in an area with parking restrictions and there, residents are entitled to two reuseable visitors' permits in the form of rear view mirror hangers, making for an environmentally-friendly way of dealing with this issue.</p>
433	Charmouth Road	<p>Further to your letter dated 16th January 2020 regarding the proposed TRO I wish to suggest a change to the proposed implementation of the parking regulations on Charmouth Road.</p> <p>The majority of the homes on Charmouth Road are houses with their own driveways. The maisonettes on Charmouth Road (and Charmouth Court) do not have driveways and therefore on-street parking is an essential for those residents. For this reason I think it would be less inconvenient for the residents of the maisonettes if the resident permit-holder parking on this section of Charmouth Road is on the side of the road where the maisonettes are (i.e. the East side of the road), with the single yellow line in force between 11am and 1pm Monday to Friday being on the other side of the road, where those residents have access to their own off-street parking.</p> <p>I expect that this change to the proposal will also have the effect of (slightly) increasing the total length of resident permit-holder parking available on Charmouth Road as a whole, since there are no driveway entrances on the East side of this section of Charmouth Road that one would need to be careful not to obscure when parking.</p>
434	Monks Horton Way	<p>Thank you for your letter and documents showing the local parking restrictions . I noticed that Monks Horton Way has been excluded from the proposed restrictions .</p> <p>My concerns are that it could become a problem for the residents of Monks Horton Way being available for drivers looking for parking spaces within walking distance of the railway station , making this road a giant car park . We already have problems with bin collection etcetera being a cull de sac and difficulty in manoeuvring as the roads are quite narrow .</p> <p>I feel parking restrictions are needed similar to what is been suggested on other roads in St. Albans .</p> <p>I realise this is an ongoing problem with the saturation of traffic , and not an ideal solution for the residents but to avoid gridlock and annoyance gives no alternative .</p> <p>I look forward to hearing further of the intentions the council propose .</p>
435	Monks Horton Way	<p>I would like to state my objection and concerns regarding the proposed lack of parking restrictions in Monks Horton Way.</p> <p>I have looked at the plans with the proposed parking restrictions in Marshalswick and am extremely concerned that Monks Horton Way is not going to have any restrictions.</p> <p>Monks Horton Way is a much narrower road than the other current 'ladder' roads and to have cars parked along it would make getting in and out of our drive much more difficult. I fail to see how a bin lorry would be able to drive down the road if cars were parked on both sides.</p> <p>If we are one of the only streets in Marshalswick without parking restrictions, cars will of course park here all day. This will have an impact on where any visitors, delivery vans or emergency vehicles would be able to park, there simply won't be any spaces.</p>
436	Brampton Road	<p>Along Brampton Road there are several bays which can accommodate two vehicles, if they are parked considerately. This is not always the case unfortunately - so one selfish driver can make the bay unusable by a second vehicle.</p> <p>Can I suggest that you consider dividing such bays into two, with an appropriate addition to the street marking.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
437	The Park	<p>I am writing to give my comments and complain about the proposed Parking Restrictions in The Park, St Albans. Whilst I agree that something needs to be done about parking in the Ladder Roads and Marshalswick South areas, I do not believe that your proposal is the best way forward.</p> <p>The problem that you are trying to fix is that too many commuters using St Albans station are parking in the roads within a mile or so of the station. The answer to this problem is to provide more, cheaper parking at the station. This would alleviate the on road parking that is currently causing problems. Another couple of floors need to be added to the car park next to the station and the parking charges need to be reduced significantly for daily parking e.g. allow commuters with train season tickets to buy cheap car park season tickets. Has Park and Ride been considered? In terms of the proposal that you are putting forward, I have the following comments / complaints:</p> <p>1.Providing a 'Pay by Phone' option that allows people to park for the whole day for £2.90 is simply going to attract commuters using the station to park in these roads. This is a very cheap daily rate . Commuters can park early morning, go to the station and then pay for the 2 hours restricted parking.</p> <p>2.Talking specifically about The Park, I would say that it is currently a very nice looking road – fairly wide, tree lined with grass verges and pavements. Having an assortment of single yellow, double yellow, solid white and dotted white lines will spoil the look completely.</p> <p>3.The time that you are proposing to have the restrictions doesn't need to be as long. If roads around the area had staggered half hour restrictive periods then this would have the same effect of deterring all day parking and allow one Parking Warden to monitor all the roads. This should be a cost saving.</p> <p>4.My suggestion would be:</p> <p>a.No 'Pay by Phone' parking</p> <p>b.No single yellow lines</p> <p>c.Mark outline of parking areas (not each space) with thin dotted white lines and make this residents permit holders parking but only for half an hour per day (or 1 hour only with no return within 1 hour)</p> <p>d.Parking notices to be attached to current lamp posts or walls, no added posts everywhere</p> <p>5.Homewood Road and Marshal's Drive are not included in this proposal. Doesn't this mean that the commuters will simply move one road further to park there instead?</p> <p>To summarise, I re-iterate that you are not solving the real problem – not enough reasonably priced parking at the station. Instead, you are planning to spread the parking over all the roads causing more widespread traffic problems</p>
438	The Park	<p>Regarding the “Parking Review....Sandpit Lane” I would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>When various people canvassing for candidates (one was a candidate) recently in the past year (2019), I complained about the nuisance, and danger, of so much parking in our local roads, and I suggested that the multi-storey car park at the City Station should reduce it's fees. I have been given to understand that it was never completely full because of the high cost of its annual parking fees. I am sure that if the price there were reduced, more people would make use of it and thus reduce a sizeable number of cars currently parking on our roads, and, also increase the revenue of the car park owners. It strikes me that they, the owners of the multi-storey car park, are in part to blame for this menace. The Park is a very pleasant residential area. Why should it be ruined by yellow lines, with cars parked all day all the way round? This will also increase air pollution; we already have more than enough of this from the learner drivers (private and driving schools) using our roads.</p> <p>Also, I understand that some of the parking in Charmouth Road is caused by pupils from Verulam School. Why can they not walk, cycle or travel by bus to get to school, as I did many years ago?</p>
