

Appendix 2: Conversion of free to paid parking in St Albans:

Free Text and Email responses

- This appendix contains the consultation responses received in the feedback text portion of the public consultation for changes relating to St Albans between 25/07/24 and 22/08/24, as well as emails received by the council in response to the proposed changes within this period.
- Sensitive data has been redacted to protect the privacy of respondents, however some traceable information may still present. Please review this content with discretion and ensure compliance with confidentiality guidelines.

Contents

Table 1: Consultation feedback responses:.....	3
Table 2: Email responses.....	12

Table 1: Consultation feedback responses:

Feedback Text
I absolutely object to the proposed parking changes in York Road and lower Clarence Road. The current arrangements work well. 20 min parking slots there will create chaos on Brampton and the ladder roads – already heavily parked and frequently with traffic incidents as a result. I cannot think who would benefit from these proposed changes.
I am strongly against this. Park users and football fans will cause traffic chaos trying to find other places to park.
I am against these changes, in particular those changes in York Road. This change will limit the use of those wishing to use the Clarence Park weekdays, which is very popular with dog walkers, families with young children and those using the cricket, hockey, bowling and tennis facilities. I am not surprised that the parking controls have not been paying their way taking into account the costs the council will have incurred in setting up the large amount of controls we now have. My road (REDACTED) has had parking control signs and road markings added when we never had any parking issues on this road. This was pointed out at the time by various residents and I doubt much if any revenue can have been received by the council. Rather than having the cost of setting up and running parking schemes in residential roads out of the centre, why not simply let each road have its share of free parking. and use the carparks in the centre as a source of revenue.
I am making an objection to the proposed new parking charges for Zone G on this map, namely York Rd, (REDACTED). My family have lived in York Road for over 40 years and my parents are still residents here. Only in the last few years did you bring in residents permits and restrictions for the road, a measure that was largely unnecessary but perhaps reduced all day parking by rail commuters. However, this new proposal to charge for over 20 mins of parking is disgraceful. The major draw here being Clarence Park, used socially by so many families, dog walkers, people playing sports etc. You're essentially proposing a charge to enjoy the park which frankly I find immoral. I find it particularly mean that a community of lawn bowlers will be charged, a club largely made up of retirees. Having lived in this road for many years and now a frequent visitor I will be charged if I drive to visit my family. We love this park, we feel blessed to have had access to it for many many years, it has brought joy to many generations, but now you're saying if you come via car, it's going to cost you to use it. This isn't London, you don't have to charge for every last morsel of space, St Albans should be better than this, come on.

I am totally opposed to your proposals.

Clarence Park is a facility for recreation including childrens play and sporting activities. By making these changes you are discouraging residents who live a little way from the park from taking exercise.

The parking restrictions were originally introduced to stop commuters parking all day and making it difficult for residents to park. This has been achieved and changes are totally unnecessary.

It is totally wrong to charge for parking on Saturdays as it will affect players and supporters of local sports teams. All this will do is to cause people to park further away and no we should not extend restrictions on the ladder roads to Saturdays

I am writing to object to the constant chipping away at free parking within the St Albans district. In particular, I object to the proposed charges for Clarence and York roads adjacent to Clarence Park. As a resident, dog walker and frequent user of the park, I can attest to the fact that there are currently no problems being able to park on these roads under the terms of the current restrictions.. I can therefore, only see this (and all the other proposed new charges) as yet another cynical cash grab by the council. Where is the logic in introducing a set of charges to dissuade people driving to the park to enjoy (for a limited time window) the widely recognised health benefits of spending time and being active outdoors in green spaces? My conclusion, is that the motivation behind these charges can only be to raise more revenue to address the significantly escalating costs found elsewhere in the budget e.g. Housing costs for the Homeless

I do not support the proposals relating to York Road (marked as 'G' on consultation) in St Albans and Central Harpenden.

York Road, St Albans:

York Road parking is not in high demand during week days.

I make use of the bays every week day to take my kids to Alban City School as part of school drop-off and pick-up; I know of other parents who do the same for Alban City School, Verulam School and Maple School (and possibly other primary schools). This allows me to have a short drive from home to York Road and a 15 minute walk to school. I have never seen more than 30% of the bays used and in most cases there are just a handful of cars. The proposed 20 minutes is far too short a time - to be able to drop my children I would require at least 40 minutes at drop off (Alban city has a soft start policy whereby parents can stay with their children for up to 20 mins at the start of the day) and 40mins-1 hour at pick up. I therefore won't be able to park for free for our school run which Helen Campbell said should still be possible.

I often see dog walkers using these parking places, I am certain that 20 minutes would be too short for them also,

The impact of charging beyond the first 20 minutes will mean an increase in our use of central St Albans car parks, contributing to extra traffic in the town centre and a reduction my active travel, and the activity of my children by walking as if we have to pay for parking we would instead use car parks nearer the centre of St Albans.

If the proposals are implemented, this will mean us incurring over £900 each year.

Headlines:

Parking on York Road during weekdays is in far less demand than weekends.

Parents and carers will not be able to drop their kids off at school in 20 minutes and so will incur substantial cost over the year, increase demand on central parking, increase traffic and decrease wellbeing. As a minimum free parking should not be less than 1 hour, ideally 2 hours

Harpenden high street parking:

The proposals are likely to have a damaging impact upon lost revenue for shops. Analysis needs to be shared as part of the consultation on likely impact before a decision is made.

I do not support the proposals relating to York Road (marked as 'G' on consultation) in St Albans and Central Harpenden.

York Road, St Albans:

York Road parking is not in high demand during week days. The decision regarding this should account for there being a distinct difference with demand at weekends.

I make use of the bays every week day to take my kids to Alban City School as part of school drop-off and pick-up; I know of other parents who do the same. The proposed 20 minutes is far too short a time – I require at least 40 minutes. I therefore won't be able to park for free for our school run which Helen Campbell said should still be possible.

The impact of charging beyond the first 20 minutes will mean an increase in our use of central St Albans car parks and reduce our active travel by walking far less to and from school.

If the proposals are implemented, this will mean us incurring over £900 each year.

Headlines:

Parking on York Road during weekdays is in far less demand than weekends. The proposals must account for this difference rather than a broad brush approach.

Parents and carers will not be able to drop their kids off at school in 20 minutes and so will incur substantial cost over the year.

Harpenden high street parking:

The proposals are likely to have a damaging impact upon lost revenue for shops. Analysis needs to be shared as part of the consultation on likely impact before a decision is made.

I object to the charging for parking for more than 20 minutes in York Road and Clarence Road.

1- The current parking restrictions on York Road and Clarence Road seem to work fine. There is plenty of space for users of the sports and leisure facilities provided by the park and the fact that there is 2 hours free means it doesn't impose an unfair cost on families, dog walkers and sports players enjoying healthy pursuits in the park which the council surely wants to encourage.

2- The 2 hours free parking currently provided in this area gives people the opportunity to park here and go into town for shopping or school drop offs on foot - rather than clogging up the town centre with yet more traffic.