439	Blandford Road	<p>We have read your proposed changes with interest and agree with what you are proposing apart from one thing.</p> <p>The parking restrictions in Blandford Road are from 1.30 - 3.30 and we see no reason to change them. They have worked well for 5 years and it also helps the church with their groups. Your rational might be to standardise the timing but at the end of Blandford road there is an area of 2 hour parking restriction so you would have to monitor the road at all times anyway. We would therefore see no reason to change them and it would certainly impact on me as I have many morning meetings. Also unnecessary cost in replacing the signage.</p> <p>We also do not want additional parking bays as the lines you have at the moment make maximum use of the space available. As you know parking is tight in Blandford Road so we need to make maximum use of all the space. Putting in parking bays would restrict the number of cars.</p> <p>We would like a 20 mile limit in our road. It s used a as a rat run with cars going down far too fast.</p> <p>We are also aware, driving locally, of empty roads, not in our area of ladder roads which are always full but in the area behind. All these residents have off road parking so we totally agree with your proposals to have parking meters there. That would also mean that if our roads were full, our visitors could park and pay there, particularly as you are changing the parking zones. Up to now if our road was full we could park there but this will no longer be the case. We know the residents are opposed to these meters but we cannot see their justification. Surely the parking restrictions are to ensure the flow of traffic and safety and we do not feel that having parking in those roads would affect these as long as you put proper lines across people's drives. The system of the P zone also seems to be working at the moment but as you intend to widen the scheme we agree that smaller zones will be needed.</p> <p>Our other real concern is the increase in price for us for parking permits. The price of these have doubled. We in the first set of ladder roads, do not in the main have any off road parking and so our visitors have to park in the road. We do not see why we should have to pay for an all day parking permit when we are only a two hour zone. Previously we had a two hour visitor parking permit. We cannot see why you should not be able to reissue these, particularly as you will have to reprint them to cover the new parking zones.</p>
440	Woodstock Road South	<p><b>Objection too long to include in full, this response has been summarised:</b> The proposal will remove 8 car parking spaces in Woodstock Road South due to double yellow lines being implemented in 3 areas. Safety reasons are given as the reason for introducing double yellow lines even though there have never been any safety concerns - no evidence is given by the council to substantiate this claim in the consultation papers.This is very rarely the case so spaces are frequently lost through thoughtless parking of vehicles that do not appreciate the delicate balance of maximising our limited parking space. Clearly we will not have enough parking moving forward with this proposed scheme as you are reducing our on road capacity in the direct vicinity of our houses. In addition the scheme also impacts on our ability to park in Woodstock Road North which acts as a natural over-flow for those in homes between Eaton Road and Woodstock Road North as well as those homes from Burnham Road to Brampton Road. It should be considered reasonable that we can park as close to our homes as possible to facilitate the loading and unloading of our vehicles. This proposed scheme is going to make this near impossible. Most residents have one or two cars and visitors to accommodate. The council has made no audit of cars to parking spaces in the proposed scheme and therefore made no effort to afford us the much needed convenience to park outside or as near as possible to our homes. Many residents have young families and it can be very stressful having to park far from your front door. Capacity in our neighbouring roads is at its limit as can be seen in Burnham Road and Eaton Road where those residents clearly need to park their vehicles. There is no excess road space on Eaton or Burnham Road for our vehicles and it seems unfair that those residents not be able to park outside their home if Woodstock Road South residents are to park there as well. The proposed zones show Brampton Road at the junction with Woodstock Road South having the South side in Zone 1 and the North side in Zone 2. How can this be reasonable? As residents of Woodstock Road South in the section from Burnham to Brampton Roads we have to regularly find parking in Brampton Road and Woodstock Road North and in the proposed double yellow line areas. The proposed scheme is unnecessarily complicated and takes no consideration of the needs of the local residents.The offering of pay per parking in Zone 2 will now encourage commuter parking to seek out our area for all day parking. We have always argued that the parking issues felt in Fleetville area are, by and large, not commuters looking to park this far out. You will actively see a change in the dynamic of the parking in Zone 2 with this option being introduced. Instead of a natural ebb and flow with parking, vehicles will be left all day or even for weeks while owners go on holiday. This will prohibit residents being able to park in their roads near their homes at all times of day let alone the proposed restricted time. The proposals do not articulate the problem that is trying to be addressed by introducing these measures and is completely lacking in evidence or consideration for the implications to local residents. Since the introduction of the ladder scheme residents of Woodstock Road South have been severely affected and yet we have seen Jennings Road, Hamilton Road, Churchill Road, Sunderland Road and Park Avenue to be devoid of cars all day. I look forward to the council's response to these objections.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
441	Lancaster Road	<p>Firstly, thank you for your proposals to address the problems with traffic safety and parking issues in Lancaster Road and its surrounding areas. Certainly they represent a significant improvement on the current situation.</p> <p>My main comments are as follows:</p> <p>I am of the opinion that commuters will willing pay the £2.90 fee for parking all day and so the places available for commuters and residents will be filled from very early in the morning by commuters parking all day. Could the £2.90 fee be raised to something more in line with other parking, eg at Clarence park or in the city car parks? The proposed system does not feel like giving residents priority as set out in point 8 of your letter. Could some of the places be reserved just for residents?</p> <p>I live at the Sandpit Road end of Lancaster Road and this area is frequently used by people parking cars for several days at a time. They are using the road as a long term car park for trips away, using, I suspect, the station and its links to Luton and Gatwick airports. At one time last summer there were five cars parked in the road, each for over a week. As parking fees will be paid by phone under the proposed system I cannot see that it will erase this problem.</p> <p>Another issue for this end of Lancaster Road is the nursery at number 1. The staff park in the road as they are not allowed to use the car park of the nursery, which, incidentally is virtually empty for all but drop off and collecting times. They work staggered hours and frequently need to park a little later in the morning than commuters and so they do on occasions, possibly in desperation, squeeze their cars into spaces not big enough and so overhang driveways. As do commuters at times! Bearing in mind these comments I fully support solid white lines to deter parking across driveways, ideally long enough to ensure good sight lines for cars entering and leaving driveways. At present getting out of the drive some days with cars parked so tightly either side feels like an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Thank you for giving residents opportunity to comment on your proposals. I look forward to your further updates.</p>
442	Woodstock Road North	<p>I live on Woodstock Road North and am very concerned about your proposed changes to the parking provision locally. At the moment, from Monday to Friday cars are parked along the road for the entire day either by commuters going into London or pupils attending Verulam School. All the parked cars mean that I, along with my neighbours, cannot see oncoming traffic as we reverse out of our drives. Given the speed at which motorists come down the road, it is a serious accident waiting to happen. You are now proposing to charge £2.90 for vehicles to continue to park all day on roads locally. This charge will mean that a lot of motorists will choose to pay this bargain fee rather than use the station or city centre car parks and the number of vehicles parking locally will be bound to increase dramatically.</p> <p>The new proposed provision will do nothing to sort out the current problems of congestion with parked vehicles blocking residents' view as they back out of their drives. They will add to them.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the suggested shared scheme of parking on Woodstock Road North has not been tried anywhere else, so you have no idea whether or not it will work and I'm sure a lot of local residents are telling you that it will not work!</p> <p>The suggested scheme is complex and I am sure it will increase parking and traffic problems in Woodstock Road North rather than solving any of the current problems.</p>
443	Faircross Way	<p>I refer to your letter dated 17th January 2020 setting out your proposed changes to parking in the local area.</p> <p>In principle, we broadly support your proposed parking changes for our road, Faircross Way, and adjacent roads in Zone P3. However, this is on the basis that you implement the proposed changes in Zone P1 and P2, where you are proposing to relax the current arrangement of "resident parking only", and to change parts of these zones to "shared use parking". This will allow the public to park in designated bays as long as they pay a fee for the 2 hour restricted period and thus will provide a more reasonable distribution of parking through the area.</p> <p>Our view is that the proposed parking fee of £2.90 for the 2 hour restricted period per day is much too low. There needs to be a reasonable balance between road parking and station parking. We believe that £2.90 is too heavily biased towards road parking. There is a strong likelihood that it will cause a large amount of extra road parking as current station parkers will be encouraged to park on the roads due to the significant saving parking fee (<math>8.70 - 2.90 = £4.80</math>). We would suggest a 2 hour parking fee of £5.99 to achieve a more reasonable balance.</p> <p>Our only other comment on the parking proposals for Faircross Way is that there is a short section of overlapping (double) parking outside No. 15 (approx.). This is the only section of double parking I can see on any of the roads and so assume you will correct this.</p>
444	Lancaster Road	<p>The proposal needs to make facility for residents only on one side of the road, or a section of bays on alternating sides.</p> <p>My wife uses the car during the day ,a nd works part time. We have a difficulty on finding a space during the day, as rail commuters take any spaces vacated- primarily from 7am till lunchtime</p> <p>The proposed charge of £2.90 for the restricted period is effectively a daily charge, given it can be paid remotely. This proposed charge is set too low, relative to rail car parks, and should be increased. The station has adequate parking provision, and whilst there may be a differential, the pricing structure should encourage commuters to use the property facility.</p> <p>My understanding is that the roads between Sandpit lane and the station are currently under-used, as a result of the restrictions imposed. The problem in Lancaster Rd was a direct consequence of the imposition of those restrictions.</p> <p>The scheme needs to re-appraise all the affected roads, and ensure that the burden of rail commuters casual parking is spread across all roads, alleviating pressure points</p> <p>My view is that imposing a workable scheme across the wider area must facilitate exclusive residents parking in some areas at the restricted times. Whilst it is accepted that this exclusive resident parking may be under-used at times, this wil naturally provide safe passing spaces for vehicles to alleviate traffic safety.</p> <p>I would be grateful if my views could be taken into account in any determination, and await confirmation my E mail has been received.</p> <p>I am away at present, so my wife may E mail additional points to I under separate cover to represent the views of our household.</p>
445	Park Avenue	<p>You will have seen the collective submission from the Park Avenue Residents' Association sent as an email and in hard copy.</p> <p>There is an additional point I would like to make in support of the existing arrangements of a personal nature which perhaps did not belong in a collective contribution.</p> <p>My partner's son " has Down's Syndrome, and he is collected every day by a special school minibus from our house. We are delighted with the service and with his school, St Luke's in Redbourn. Before the parking restrictions were introduced, the bus had to stop in the middle of the road for Charlie to get on and off as the dense parking did not allow the bus to pull in to the kerb. This held up the traffic in both directions and was quite dangerous for Charlie to cross the road. This has been made much easier now we have more space - which also allows for passing places between parked residents' cars in a single track road.</p> <p>Whilst this is a small point in the overall scheme of things, there is a surprising number of disabled and elderly people in the road who still drive or are picked up on a regular basis, and I know they share my concern about the problems created for them by nose to tail commuter parking and the poor visibility associated with this as experienced in the bad old days. We would be very disappointed to return to that situation.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