3- The current arrangements also make it much easier for carers and tradespeople to attend local residents properties without the need for visitor parking permits if it is just a brief attendance of up to 1 or 2 hours

I strongly disagree with the proposals concerning parking charges on Clarence Road and York Road. These will have a very negative impact on many users of Clarence Park, especially those with young children. Clarence Park is a popular community facility and it would be really disappointing for the council to discourage people from going there with hefty parking charges on surrounding roads. As explained below, I consider it inappropriate to use parking charges around a popular park as a way of promoting "active travel", which is cited as one of the main reasons for the changes, because active travel is not an option for many users of the park. The proposed charges, especially £5 for stays of just 1-2 hours, are so expensive that they will significantly reduce visitors to the park and will surely affect trade at Verdi's cafe significantly. The charges will also have a disproportionate impact on poorer families in the area, at a time when living costs are under pressure.

Clarence Park is used by many families, including my own, who have young children. For most St Albans residents who do not live very close to the park (i.e. further than a young child can walk there and back), a car is the only realistic way of getting to the park. We have a baby and a 4 year old and live on Watford Road – there is no viable bus option (especially with a pram and and bike/scooter that the 4 year old often wants to take) and obviously walking or cycling there is out of the question with children of that age. There is thus no realistic "active travel" option either and we need to use a car to get there. Most visits to the park take more than 60 minutes, especially if we have to park on York Road. Paying £5 for just 60-120 mins at the park is really expensive and will significantly reduce visits to the park with young children – it's a huge disincentive. This would obviously be bad for the physical and mental health of local residents, especially children. Since many users of the park cannot use active travel to get there, it is not appropriate to use parking charges around the park to encourage active travel. It clearly makes no sense from a health perspective to encourage active travel by disincentivising people from taking kids to a park and getting exercise.

Many people also use the sporting facilities in the park and need to park nearby with sports equipment. High parking charges will discourage use of these facilities and again have a negative impact on physical and mental health of residents. The proposed 2 hour cap on parking stays is also problematic. Clarence Park is used for many parties and gatherings, especially in summer, meaning people often want to stay for more than 2 hours. It will be highly inconvenient for visitors to have parking stays capped at 2 hours and this will discourage people from using the park for such gatherings. Many people who use the sporting facilities in the park will also struggle with the 2 hour cap. I cannot see that there is a need for a time

cap, but if there is one, it should be at least 3 hours.

Finally, the proposed charges are very expensive – £2.50 for just 20–60 mins and £5 for 60–120 mins. This is wholly inappropriate around a park, which is a community facility used by many children and families, not all of whom are well off. The council should not be disincentivising use of these facilities in this way. I urge you not to impose any of these parking charges, but if you do go ahead, much lower charges would be appropriate – probably no more than around half the charges that are proposed.

Thank you for considering my feedback.

I wholly object to the plans to introduce parking charges and time caps on the roads surrounding Clarence Park. I live the other side of St Albans (near the King Harry) and have a 15 month old and a 4 year old. Clarence Park is a frequent destination for us, as it is a wonderful facility where they love to play, and where we often meet other friends. We have no option but to drive, as the journey is around an hour to walk each way, and public transport is not a viable option with the pram, bike, scooter, picnic, and all the other things we have to lug around with two small children! I note that I have also been turned away from buses on multiple occasions when travelling across St Albans with the pram, as if there is already another pram (or wheelchair etc.) on the bus then there simply isn't room. When possible, we park in the car park itself, and I acknowledge and appreciate the 3 hour free parking which is available there. However the car park is almost always full, and so we often end up parking on York Road and walking into the park from that entrance. I have never had a problem finding a space on York Road, even on busy summer days. I object both to the plans to introduce parking charges, which at £5 for anything over 60 minutes is extortionate, and also the plans to introduce a time cap, as 2 hours means that Clarence Park would no longer be a viable option for many events that it is used for (sure, 2 hours is fine for a visit to the playground, but if you're having a playdate with other children, hosting a picnic, etc then it just isn't long enough). I strongly believe that the time cap on parking should be scrapped altogether, and that it should remain free to park on local roads such as York Road. If parking charges must be introduced for local roads, then prices should not be so prohibitive as to discourage people from using the park (which would be the case at £5 for 61 minutes!).

On football match days, the local roads become very congested with those trying to attend the football match. By introducing paid parking on York Road, more people will choose to park on surrounding roads, making it very difficult for local residents and the safety of young children.

I also have children at Grasshoppers Day Nursery on York Road and 20 minutes isn't sufficient for picking up, to allow for feedback and to pick up multiple children. This again will mean people park further from the nursery.

The changes adjacent to Clarence Park serve only to restrict access to one of the green spaces in the town. Residents should not be forced to pay even more to access outside green spaces.

The proposal regarding area G and H in this consultation is wholly unnecessary. The present arrangements appear to work well, having been determined after extensive consultation and amendment just 4 years ago.

The introduction of charges for almost all likely use of these currently free to use bays will inconvenience those who make regular use of Clarence Park (an activity to be promoted and welcomed); residents' budgets are stretched, as well as the Council's! The likely consequence is either a reduction in use of the Park, or displacement of parking to nearby roads which are not part of these proposals - to the inconvenience of the residents and their visitors/tradesmen. Neither of these outcomes is desirable.

It seems that these proposals (at least in areas G and H) are nothing more than an attempt to increase parking income (as referred to in the consultation) - while ignoring the interests of those directly affected. There is NO operating benefit to be gained - and much to lose.

The proposals to introduce parking charges on York Road and around Clarence Park are a scandal. Councillors should be encouraging residents to use recreation areas, not force them away.

You have already prevented a lot of Senior Citizens from having a paid parking permit and also significantly increased parking charges. I aim to find a space with no car either side to protect my car. In Drovers Way and Russell Street, I rarely now have to go up to level three and never to level four even on market days. The lack of people coming to the centre has a knock-on effect on businesses.

These proposals are fit for only one place; the rubbish bin.

The proposed changes are not needed, so far as residents and park users are concerned. The present arrangements work well. If implemented, the proposals for York Road and Clarence Road will have the effect of:

- inconveniencing local residents - we will be obliged to buy more coupons for visitors, tradespeople etc. if off-street parking is not available at our homes
- promoting parking "over-spill" into the surrounding roads, which are already under pressure e.g. the "Ladder Roads"
- discouraging visitors to the park - having to pay a £2.50 per hour hardly promotes use of the park by wider St Albans residents
- penalising many users of the park who have no choice but to drive to Clarence Park - the elderly, the infirm, the handicapped - this is hardly "inclusive"
- penalising the less well-off - each time they visit the park they'll incur a £2.50 charge - again, hardly inclusive, and discriminatory against the less well-off members of our community
- discriminating against parents with small and school-age children - 20 minutes is certainly not enough time for parents to drop-off their children at the local schools
- inconveniencing visitors to the many sports clubs in the park, many of whom have no choice but to drive - for example, visitors to the FC, the Cricket Club, etc..
- damaging local businesses - park users and visitors will hardly want to linger in the area (e.g. to buy a coffee etc.) if they face an effective £2.50 "surcharge" each time they visit

I'm curious about the councillor's description of the parking "services" here in St Albans. What possible "service" are you providing by charging park users and residents (and their visitors) to park in the street? This proposal is nothing more than another exercise in extracting cash from local residents and park users, with no regard to the wider impact on the environment, those visiting and using the park, and local residents.