446	Sefton Close	<p>Please note as I have advised you before this length of "no waiting" is too short. When leaving Sefton Close parked cars on your left restrict the view of cars coming along Blenheim Road from Sandpit Lane. There have been several "near misses" as cars come along the middle of Blenheim Road at speed. Also by allowing cars to park opposite this corner the width of the road restricts you to a very sharp and narrow left turn.</p>
447	Battlefield Road	<p>I welcome the idea to treat all the roads from Sandridge Road and Marshals Drive down to Brampton Road equally, to allow for a greater area of parking, in the hope that with more space for commuters to park, their cars will hopefully be spread about rather more than at present. With the very high cost of the Station car parks, it is perfectly understandable that people will park elsewhere and for this reason I feel that Marshals Drive and Homewood Road should be included in the scheme because otherwise the problem will simply be shifted to those roads. Furthermore I suggest that Cunningham Avenue and Cunningham Hill Road, where currently there is no all day parking, are also treated the same. I am prepared to pay £20.17 per annum for my car and purchase visitor permits for guests but do feel that there should be areas in the road which are not for commuters but for residents only and for Clare Lodge (visitors - often elderly - staff, Ambulances, delivery and collection services). The suggested public parking fee of £2.90 seems a little low and maybe should be increased to nearer £4.00.</p> <p>At present the ladder roads seem to be very cluttered in terms of white lines with the result that, even with no or very little parking there at the moment, because each side of the road is marked with dotted lines denoting parking bays, traffic is encouraged to drive in the centre of the road - between these bays. I asked one of the Council representatives at the Forum if these boxes were necessary and was told that they were legally required, but a neighbour asked the same question of another member and was told they were not necessary. Should that be correct, I would much rather see no marked bays but just the necessary lines and roadside markers which would give a much cleaner look to the road.</p> <p>Battlefield Road has not been resurfaced for a long time and the tarmac, particularly near to the pavements, has broken up in places and is very rough. When one of my neighbours complained about cars parked on the double yellow lines at the Sandpit Lane end of the road, they were told by a Council employee that nothing could be done as the lines were 'hard to see'. Whatever lines and markings we do end up with, they must be visible and I feel that resurfacing should come first.</p> <p>Finally as a member of St Saviour's congregation, while I do deplore the terrible pavement parking by commuters in Sandpit Lane from the end of Walton Street, including the Bus Stop, to the front of the Church (and wonder why nothing is ever done about these illegally parked cars), I am anxious for there to be provision for parking for those coming to funerals and other services, perhaps for a maximum of two hours only, as the car park is really not big enough, rather than the proposed double yellow lines along this stretch.</p>
448	Park Avenue	<p>Multi-signed letter by 25. Our main concern, however, is safety. We experience directly the problems and the dangers generated by our proximity to Verulam School. Over a thousand pupils walk, cycle or are driven to school each day. The commuter traffic approaching Park Avenue, looking for parking, would clash, in the morning in particular and potentially dangerously, with the school traffic in its various forms. Park Avenue is accessed from Brampton Road and Jennings Road, both roads where there is a concentration of school traffic.</p> <p>Under the current arrangements, parents of Verulam pupils use Park Avenue in the morning and afternoon (during permitted parking times) to deliver their children to and collect them safely from the school. Whilst this can be inconvenient for residents of Park Avenue, we accept that this arrangement is an important contribution to the safety of the area as it reduces the pressure of through traffic and chaotic parking in Brampton Road at the beginning and end of the school day. Commuter parking in Park Avenue would prevent or clash with this safe option.</p> <p>We feel the cost of parking for one day's commuter parking at £2.90 will not serve as a deterrent. Indeed, it compares very favourably with a return bus fare. The consequence will be two-fold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Commuters will prefer to park in our streets at significantly less than half price than use the station car parks, designed for the purpose.</li> <li>2. Those commuters who have found alternative, and in many cases environmentally friendly ways, of reaching the station — bus, cycle, on foot — will return to using their cars. This will completely reverse the progress made by the current scheme in its aim to improve the quality of the environment.</li> </ol>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
449	Park Avenue	<p>If the council wishes to look after commuters from outside St Albans then the answer must be to provide for more and cheaper parking at the station. If the rail companies benefit from the commuter traffic, then they should pay for this not the St Albans' residents.</p> <p>Other options practiced in many other commuter towns are to provide efficient and affordable Park and Ride solutions.</p> <p>As part of the residence association we counted empty spaces at the Station car park, unbelievably there were over 300 spaces available on a normal Tuesday morning.</p> <p>The only reason can be that commuters would rather walk 20 minutes to the station than pay the daily £8 charge. Surely there is a calculation that says it would be better for the council to reduce the income at the station if that alleviates the current furore and work you now have to undertake, trying to redress a plan that was expensive to implement in the first place and is working.</p>
450	Lancaster Road	<p>I would also encourage you to reduce the length of the restricted period. The main purpose of the scheme has to be to improve traffic flow and safety by reducing commuter parking. The fact that there were no traffic flow or safety issues before the implementation of the Ladder Roads Scheme led to increased commuter parking on Lancaster Road means that it is commuter parking that has caused the problems. A one hour restricted period would be just as effective at preventing commuter parking as a two hour period, but would cause less inconvenience to residents.</p> <p>As mentioned above, a charge of £2.70 to allow commuters to park for the whole day simply will not deter commuter parking when it costs more than £7 per day to park in the station car parks. The commuters who currently park on Lancaster Road will need to park somewhere, so they will choose the cheapest location as close to the station as possible. This means that they are likely to continue to park on Lancaster Road, but will accept the increased costs of commuting (largely because they have no other option). Gary explained that the Council cannot impose a charge that is higher than other Council car parking charges in the area and I accept that. However, you do need to appreciate that a daily charge of £2.70 (which can be paid remotely by telephone from the commuters' desks in London) will not reduce commuter parking on Lancaster Road. Unless you have proper evidence to the contrary, I would say that it is very naïve to think otherwise.</p>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
451	Woodstock Road North	<p>I believe that this will result in significant problems for residents, road users including pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a result of the current Ladder Road regulations there has been a significant increase in the number of cars parked in Woodstock Road North (WRN), mainly cars used by Verulam School pupils and commuters;</li> <li>• The introduction of “Pay to Park” for non-residents and “Shared” parking for residents with the extension of the proposed parking restrictions for the Ladder Roads South of Sandpit Lane and the introduction of parking restrictions to the roads North of Sandpit Lane will lead to an increase in both part-time and all-day car parking in WRN;</li> <li>• School pupils with cars can easily circumvent the parking restriction 11.00 -13.00 by moving their cars to Homewood Road or pay for all-day parking;</li> <li>• In addition to the above the introduction of parking restrictions – parking for Residents Only in Woodstock Road South will lead to a significant increase in all-day parking in WRN by owners, employees and customers of the shops restaurants and businesses in Fleetville;</li> <li>• WRN is a busy throughout route for Schools, the Morrisons Supermarket and local shops in the Fleetville area. At School starting and closing times there are queues of cars throughout the length of WRN from the Jennings Road intersection to the major junction of WRN, Sandpit Lane and Homewood Road.</li> </ul>
452	Homewood Road	<p><b>Concerns about the impact of the proposals</b></p> <p>I am concerned that the proposal as drafted appears to omit Homewood Road from the restrictions. The inconsistent treatment of Homewood Road compared to other neighbouring streets, I believe will result in a significant amount of displaced cars choosing to park on the south end of Homewood Road (as closer to the school and railway line). This will exasperate the parking issues by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increasing the volume of parked cars on Homewood Road</li> <li>- increasing instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking as they are fewer/ no other free parking options close by</li> <li>- increasing congestion and reducing the number of places to pass</li> <li>- reducing visibility at road junctions and property entrances;</li> </ul> <p>which will further diminish safety at this already dangerous junction, and, I believe, significantly increase the chances of a fatality at this junction.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
453	Homewood Road	<p>The proposal will restrict parking in the great majority of streets bounded by Sandpit Lane, Marshalswick Lane and Sandridge Road, but it will not restrict parking on Homewood Rd. Restricting parking in essentially all neighbouring streets will significantly increase parking on Homewood Rd.</p> <p>This will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking</li> <li>- Increase congestion</li> <li>- reduce visibility at road junctions and property entrances</li> <li>- make the road less safe</li> </ul> <p>As a parent of a 5 year old and a 7 year old child, I am particularly concerned about the impact on road safety.</p> <p>This includes the impact on the dangerous junction between Homewood Road and Sandpit Lane, which is already a difficult and accident-prone junction, especially at times of excessive street parking due to events at the United Reform Church. Increasing parking, particularly at this end of Homewood Rd, will make this issue even more common.</p> <p>Please amend the scheme so as to treat Homewood Road consistently compared to the other neighbouring roads.</p>
454	Clarence Road	<p>The proposed new changes appear to be encouraging commuters to return to parking in our streets. This seems absurd.</p> <p>Our main concerns are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed parking fee of £2.90 is too low to deter commuters – given the scarcity of free parking in the vicinity of the station, this is a relative bargain. Perhaps the fee should be closer to the daily fee of £7 or higher which is charged by the official station car parks? Those parking in our streets will be benefitting from an almost identical facility.</li> <li>2. The term “shared use parking” will in reality mean “first come first served” which will in effect mean commuters who arrive early and stay all day – leaving no space for visitors or trades vehicles. A measure such as: “Maximum stay three hours. No return within [for example] four hours” or similar, may help here.</li> <li>3. We are concerned that unless the area is patrolled daily by parking wardens, the parking will become “free” for many. Without tickets on display, who would know?</li> </ol> <p>Finally, while we agree that parking restrictions need to be extended to the streets which are now suffering what we used to suffer – such as Charmouth Road, Faircross Way and The Park – we would prefer to retain the current scheme on Jennings Road and Clarence Road. Extending restrictions might encourage commuters to use the ample parking facilities available at the station.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
455	The Park	<p>Logically there should be more and cheaper parking provided at the station itself.</p> <p>The proposed pay by phone charge is too low to deter people from parking all day in hitherto peaceful and uncluttered residential roads.</p> <p>The addition of parking lines and notices will act as an invitation to park.</p> <p>The Park in particular is well-known as a quiet and good-looking road and as one of the best in St Albans. It has always been enjoyed by residents and other locals for its comparative openness and greenness, being used by walkers, dog-walkers, runners, young families and the elderly as a pleasant place to take a breath of air.</p> <p>The parking of many additional cars will add to the blight of pollution from petrol and diesel fumes and from noise (adding to that already caused by learner drivers), thus threatening the amenity that people rely on for a bit of peace.</p> <p>The imposition of yellow and white parking lines and parking notices will destroy the attractiveness of the road and alter its character for good.</p> <p>The presence of parked cars will inconvenience residents and others by restricting visibility at drive entrances and reducing space for visitors and service vehicles.</p>