There is nothing wrong with the present arrangements at Clarence Road and York Road. Please do not implement these proposals.

There are few free to park spaces left in St Albans for 1 or 2 hours - these latest proposals are yet another deterrent from using the town centre for shopping as parking charges are way too high. This is killing our town centre and is a tax on car

owners to raise money for the council. The town centre will get used less and less and eventually turn more and more residential. This will affect businesses as I certainly won't now come into St Albans to shop as the parking charges are ridiculous. 20 mins free parking is of no use unless it is outside shops and roads like York Road and the area around Clarence Park it would take 20 mins to walk into the town centre. I agreed with stopping it being free parking all day, but you need to retain free 1 and 2 hour parking to help support the town centre

York Road never is busy with cars during the week, use it constantly with my daughter to go to the park and playground. This restricts access to the park for parents as 20 minute is not enough to get into the park and take children there! Then £2.50 is a lot to have to pay!

You've already killed the high Street now you want to extend further restrictions to impact the sport played at Clarence Park and put off families from using the outside space. You spend public money poorly so want to leach even more off of residents despite offering nothing for the constantly increasing council tax costs, parking permit costs and additional charges. I used to be proud to be born and bred in St Albans but now I'm embarrassed as the decisions the council make are a disgrace aimed to hurt residents just to line your own pockets.

Table 2: Email responses

Email Msg
<p>I object to plans (such as PPB/01) that would restrict parking around Clarence Park to a length of time longer than it would take to walk around the park and have a snack (e.g. less than one hour).</p> <p>Dear Madam or Sir,</p> <p>I wholly object to the proposals PPB/01 advertised on a lamp-post in York Road on 16th July (attached)</p> <p>The parking scheme in York Road was set up in consultation with local councillors, residents and local community stakeholders (Grasshoppers Nursery, St Albans Football Club, Verdis, St Albans Cricket Club) in order to offer the best of outcomes for all parties. The scheme, for example, was recently changed after one such consultation to exclude Saturdays from the restrictions to encourage shoppers to visit the City Centre and supporters of the football and cricket clubs, who will now be penalised by these proposed changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The changes will have precisely the opposite effect to the stated aim of encouraging Active Travel since parents with children attending City centre schools and shoppers are much more likely to simply drive into the City centre rather than have to pay for parking in York Road and then walk the last half mile. We see many children setting off for school from York Road in the morning. - Enforcement is not an issue in York Road or Clarence Road – there are spaces for everyone. Since commuters are deterred the parking spaces are used by park users, parents of children at local schools and people who want a pleasant walk to the City Centre for shopping, socialising and contributing to the livelihoods of many city centre businesses. - There is no need for Greater turnover of premium places due to the maximum stay provisions. The concept of 'premium places' in York Road or the lower end of Clarence Road is irrelevant. - 20 minute free parking sessions are nonsensical in the roads surrounding Clarence Park which provide vital overspill

parking for the tiny car park in the Park and provide the opportunity for people living on the outskirts of St Albans to choose to walk into the City centre and park in York Road.

The current parking regime around Clarence Park works well as it is

The Parking Review for the 'Ladder Roads, Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane) and original Zone P areas' was completed less than 4 years ago and, so far as we are aware, residents have been largely happy with the outcome of that review. Why then, after all the effort and Council officer time and resource spent on the last Review, does the Council consider that it is necessary to launch yet another parking consultation so soon after the last one?

The parking regime around Clarence Park works fine as it is – it provides parking for overspill from the Clarence Park car park, it enables parents of school children to park in York Road without charge and walk up to the town centre junior schools and back in the morning and afternoon (thereby reducing traffic and parking problems in the City centre and giving children daily exercise) and it allows residents to maintain the ability and space to have their visitors and workmen able to park nearby.

I do not see any reason for changing the current regime. The proposed changes will mean that available free parking will be massively reduced for Park users. The free parking spaces on Clarence Road and on the nearby 'Ladder Roads' (outside the hours of 11am – 1pm) will fill up quickly. This will result in many Park users having to park in York Road or at the lower end of Clarence Road (and pay either £2.50 for 1 hour or £5.00 for 2 hours) if they want to take their children to the playground, or take their dog for a walk in the Park (since the free 20 minute period will be insufficient). It will also deny residents in Clarence Road, Brampton Road and adjacent 'Ladder Roads' the opportunity to allow their visitors or tradesmen to park near their houses since the parking spaces in those roads will become rapidly filled with Park users who won't want to pay the charges in York Road.

The lack of parking restrictions on Saturdays in York Road works well for Park users, shoppers wishing to walk up to the City centre, and for St Albans Cricket Club and St Albans FC when they have matches. If parking restrictions are introduced on

Saturdays, all the people attending matches who have driven will be forced to clog up Clarence Road, Brampton Road and all surrounding roads, creating potentially dangerous road safety hazards with parking manoeuvres in busy roads.

All the signs were recently changed to exempt Saturdays from restrictions. Now the proposal is to change them all again at great expense to introduce restrictions on Saturdays. This is a ridiculous waste of time, money and resources which should instead be focussed on other more pressing issues, such as repairing and improving the 130 year old infrastructure of Clarence Park (fences, paths, trees).

Finally, introducing charges for parking on York Road for park users will disadvantage elderly visitors who do not have smart phones to pay or can handle complicated parking apps. It is also discriminatory towards single parents and parents of limited means who bring their children to play in the fantastic childrens playground in Clarence Park.

The plans to change the current parking arrangements around Clarence Park are totally unacceptable and I wholly object to the proposals.

As a resident of (REDACTED) for nearly 40 years I regard Clarence Park as a jewel in the crown of the Fleetville/Clarence area. This magnificent open space attracts many from the surrounding area to enjoy the facilities, the children's playground and to walk their dogs. To meet friends, have a coffee at Verdi's, watch the cricket, bowls or croquet or just sit and relax. A haven in the centre of a busy, bustling area.

A parking allowance of 2 hrs on the surrounding roads is perfect and appropriate. The residents parking scheme protects us from long-term parking and the car park is available for those who wish to stay longer or visit the Cricket Pavillion.

Changing free parking to 20mins only is outrageous and short-sighted - showing a lack of understanding of the way Clarence Park is used.