456		<div> <div> <p>I support extension to the area covered by the scheme but object to plans to introduce a Paid Parking element, especially not in my road. I attended the open day event and my comments below reflect my subsequent concerns.</p> <p>Prior to first introduction of the present Ladder Roads residential parking scheme it was my observation that the majority of the daily (non-residential) parking in this area was from St Albans train station commuters<sup>1</sup>. It was clearly not reasonable to expect Ladder Roads residents to tolerate excess parking and to suffer the disruption this caused<sup>2</sup>. Consequently (in part) and after a survey, the local authority introduced the presently used residential parking scheme. This scheme with it's in-built timings to discourage all day parking has worked well - except where it has moved the problem on to other areas, causing those residents to complain in turn. Now the authority proposes to extend the scheme (which I support) but also to reverse direction by introducing an open-to-all telephone payment system (which I do not support).</p> <p>As I understand it (from the open day), a commuter could in effect acquire all day parking simply by paying for two hours just prior to the zone limitation coming into effect for that day (eg 11:00-13:00 as posted outside my house). The effective daily rate achieved by paying for just the period defined in the zone would be approximately half the daily rate levied by the commercial parking operator at the station itself. It is this element that I do not support, because by setting a low daily rate it encourages car use above other forms of transport - where it should instead be discouraged.</p> </div> <div> <p>Parking allocation is probably one of the few methods the local authority to align with the County transport vision. Failure to take this opportunity lays open a clear route for action by Green/Climate Emergency Groups and possible crowd-funded residents. For the local authority such actions would become both expensive, protracted and disruptive.</p> <p>No doubt the council may have other objectives in proposing a payment system. For example I imagine it might be called upon to allow house renovation or social care visits. However, such can be dealt with under the present voucher system without introducing the massive disadvantage a return of semi-permanent commuter parking will inevitably bring. Indeed I am not personally aware of any other areas where both residential and pay-by-phone parking are combined.</p> <p>It is my opinion that the allocation of on-street residential roads for commuter parking should be enabled only as a last resort. As a resident, I should expect, at minimum, an analysis of the benefits <i>to residents</i> of the proposal. How do proposed charges compare with local commercial parking rates? Bearing in mind the value of property in this area, how do the proposed charges relate to the neighbourhood value of the land that will be occupied by parking?</p> <p>I could see the benefit to me of the existing scheme, I see no benefit to me if a pay-by-phone element is now added. What is the point of a <i>residential</i> parking scheme that is also open to any non-resident who can use a mobile phone? More generally I ask – what is the purpose of the road running past my house, if not to allow clear movement for all types of traffic? Why does the local authority appear willing to use my road as a semi-permanent secondary parking space and income stream? If it is purely for the money then let us see the analysis based on a fully commercial (and discouraging) daily rate, in line with the County visions above</p> </div> </div>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
456		<p>Arguably this new element is contrary to the objectives set out within the <b>Hertfordshire County Transport Plan</b> and the <b>Hertfordshire Climate Emergency Declaration</b> (July 2019). Quoting directly from the Executive Summary of the former we see:</p> <p><b>“The overall approach to transport</b>  This plan accelerates the transition from a previous transport strategy that was largely car based to a more balanced approach which caters for all forms of transport and seeks to encourage a switch from the private car to sustainable transport (e.g. walking, cycling and passenger transport) wherever possible.”</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>“Travel behaviour change will be encouraged through various initiatives but crucially this will need to be supported where appropriate by a greater emphasis on demand management, such as with the development of plans to constrain car use through parking charges and supply.”</p> <hr/> <p>1 Around me there was also parking related to Verulum School (mainly I think, from 6<sup>th</sup> form students) but this was transitory. Near Hatfield Rd there must also be some parking by shoppers and businesses which could be dealt with by a limited waiting time allowance.</p> <p>2 At peak time, try cycling along a road where cars are parked on both sides. Also I have seen a local woman being verbally abused by a delivery driver while she tried to find a parking slot near her home.</p> <p>I suggest that as more house building takes place the demand for train station related parking will also rise. But the capability of the Ladder Roads to accommodate this demand is clearly finite so we need a longer term plan. Where is this plan?</p> <p>The present proposal undervalues the land being used and undercuts commercial providers - who should by now be fully engaged on the problem. Moreover it discourages the establishment of new sustainable transport, including bus routes. And why would anyone go by bus or bike, when driving and parking one’s own car is not only safer but also only marginally more expensive? Have comprehensive and targetted discussions taken place between the council and commercial parking/transport providers – where are the results and what are the out-turn plans?</p> <p>Without analysis and open discussion it is not reasonable to treat the residential Ladder Roads as an unlimited and uncontrolled extension to train station parking. Withdraw the non-residential on-demand paid parking element of the proposal. If the authority believes the situation to be not as I describe above – then residents need a better explanation as to how it will work for them.</p>
457	Woodstock Road North	<p><b>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on your latest proposal dated 17 January 2020. I am trying to look at the proposals from everybody’s point of view but my main personal concerns are about the restrictions in Woodstock Road North , which I think will increase dangers to all road users.</b></p> <p><b>My reasons are as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The junction of Woodstock Road North with Sandpit Lane must be one of the most dangerous crossings in St. Albans, having been the scene of many accidents over the years. At peak times there is a build up of traffic in both roads. In order to keep the traffic flowing in WRN there is a queue of cars, often past 47 WRN, acting responsibly to let cars through the ‘chicane’ to go south. This of course blocks exits or makes dangerous situations .</b></li> <li>• <b>The introduction of “Pay to Park” for non-residents and “Shared” parking for residents with the extension of the proposed parking restrictions for the Ladder Roads South of Sandpit Lane and the introduction of parking restrictions to the roads North of Sandpit Lane will lead to an increase in both part-time and all-day car parking in WRN;</b></li> <li>• <b>The charge that is proposed for Shared parking is insignificant in comparison with other city parking rates and would be likely to encourage <b>more</b> all day parking in purple zones.</b></li> <li>• <b>In addition to the above the introduction of parking restrictions – parking for Residents Only in Woodstock Road South will lead to a significant increase in all-day parking in WRN by owners, employees and customers of the shops restaurants and businesses in Fleetville;</b></li> <li>• <b>WRN is a busy throughout route for Schools, the Morrisons Supermarket and local shops in the Fleetville area. In fact it is a ‘rat run’, where cyclists and pedestrians are often put in perilous situations.</b></li> </ul>
458	Salisbury Avenue	<p><b>I would therefore strongly urge that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Salisbury Avenue is included in the current proposals to restrict uncontrolled parking before the remainder of the Zone P proposals are implemented.</b></li> <li>• <b>Measures be taken to prevent the other aspect of this problem in there being be a substantial increase in verge parking which will (and has already) destroyed the grass verges in Salisbury Avenue (as opposite 2 Salisbury Avenue) and that measures taken to prevent such activity as the installation of “double height” kerbs.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>I trust my comments will be taken into account in the current consultation.</b></p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
459	Woodstock Road South	<p>However, we are not happy with many of the proposals in the consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plans will place double yellow lines outside our house and that of our neighbour at number ■. We have lived here since the 1960s and there have been no safety concerns about parking here and it will mean 2-3 parking spaces lost in this part of the street. In addition, please note that we are elderly and have difficulties walking any distance and are seeking help to obtain a disabled parking bay outside our house.</li> <li>A further 5 spaces are also being removed in the street (outside ■) - there is no safety reason for this and this will put more pressure on an already crowded street</li> <li>Another two parking spaces are being removed outside ■ Woodstock Road North - again there is no safety issue and this will put pressure on the parking situation</li> <li>Double and single yellow lines are proposed in Woodstock Road North - this will further reduce car parking for those in Woodstock Road South as we frequently have to park in Woodstock Road South because of the parking pressure in our own road.</li> <li>The proposals will mean that we cannot park in Woodstock Road North because it will be in a different parking zone. Residents in Woodstock Road South should be able to park in Woodstock Road North because of the pressure on spaces in our road. The availability of parking in Brampton Road will not cope with the overflow from our road.</li> <li>The proposed public parking in Woodstock Road North will be a problem as it is close enough to the station that the cheap parking will attract many commuters and place more pressure on resident parking.</li> </ul>
460	Eaton Road	<p>We, the residents of Eaton Road, have signed our names below to request that, based on the most recent proposals (letter to residents dated 17th January 2020) re. the new proposed parking permit scheme on Woodstock Road North and South, Arthur Road, Royal Road and Burnham Road, we become part of the permit scheme so Eaton Road also becomes residential permit parking only, in line with the surrounding residential roads.</p> <p>Petition signed by 19 properties</p> <p>We request this on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plans will have a significantly detrimental impact on our ability to park our cars on our road and surrounding roads (if we do not have permits we cannot park on their roads but they are able to park on ours and for some this will be nearer to their houses than permitted areas).</li> <li>The parking on Eaton Road has already been significantly impacted by the current parking restrictions that were put in place last year. We know this because the availability of places to park on Eaton Road significantly increases at the weekends, when there are no commuters or school traffic parking on the road.</li> <li>An increase in traffic due to drivers looking for non-permitted spaces to park is already apparent on Eaton Road. This will only increase, adding further concern to safety including vehicles using Eaton road as a cut through, of which many drive far too fast. This is a safety concern as not only are there lots of young children living Eaton Road but also because it is a known route for children to walk to school. Eaton road is constantly full with parked cars either side, which allows only one car to pass at a time. There is nowhere for cars to pull in causing increased road rage and cars having to reverse the entire length of the road. These incidents create congestion, which will only increase if there are more cars trying to park. Eaton Road is narrow and on several occasions residents' cars have been clipped by other drivers, in particular on the corner with Salisbury Avenue. These incidents will increase as a result of increased traffic looking for parking.</li> </ul>



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
461	Not Provided	<p>Churchill Road is used as access to Verulam School by parents and the School bus but current plans would create a road with effectively a 'single' lane of traffic which could cause issues. Think of the dangers to young pedestrians and cyclists mixed with cars moving out of driveways with poor sight lines. There is a need for a clear road for the school pupils/ staff /buses/coaches which use Churchill Road and for emergency vehicles. There is a need for space for pick up and drop off before and after school, Jennings Road is a nightmare at drop off and pick up time.</p> <p>Two sided parking will make Churchill Road, Jennings Road and others into a one way streets, especially at drop off/pick up times.</p> <p>I am concerned that if I was to go out early in the morning (in my car that is parked on the street) by the time I returned later I would not be able to park in the road despite having had to pay for residents parking.</p> <p>The feel the consensus is that residents do not like the proposals, but maybe we should take some element of the station/school parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• but not so much that we cannot safely get in or out of own driveways</li> <li>• those without off road parking have a reasonable chance of accessing residents parking that they have paid for, whatever time of day</li> <li>• the roads do not become dangerous single track rat runs.</li> </ul>
462	Eaton Road	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>With all the changes in the <u>Ladder Rd</u> parking scheme of late surely it must be the case that <u>EATON RD</u> be included in this process as parking and traffic flow is already extremely difficult.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely H Chapman</p>
463	Burnham Road,	<p>I have read your letters and read its contents, there is no mention of whether People with their disability are exempt from this plan or not?</p> <p>I am 81 years of with severe disabilities. I hardly can walk 20 yards at times. I have disability badge and I have Disability Bay in front of my house. Will I be exempted from my parking charge or not.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