As a volunteer with Computer Friendly, a local, award winning charity, I have recently made arrangements to hold some courses at the newly refurbished Cricket Pavillion. These courses serve the local community and offer people who are rapidly

becoming digitally disenfranchised the opportunity to learn how to use tablets, phones and laptops. These people tend to be older, some with mobility problems, and parking nearby is vital to them. Being able to offer up to 3hrs free parking in the car park was a major factor in our decision to bring our courses to Clarence Park.

What will undoubtedly happen if these proposals go ahead is that those who have parked in York Road for a couple of hours will now fill the car park making it impossible for our clients to attend courses.

These proposals MUST be reconsidered and rejected.

I am writing to wholly object to the proposed changes to Clarence Park parking - reference PPB/01.

These changes appear to just be a money making exercise for the council and you should clearly state this rather than hiding behind environment reasons.

Rather than encouraging people to walk or cycle to the park as suggested it is just going to move cars to the rest of Clarence Road and the surrounding streets.

If you decide to go ahead with these changes then consideration needs to be given to making changes to the current parking restrictions on the remainder of Clarence Road to ensure cars aren't just moved from the perfectly adequate car park to the street making it difficult for residents and their visitors.

We would like to state that we wholly object to the proposals quoted in map reference PPB/01

We believe they will have a detrimental affect on parking in all the other surrounding roads .This will make traffic congestion worse together with pedestrian safety .

It will also dramatically reduce the amount of free parking near to Clarence park which has a very small car park anyway. We believe we should encourage people to use the park, not deter them.

The proposals will shift all the traffic further down Clarence, Brompton and other surrounding roads creating a very difficult situations where driveways get partially blocked ,our vision is obscured trying to get our own cars out from our driveways

and there will be more accidents .

We believe the existing set up works very well as it is, and wholly object to the new proposals

I am writing to wholly object to the proposals to limit the free parking in York Road and lower Clarence Road to 20 minutes.

I recently moved from St Albans to Harpenden and regularly meet up with local Saint Albans friends for dog walks in Clarence Park mid week which requires me to drive and park there. I cannot walk there and wouldn't take public transport there.

The current parking situation works fine, there is always a space to park in York Road and this enables me to have an active catch up with local friends, for a good hour dog walk.

Having read through the proposals, I do not agree with them. They don't make sense It wouldn't enable more activity from people as they would all just park in town instead of they need to pay. And 20 minutes is not long enough to have a decent walk in the park - going to the park itself encourages health and activity so limiting this to 20 minutes is actually counter-productive!

Thank you for your consideration,

I wholly object to the proposals of parking restrictions in York road.

I am writing to wholly object to the proposed changes to the parking restrictions on York Road, Clarence Road, and surrounding areas in St Albans. As a local resident and member of St Albans cricket club based in Clarence Park, I believe these changes will have a detrimental impact on our community for the following reasons:

Negative Impact on Park Users and Visitors: The proposed reduction in free parking time from 2 hours to 20 minutes is insufficient for visitors to Clarence Park, who often need more time for recreational activities. This will discourage park use and force visitors to either pay excessive fees or seek parking in already congested nearby roads. This would be particularly

relevant for children taking part in cricket training and matches at Clarence Park. The additional parking cost may deter some parents from bringing their children to play cricket, tennis, or other activities or making use of the children's playground.

Increased Congestion in Surrounding Roads: By limiting free parking hours in York Road and Clarence Road, park users, parents, and shoppers will likely park in nearby roads, such as Brampton Road and other 'Ladder Roads.' This will increase congestion and reduce available parking for local residents and visitors, potentially creating road safety hazards. This could also increase traffic into the town centre.

Detrimental to Local Residents and Families: The changes will adversely affect parents who park in York Road to walk their children to local schools. These parents contribute to reducing traffic and parking problems in the city centre. Imposing parking fees will likely lead them to drive directly into the city, contrary to the Council's goal of promoting Active Travel.

Unnecessary Disruption to an Effective Parking Regime: The current parking regime, reviewed and implemented less than four years ago, is working well for residents, park users, and visitors. It effectively balances the needs of the community, providing adequate parking without significant issues of enforcement or turnover. The proposed changes seem unnecessary and counterproductive.

Impact on Local Businesses and Weekend Activities: Introducing Saturday parking restrictions in York Road will negatively impact visitors to St Albans Cricket Club, St Albans FC, and local businesses, particularly on match days. This will lead to increased parking in residential roads, causing inconvenience and potential safety risks.

In summary, the current parking arrangements around Clarence Park effectively serve the needs of residents, park visitors, and the broader community. The proposed changes will only create unnecessary inconvenience, congestion, and potential safety issues, without delivering any meaningful benefits.

I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and retain the existing parking regime, which adequately meets the needs of our community.

Thank you for considering my objection.

I wholly object to the proposals as set out in the referenced parking consultation to change the restrictions on length of free duration to 20 minutes.

The proposed changes will mean increased traffic, footfall and parking on ladder roads surrounding the park. Especially to highlight on weekends, evenings and match days when these roads are already congested from park users and sports spectators.

I believe it is also at a disadvantage to residents in the area who enjoy the park, such as ourselves whom park there when visiting the park with older grandparents or small children who can't walk far, for a trip the playground or when wanting to have a shorter route into town for shopping or a coffee.

Re: proposed parking charges map reference PPB/01

I am writing to let you know that I wholly object to the proposals for parking charges for map reference PPB/01.

Yours faithfully,

Hi

I am writing to object to the changes to the currently free parking spaces outside Clarence park. This allows people to access the park. This is a right of the people of St Albans. Access to green spaces shouldn't be limited to those who live next to it or within walking distance.

Stop making st albans an insanely expensive place to live to just enjoy a park!!!

Some of us aren't rich.

We would like to wholly object to the new parking proposal for York Road.

The current system of free parking for 2 hours is working perfectly well and seems fair and just exactly as it is. We can not understand why it needs to be changed. The current arrangement allows park users to use all the wonderful park facilities. It allows parents to park and walk their kids to school and residents to park outside the centre and walk into town. It prevents commuters parking their cars on York road all day, taking up spaces for park users. It allows us as residents to have visitors, without the need to pay for parking permits.

If this proposal goes ahead park users will simply avoid paying for parking in York Road and start parking in nearby roads instead, so you will be merely pushing the traffic elsewhere.

We urge you to not go ahead with this proposal

Dear Sir,

Parking consultation Clarence Road/York Road ref PPB/01

I wish to wholly object to the proposals.

The proposed changes will be detrimental for anyone wishing to use Clarence Park and its facilities, including families, dog-walkers, and people playing or watching sport. Not everyone who uses the Park has the benefit of living within walking distance of the Park and the Park's dedicated car park is tiny. The current parking arrangements have worked well since they were drawn up after the last consultation 4 years ago and they allow a greater number of people to use the Park. Limiting the parking slots to a maximum of 2 hours will just shift the parking from new paying roads to all other free roads around Clarence Park, including ladder roads. This will then completely clog up available space for residents to park by their houses in spaces they have already paid for with permits.

Whoever has designed these proposals simply does not understand how Clarence Park is used and by whom. The new proposals will actively discourage residents of St Albans from using this valuable outside space as it will either be too time-restrictive for them to park or too expensive for many, especially for families. This is directly opposed to one of Council's stated aims of discouraging 'active travel' as it will make it too difficult and expensive for many Park users to come to use the Park, so they will stay at home instead. Exactly the opposite of what the Council intends. It will have little or no impact on encouraging people to walk or cycle into the city centre as the parking spaces are currently used by people wishing to use the Park and its facilities, not by people using the city centre. A 20 minute free slot is of off little use or relevance here – Clarence Park is not a business!

These new Saturday parking restrictions in York Road will mean that football club supporters will not now be able to park in York Road for a Saturday afternoon and will clog up all surrounding roads and local residents' driveways as they look for somewhere to park.

There was a major parking consultation a few years ago for York Road, Clarence Road and ladder roads that seems to have worked well and local people seem happy with it. There is no demand at all from local residents to now change this, so please do not go ahead with a scheme that will not yield the benefits you expect from it.

I object wholly to this proposed scheme in its entirety.

Parking consultation map reference PPB/01

I object completely to all proposals in the parking consultation PPB/01 regarding York Road and Clarence Road, St Albans. The current parking arrangements agreed in past consultations work well as they are now.

By introducing these expensive 'pay for' parking zones, it will simply means those two areas will be avoided by car users and all adjacent roads will then be even more clogged up where there is currently free parking for most of the day. What about the adverse effect on local residents' parking who will now find all parking spaces opposite their house utilised? Where will the free spaces now be for local trademen or people visiting houses to be able to park freely for most of the day?

If one has the choice between being forced to pay £5 for parking for two hours in the afternoon in York Road, with all the associated hassle of paying online, or simply parking free of charge just round the corner in Clarence, Brampton and other roads, say, what do you possibly think people will do? This council proposal is simply not thought through properly! There is no regard for logic in the proposal nor regard for local residents' parking.

Even more so, applying this to York Road on a Saturday when there are football matches, nobody will be able to park on York Road, even paying, as a football match visit lasts more than two hours paying visit! (Current restrictions are Monday-Friday in York Road). Why does the consultation map online say 'Area G' in York Road Monday-Friday, yet the public notices put up

by (REDACTED) say Monday–Saturday? Which one is right? This sloppy, lazy drafting just misleads the public who are commenting on this. Some Council documents say that the consultation period ends on the 14 August, others on 15 August. Does anyone in the Council check their drafting? Does anyone in the Council check their writing?

The reasons the Council gives for these proposed changes are plain wrong and misleading. This does NOT encourage active travel. By forcing people to now pay or find other non-existent clogged-up free parking spaces, this discourages people coming to Clarence Park.

Increased enforcement has no connection to this consultation and is independent of it.

Greater turnover of premium places is not a need. It is an irrelevance. Or is this a softening up exercise to eventually make any parking anywhere a ‘premium place’ activity that the local people of St Albans have to pay dearly for?

20 minutes free parking is useless for any park visitor, family, friends or tradesmen visiting local residents. The Clarence Park car park is minuscule with circa 34 places. So parking will simply spread to all the ladder roads around the park leaving the new paying roads largely empty.

If the Council decides they do not have enough money, then either stop doing things or put the overall Council Tax up. Do not antagonise local residents and Park users with spurious penny-pinching and ineffective schemes to scabble for pennies. Why are our Local Liberal Democrat elected councillors not standing up against this?

I object completely to all proposals in consultation PPB/01 and will also be supporting the local petitions that are being set up against this.

I wholly object to the proposals PPB/01 advertised on a lamp-post in York Road on 16th July (attached)

The parking scheme in York Road was set up in consultation with local councillors, residents and local community stakeholders (Grasshoppers Nursery, St Albans Football Club, Verdis, St Albans Cricket Club) in order to offer the best of outcomes for all parties. The scheme, for example, was recently changed after one such consultation to exclude Saturdays from the restrictions to encourage shoppers to visit the City Centre and supporters of the football and cricket clubs, who will now be penalised by these proposed changes.

- The changes will have precisely the opposite effect to the stated aim of encouraging Active Travel since parents with children attending City centre schools and shoppers are much more likely to simply drive into the City centre rather than have to pay for parking in York Road and then walk the last half mile. We see many children setting off for school from York Road in the morning.
- Enforcement is not an issue in York Road or Clarence Road – there are spaces for everyone. Since commuters are deterred the parking spaces are used by park users, parents of children at local schools and people who want a pleasant walk to the City Centre for shopping, socialising and contributing to the livelihoods of many city centre businesses.
- There is no need for Greater turnover of premium places due to the maximum stay provisions. The concept of 'premium places' in York Road or the lower end of Clarence Road is irrelevant.
- 20 minute free parking sessions are nonsensical in the roads surrounding Clarence Park which provide vital overspill parking for the tiny car park in the Park and provide the opportunity for people living on the outskirts of St Albans to choose to walk into the City centre and park in York Road.

The current parking regime around Clarence Park works well as it is

The Parking Review for the 'Ladder Roads, Marshalswick South (North of Sandpit Lane) and original Zone P areas' was completed less than 4 years ago and, so far as we are aware, residents have been largely happy with the outcome of that review. Why then, after all the effort and Council officer time and resource spent on the last Review, does the Council consider that it is necessary to launch yet another parking consultation so soon after the last one?

The parking regime around Clarence Park works fine as it is – it provides parking for overspill from the Clarence Park car park, it enables parents of school children to park in York Road without charge and walk up to the town centre junior schools and back in the morning and afternoon (thereby reducing traffic and parking problems in the City centre and giving children daily exercise) and it allows residents to maintain the ability and space to have their visitors and workmen able to park nearby.

I do not see any reason for changing the current regime. The proposed changes will mean that available free parking will be massively reduced for Park users. The free parking spaces on Clarence Road and on the nearby 'Ladder Roads' (outside the hours of 11am – 1pm) will fill up quickly. This will result in many Park users having to park in York Road or at the lower end of Clarence Road (and pay either £2.50 for 1 hour or £5.00 for 2 hours) if they want to take their children to the playground, or take their dog for a walk in the Park (since the free 20 minute period will be insufficient). It will also deny residents in Clarence Road, Brampton Road and adjacent 'Ladder Roads' the opportunity to allow their visitors or tradesmen to park near their houses since the parking spaces in those roads will become rapidly filled with Park users who won't want to pay the charges in York Road.

The lack of parking restrictions on Saturdays in York Road works well for Park users, shoppers wishing to walk up to the City centre, and for St Albans Cricket Club and St Albans FC when they have matches. If parking restrictions are introduced on Saturdays, all the people attending matches who have driven will be forced to clog up Clarence Road, Brampton Road and all surrounding roads, creating potentially dangerous road safety hazards with parking manoeuvres in busy roads.