464	Gurney Court Road	<p>We welcome the proposals to attempt to restrict parking in Marshalswick South and to prevent parking completely at road corners and serious traffic hazard points by the introduction of double yellow lines. Our especial concerns were the Sandpit Lane end of Gurney Court Road and outside St Saviours Church on Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>We attended the open forum on Saturday 1 February where many of our queries were clarified, but we came away with a little bit of confusion about the single yellow lines. It seemed to be possible to park on these at any time and even between the hours of 11.00 and 1.00 on Mondays - Fridays provided you held a parking permit – or paid for a permit by telephone. Other residents attending the forum seemed similarly confused and voiced the concern that a commuter could park on a single yellow then telephone from their office to cover the restricted hours and thereby all day unrestricted parking remains. If this is the case then nothing much will change in our congested double parked roads.</p> <p>I hope when the decision is made to put the scheme into effect that this loophole, if indeed we are correct, is eliminated.</p>
465	The Park	<p>I was very pleased to meet with you on Saturday afternoon at the Civic Centre where I was extremely impressed with your answers to a number of questions from a variety of different people who were concerned about the parking. I thought you dealt with this extremely professionally.</p> <p>I wish for you to know that I entirely agree with your views of spreading the parking pain with regard to the Station over the northern roads from Hatfield Road up to Beech Road.</p> <p>I do however believe that you, the Council, will struggle to get both the residents and the Councillors to agree but I hope you can achieve this.</p> <p>I do believe you should place more of the emphasis on the residents' parking than you are doing at this time but in my view you are quite correct.</p> <p>I do hope a decision is made well before the year's timescale you were indicating.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
466	Not Provided	<p>THIS ACCOMPANIES A PETITION SIGNED BY 80 RESIDENTS, COLLECTED OVER A SHORT PERIOD IN THE WEEK ENDING 2/2.</p> <p>THERE WAS A 100% RESPONSE IN FAVOUR OF MARSHALS DRIVE BEING INCLUDED IN WHATEVER RESTRICTIONS ARE ULTIMATELY AGREED, WITH A CLEAR MAJORITY IN FAVOUR OF A TWO HOUR "RESIDENTS ONLY" PARKING RESTRICTION IN THE MIDDLE IF THE DAY. ABOVE ALL ELSE THE VAST MAJORITY AGREED THAT IF THE DRIVE IS LEFT WITH LESS RESTRICTIONS THAN, SAY, CHARMOUTH OR GURNEY COURT ROADS, THE RESULT WAS LIKELY AN UNACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF DISPLACED PARKING.</p> <p>MARSHAL'S DRIVE IS ALREADY USED AS A FREE CAR PARK AT ONE END BY VEHICLES FROM THE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ADJACENT TO THE REFUSE TIP, AND AT THE OTHER FOR WORKERS FROM THE QUADRANT. THE BUS WHICH TRAVELS UP CHARMOUTH ROAD ONTO THE TOP END OF MARSHALS DRIVE ALREADY EXPERIENCES DIFFICULTIES, PARTICULARLY AT BUSY TIMES, AS IT TRIES TO TURN ONTO THE DRIVE....</p> <p>HOPEFULLY THE MESSAGE FROM THE RESIDENTS OF MARSHALS DRIVE IS CLEAR – PLEASE INCLUDE OUR ROAD IN WHATEVER RESTRICTIONS YOU ULTIMATELY DECIDE AS MOST SUITABLE.</p> <p>THANK YOU</p>
467	Lancaster Road	<p>I refer to your letter of 17<sup>th</sup> January and the proposals for dealing with some of the parking problems that are blighting the city.</p> <p>We, that is my wife and I are happy with your scheme as detailed in the diagrams that accompanied your letter. However, there does seem to be a hole with respect to vast stretches of Sandpit Lane. Apart from one small section between Lancaster Road and Gurney Court Road, it seems that parking will be allowed along Sandpit Lane. Is this the intension?</p> <p>The consultation meeting last week was informative. But while everyone seemed to want a parking system far too many people seemed to have objections if it inconvenienced them. I hope you will be able to push through your proposals expeditiously and implement the scheme quickly.</p>

Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
468	Park Avenue	<p>Please find below my response to the proposed changes to the current parking restrictions in Zone P2 area 2.</p> <p>The original scheme was installed to overcome the problem of vehicle overcrowding causing difficulties with resident accessing their own off street parking by restricting access to drives, safety problems to pedestrians and vehicles involved in dropping off and collection for schools, obstructions to through traffic.</p> <p>The proposal to charge £2.90 Pay-by-Phone for the 11;00 – 13.00 period may deter some but for most pay by phone from the office would be preferred with Station carpark at £8.20,£7.80 or £7.14 per day: depending on daily, weekly or monthly rate. Reducing the charges overall, or for extended term tickets could be beneficial.</p> <p>There are a large number of spare places on weekdays. Reducing the prices could improve the usage and maintain the revenue.</p> <p>I believe since a timetable reorganisation there are fewer London bound trains stopping at Harpenden, encouraging some to drive to St Albans. More stops at Harpenden could also improve the St Albans parking situation.</p> <p>I understand the problems for commuters but I’m sure the all Pay-by Phone 11:00-13:00 for Park Avenue would only return the area to the original chaotic situation necessitating further modifications to the scheme. We would prefer the scheme to remain as it is but accept that some places at the Brampton Rd end of Park Avenue could be made available if the station car park can be improved.</p>
469	Homewood Road	<p><b>Significant Safety Issues</b></p> <p>The junction, intersection between Sandpit Lane, Homewood Road and Woodstock Road North already has an appalling safety record and this proposal will make matters even worse because Homewood Road would be blocked up by displaced cars from Woodstock Road. Sensibly, there are already parking restrictions, double yellow lines on Woodstock Road North on both sides as you</p> <hr/> <p>approach the junction. The same should be implemented on Homewood Road. The road design is the same and, as such, so are the safety concerns. I have seen many cars damaged at this junction and even know one of the poor drivers who was impacted. Point 3 on page 2 states that a double yellow line review is in progress - can you ensure that this is captured for both consultations.</p>
470		



Rep. No.	Street Address	Comments
471	The Park	<p>The present review should consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/ Freeing up bus routes with parking allowed on only one side e.g. Chelmsmouth Road, especially between Faircross Way and Sandpit Lane junctions where frequent builders' delivery vehicles block bus access. (N.B. See existing or impending building projects likely to exacerbate this, with likely builders' parking spill-over into the nearby Curney Court Road / Sandpit Lane junction and surroundings.)</li> <li>Beyond zone P, Hatfield Road choke-point between Camp Road and the Cemetery causes routine congestion where traffic density can only increase with the building of more housing in the Docklands area.</li> <li>2/ Existing parking spaces taken up by abandoned vehicles, eg. Althorp Road and Lensford Road.</li> <li>3/ Safety with respect to obscured sight-lines for vehicular egress from eg. Althorpe Road, Avenue Road onto Lensford Road and from 31, Lensford Road where sightlines are routinely blocked by high-sided vehicles such as motor-caravans and commercials parked in the vicinity of the nearby hotel.</li> </ol>