All the signs were recently changed to exempt Saturdays from restrictions. Now the proposal is to change them all again at great expense to introduce restrictions on Saturdays. This is a ridiculous waste of time, money and resources which should instead be focussed on other more pressing issues, such as repairing and improving the 130 year old infrastructure of Clarence Park (fences, paths, trees).

Finally, introducing charges for parking on York Road for park users will disadvantage elderly visitors who do not have smart phones to pay or can handle complicated parking apps. It is also discriminatory towards single parents and parents of limited means who bring their children to play in the fantastic childrens playground in Clarence Park.

I wish to wholly object to the proposals for map reference PPB/01. There are no current parking issues in these roads and it is not long since we have had a parking consultation, so I see no need for further changes in such a short space of time. My understanding is that local

I wish to wholly object to the proposals for map reference PPB/01. There are no current parking issues in these roads and it is not long since we have had a parking consultation, so I see no need for further changes in such a short space of time. My understanding is that local residents are happy with the status quo.

Many users of Clarence Park rely on these free spaces and cannot complete a visit within 20 minutes. We should be encouraging people to use such a park and get outdoor exercise for themselves and their children, and not making it more difficult and restrictive. Users of the park are unlikely to stay for very long periods but 20 minutes is clearly inadequate. All this will do is move these users to nearby roads where the restrictions are only for 2 hours a day, causing knock on issues, or mean they stop using the park, which would be very sad. A lot of money was spent on replacing the playground, which is now very popular. It would be so sad if children are told by their parents they can no longer afford to visit it regularly.

I fail to understand why anything needs changing at this time, when it is all working fine. This appears to be just a money-making exercise and not for any of the reasons given in the consultation which do not appear to be applicable to these roads.

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to wholly object to the proposals contained in the referenced parking consultation document. My reasons are as follows:

In recent years the Council has worked in collaboration with citizens interested in maintaining Clarence Park as a pleasant place for relaxation, recreation and peaceful enjoyment – a much needed breathing space in this part of St. Albans. It beggars belief that the Council is now proposing to introduce measures that will make it difficult for a large section of those and other citizens to enjoy those benefits.

As residents of York Road we witness everyday Park users arriving by car from further afield to make use of the Park amenities to play or practice in the Bowling Club, croquet pitch, play tennis, or cricket, walk their dogs, bring their children to enjoy the playground, or simply to walk and enjoy the open green space that the Park provides. In general, these are not people whose activities can be accomplished in a 20 minute span and they would therefore be required to pay the proposed exorbitant parking fees. It is disingenuous to suggest that they can walk to the Park, undertake their desired activity and walk home again – quite often with heavy equipment bags. Young parents, already struggling with the high cost of living would be deterred from visiting the Park if faced with high parking fees. Overall, therefore, these proposals are likely to have the effect of reducing Park usage rather than enhancing it. i.e. quite contrary to the long term aims.

Additionally, the proposed parking charges seem to ignore the ordinary requirements of residents in York Road in terms of visitors for house maintenance, decorators, window cleaners, carers (in some cases), etc. or simply social occasions. The very limited free parking period would mean that residents will be required to pay the extra charges involved – extra off-road parking is not universally available.

The current parking arrangements in York Road and the adjoining ladder road areas were introduced barely 4 years ago and seem to have worked well since then: there appears to be a happy balance between the number of Park users and the parking demands that follow. As a consequence I do not see a need to change these arrangements.

DearSir / Madam

I am writing to wholly object to the planned changes to parking on Clarence Rd and York Rd .

Having lived on Clarence Rd for 26 years we have observed many changes to parking parking arrangements and in my opinion the current arrangement works the best and benefits many people whilst deterring commuter all day parking .

You new plan is highly inflexible and will especially impact families and older people wishing to enjoy our wonderful park . The current arrangement is respected by motorists and valued .

20 mins is not long enough to do anything so in effect you are removing the right for free parking for everyone except delivery drivers .

In recent years it has been demonstrated that parked cars help traffic calming on Clarence Rd and if all the bays remain empty it encourages drivers to go far too fast and the junction with York Rd has already been identified as an accident hot spot as has the bend in the rd near the park entrance and the steep cambre of the road .

I am very hopeful that you will realise that this plan is not appropriate for York and Clarence Rd .

Dear Sirs and Mesdames,

Map reference PPB/01

I, (REDACTED)

Wholly object to the new proposals for Parking Charges for the areas around Clarence Park.

20 minutes free parking is totally unreasonable.

The subsequent parking charges are outrageous.

Yours sincerely

Dear Council,

Parking is not an issue that usually takes up my attention and focus. Indeed in my view there are many higher priority issues, such as the environment, health and social care, and social justice. However I have been moved to write to you because the current proposals from the District Council are simply flawed.

I am not against change, indeed driving change is something I did for many years in my work life. However, I speak from a knowledge of the town as I have lived here since 2005 and have worked from home since 2010. I have seen how the town centre operates throughout the week and weekends.

I have read the documents and my strong view is that the existing parking restrictions and rules for Harpenden centre are perfectly adequate and appropriate. The proposed changes (quotes are from the documents online) are flawed for the following reasons:

1. "These proposed changes relate to bays located in St Albans and Harpenden."

St Albans and Harpenden are quite different places, economically, in scale, in parking facilities, in population, in visitor numbers, in amenities, in uniqueness, in social culture. Applying one approach to both might be 'neat' for the council, but inappropriate as a 'one size fits all'.

2. "It is proposed to allow two 20-minute sessions per day, per vehicle registration. This will allow motorists to continue to make quick visits to the town centre, e.g., to drop off children at school without charge. Use beyond these periods will be chargeable."

Dropping off children at school is not the main use of parking spaces in the zones impacted by the proposal. The schools are not in those roads but elsewhere. So that is a disingenuous reason. The main use of the spaces is clearly for other purposes, which require longer than 20 minutes. The existing 30 minutes, 1 hour and 2 hour free parking and no return within two hours are entirely appropriate and work well for the public. This is proved by the few spaces available at any time but also the high 'churn' of spaces. 20 minutes is a ridiculous free-parking time as evidenced by the just-one example given as the "eg" which I've explained is not even pertinent to these spaces.

3. "Encourage Active Travel – payment for parking is an incentive for customers to consider alternative transportation options e.g., walking, cycling, public transport etc"

I am actively in favour of active, green travel, but this point is utter nonsense!

We live in Harpenden and sometimes walk into town and sometimes drive. The choice is driven by what makes most sense, what we need to take with us, where we are going, for how long, the age of our child, how tired she is, what we have to carry with us, etc. The option to do either is one of the huge attractions of Harpenden. My wife's neurological condition which she has had for the past five years (she is not 'disabled' so that option does not apply) has meant that throughout the life of our five year old daughter we have needed to rely on my car to make certain trips into town. No other option is sensible. Yes, we sometimes walk, yes we use public transport to go to London and other places but not for trips into Harpenden. Paying for spaces is not what impacts our choice, the existing restricted free parking hours already do that.

4. "Increased enforcement – more monitoring and enforcement of restrictions supports fairness and street safety."

Goodness me. What? Charging money in more places will enable you to pay for more traffic wardens... to result in more "fairness and street safety". What unfairness is there currently? What lack of street safety? I've witnessed none of that and question what evidence the council has gathered to make such a bold statement.

5. "Greater turnover of premium places – parking charges encourage turnover of parking spaces, improving availability of spaces for motorists who need to park closest to businesses."

What evidence? That really doesn't stack up. Restricted hours combined with random checks by wardens achieves turnover of spaces. What sort of businesses need customers who will pop in for under 10 minutes (5 minutes to walk there and 5 minutes to walk back). The current mix of 30 mins, 1 hour and 2 hours encourages turnover of parking spaces etc. Charges themselves don't encourage that, the current marked restrictions with the randomness of the few wardens does encourage that. The availability of free spaces around the various parts of the high street are what encourage people to come into the town centre, to visit local businesses, shop locally, visit cafes and restaurants, the local market each Friday, etc. None of those activities can be done in 20 minutes.

6. "The cost of providing parking services should be met from the income received from fees and charges, including permitting schemes for parking on street and the issue of Penalty Charge Notices. This historically has not been the case and for many years the parking service has made a loss which has had to be covered from other service areas. This is unfair to Council Taxpayers, given that part of the cost for parking services has, in the past, been subsidised by non-parking related income.

Providing free parking in city and town centres is no longer financially feasible. Parking charges already exist across most of St Albans City Centre and the surrounding area, and Harpenden Town Centre (where overall, charges for over eight hundred car park spaces are already in place)."

This gets to the heart of it and I can guess is the real driver for the council – money! I understand funding is tight, it always is, but this isn't the answer.

The first paragraph sounds logical but is glib and surely not correct.

Perhaps it has historically "not been the case" – but perhaps that tells us that it was for a sound reason and it is clear that the town has thrived historically.

Why is it "unfair to Council Taxpayers"? Have Council Taxpayers been asked "are you happy paying £X of your annual council tax to provide good, efficient access for visitors and residents to local shops, amenities and restaurants?". I'm sure most would say yes. Stating it is "unfair" isn't enough. Unfairness is in the eye of the taxpayer. Surely the cost is not a significant percentage of total council tax, especially if the costs (extra wardens, hours etc) is deducted!

In the second paragraph "Financially feasible" is a phrase that covers a multitude of things – I say as a qualified accountant. Why should a town not subsidise parking? That cross-subsidy leads to a thriving town centre which is of benefit to all its residents. Insisting that each element of council spend is cost-neutral is crazy economics and short-sighted. There is

considerable overlap between policy areas. I can think of so many services where that is the case. Let's charge for access to libraries, what a slippery slope.

7. "This proposal will encourage the use of off-street parking – where charges are lower – for longer visits and manage the demand for kerbside space by encouraging higher turnover there through the setting of charges beyond the 20 minutes drop off/collection period outlined."

Basically this is saying free parking in the town centre is to be banned other than 20 minutes which is of practical use to virtually no-one other than imaginary parents dropping imaginary children off at imaginary schools on the high street, or maybe a pensioner making a sprint into the library to grab a random book from the shelves, or a mum grabbing a takeaway coffee for a dangerous drive home rather than sitting in a cafe enjoying it and chatting with others.

I've responded to the 'justifications' set out in the proposal.

I end by stating my main objections:

1. The range of free parking (30 mins, 1 hour and 2 hours), combined with the range of paid parking in the open air car parks in Harpenden, works well to give residents and visitors a brilliant range of options and choice. They work well to impact behaviour and meet individual needs. Removing all but a 20 minute free option will kill the free parking option. Once done, it's done. Leave it as 30 mins, 1 hour and 2 hours in different places. That encourages good behaviours.
2. Paying for longer term parking in those car parks around the town is something we do and happily do, but not for every visit. That would be a prohibitive cost and lead us not to visit the town centre as often as we do. It would not lead us to walk or take the bus! That would impact local retailers who are already struggling with footfall.
3. It is clear from the volume of dismay from local retailers that they are fearful of this proposal. Why? Because they believe it will decrease footfall. I agree with that. It certainly won't increase it by making Harpenden town centre a place to visit. It is

unlikely to leave it the same so is the council happy for a bit of damage? What studies have the Council done to understand the impact on footfall, to understand the current habits of visitors? I suspect it's none as I've never seen any consultation, any surveys, and nothing has been published.

4. St Albans and Harpenden are quite different places as I set out above. One basic policy does not "fit all".

5. There are so many examples around town where ticket machines have been installed for parking that do not work for months, years. Many examples where the online/app payments do not work reliably, are inaccessible to the elderly, and inaccessible due to mobile signal fails. Moving to largely all-paying parking is a damaging step.

In short, my own experience living here over the past near 20 years, walking into town, driving to town, as a single professional working man, as a father of a young child, as the husband of a wife going through medical treatment, tells me this proposal will have a detrimental impact. A detrimental impact on the vibrancy of the town, the cafe and restaurant life, the vibe and attractiveness of the town. It will hit the local retailers hard. It will damage the town and sadly make it like so many others in Hertfordshire that have gone down this route. Let's keep Harpenden special.

Dear Sir

Further to your announcement of parking restrictions in York Road, I would like to make the following complaint.

We are an elderly couple who have children needing a car to visit. It is easier for them to park in the road for a quick visit. Otherwise we have to move our car in the drive.

We also employ a gardener who has equipment and the window cleaner who also parks in the road with his ladder.

We feel our lives would be inconvenienced by having always to obtain and give out vouchers to our visitors .

We cannot see the reason for this development, other than another way to extract funds from ever more impoverished residents.

I wholly object to the proposals to change the parking restrictions for the whole of York Road and the stretch of Clarence Road from the junction with Hatfield Road to the main vehicular entrance to the park as stated in the consultation.

The changes will have the opposite effect to the stated aims

Active Travel – people will just drive into the centre or park in Clarence Park preventing park visitors from parking and using the park facilities.

Enforcement – this is not currently an issue there are spaces for all. There is no need for greater turnover of premium places due to the maximum stay provisions currently in place.

20 minute parking – I have never managed to shop or take children to school within 20 minutes. It is pointless unless the parking is directly outside a place you need to visit.

It means that there will no longer be enough free parking to visit Clarence Park and people from all walks of life who visit the park will cease to do so. Paying £5 to for example take your children to a park is prohibitively expensive for most people.

Residents around Clarence Park will have much reduced on street parking for visitors.

It will cause more congestion during football matches at the week-end.

I also object to the council obtaining revenue from on street parking in areas where parking has never been a problem and where there should be no parking costs.

Hello

I am writing to state my objection to the proposed changes to parking restrictions proposed on York Road, St Albans. Map Reference PPB/01.

The current model works and I can only see downsides to any proposals. I only have one car and don't use the road to park so I am objecting on behalf of the broader community and the many people who gain value from access to Clarence Park.

I see no clear rationale for the proposal and therefore I want to be clear that I WHOLLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSALS.

Dear Madam or Sir

As a resident of Clarence Road I wish to object most strongly to the proposed changes to the parking around Clarence Park and Clarence Road. My reason for this is that the existing arrangements work perfectly well (the free 2hour parking for the park in particular being a fantastic local amenity) so it seems an entirely pointless exercise to alter anything. As they say, 'if it ain't broke don't fix it'.

I wholly object to the proposals currently under consideration.

There is not a problem so see no reason at all for change. There was a full review of parking in this area less than 4 years ago which did not see any reason for change and I strongly agree that is still the correct decision.

As a local resident, park user, a walker into town via York Rd and a walker to station via Clarence Rd, there is never a problem so I fail to comprehend why the council is proposing these changes. It will inconvenience many park users and a parking fee after 20 mins makes it impossible to walk dogs in the park, access the children's playground, walk children to city centre schools and more. To avoid the fees people will simply park on neighbouring roads inconveniencing residents there and adding to congestion on the narrower ladder roads. Or they will drive further into town adding to congestion there. For residents of the areas directly affected, visitors parking permits become exorbitant!

Additionally it seems a review of access to parking permits for householders across St Albans could see draconian restrictions to their availability to householders. This is again a change that is not needed for something we pay handsomely for. A cynic might say this is all about increasing revenue for the Council...

Yours faithfully

To whom it may concern

As a local resident, who has used Clarench for many years, I 'wholly object to the above proposal'.

If anyone using the park for sports, recreational, children's activities cannot find a space in the park, they should be able to park in adjacent streets (York Road and the Hatfield Road end of Clarence Road). 20 minutes free is absurd and doesn't allow time for any of the above activities.

On busy days i.e. football matches, there is no space in the park, and this would mean anyone else wishing to park nearby would be penalised.

Hi

I would like to wholly object to the proposals for car parking charges on York Road & Clarence Road. The present parking scheme works & so I do not feel there is any need to change it.

I wholly object to the proposals on changing the parking restrictions on York Road which will mean that free parking of 2 hours on York Road will in future be limited to 20 minutes and will include Saturdays as well. These would be of great inconvenience to

- Park users;
- parents wishing to park outside the City centre in York Road and walk their children to and from schools (including Maple, Aboyne Lodge, Alban City, Loreto, St Albans High School for Girls);
- shoppers who live away from the City centre who choose to park in York Road and walk to the shops;
- local residents, not only in York Road and the lower end of Clarence Road, but also residents in the rest of Clarence Road, Brampton Road and the other nearby so-called 'Ladder Roads' (a term previously used by the Council to mean all roads north of Hatfield Road through to Sandpit Lane between Clarence Road through to Woodstock Road North and South). Park users will simply avoid paying for parking in York Road and start parking in nearby roads instead.

Hello Parking Consultation

I'm a resident of (REDACTED) and have a resident permit P for one of our cars and have lived in Fleetville for over 20 years.

My concerns relate to York Road amendments and there effect on other ladders roads in Fleetville.

Your documents contradict each other with the Public Notice stating that the proposed charging hours of operation for York Road is Monday to Saturday between 8.30 am and 6pm.

The Map 4 of 7 which is specific to York Road refers to charging Mon – Fri 8am – 6pm BUT also refers to Permit Holders parking place Zone P Mon – Fri 8am to 6pm so on this basis we could park anytime on York Road in our car with our permit P and not face paying additional charges.

Can you please clarify as if the Map is correct and we can park on York Road then that's great BUT if the Public Notice is correct and we can't then we strongly object to these proposals as we've just renewed our Permit P and are regular users of Clarence Park but due to limited mobility and very limited parking provision in Clarence park itself regularly park on York Road to allow access to the park and these new regulations may restrict our use of York Road.

Also, why does York Road need these further regulations? The houses all have driveways that can accommodate a minimum of x2 cars and by bringing in new regulations all you are doing is moving parking from York Road to the other ladder roads.

As you know, Clarence Park has limited parking spaces and currently has 3 hours free parking so why are you proposing charging after 20 minutes on York Road where parents with children and dog walkers have to park to use Clarence Park on a daily basis.

If the restriction are inclusive of Saturday then the football / cricket / hockey traffic will all have to use the ladder roads making these more congested and difficult to use for local residents.

Look forward to hearing back from you.

I wholly object to these proposals.

The current two hour free parking arrangement works well – it is sufficient deterrent for commuters and is enough time for most park users,. Those using our open spaces often don't have gardens or access to other open space and this proposal unfairly penalises them.

Also, the idea that it will get people out of their cars and onto their feet/bikes is patronising and frankly fatuous, in my opinion.

am writing to say that I wholly object to the proposals to change the parking restrictions on York Road.

I believe the current restrictions are working well allowing for people to park and walk children to school, allowing for park users to enjoy the outdoor space. (20 minutes is not enough time to take children to the playground, walk the dog, or walk to local businesses). It also allows residents to have visitors at their homes (although we have to pay over 2 hours). On this point I wholly object to the restriction of permits to one vehicle per household only.

I feel deeply upset that we have to fight for the right to park cars outside our houses so soon after the last consultation and I would be very grateful if you could reconsider this preposterous proposal.

I wish to wholly object to the proposals in relation to changes to parking restrictions and the proposed introduction of charging in the above area.

In the streets around Clarence Park, this is totally contrary to the original intentions of the introduction of parking controls. The aim was to prevent all day parking linked to the station but enable incidental parking for park visits and for football club supporters.

The current parking regime works very well – and on that basis it seems a destructive to try to change it.

I understand that finances are tight but this plan is not a solution, and I totally support the objections of the Clarence Park Residents Association .

Please do not go ahead with this scheme.

As a resident of (REDACTED), near York and Hafield Roads, I object wholly to the proposals to remove the 2 hour free parking currently available in York Road and Clarence Road.

This is not going to benefit local residents as the current approach works well.

With regard to the proposals that have been made I wholly object to these proposals for the following reasons:

Park users will simply avoid paying for parking in York Road and start parking in nearby roads instead which means that residents in nearby Brampton Road who live in a terraced house with no driveway (including myself) who rely on on-street parking will find they have nowhere to park when the park is busy and the roads full of park users cars. This in turn will impact residents who rely on on-road parking in all the ladder roads.

Shoppers who live away from the City centre who choose to park in York Road and walk to the shops would now park in other residential areas such as Brampton and the ladder roads would have less parking spaces for residents.

The knock on effect might be less customers for verdis/the crown and other restaurants around Clarence Park, and lower footfall in the Fleetville shops if their customers cannot find anywhere to park their cars.

It will be more difficult for our own friends and family who either visit us at home at the weekend or expensive or difficult for them to park on York Road to meet them at the park, particularly as they cannot not walk all that far but are not registered disabled.

Another effect of Brampton Road/ladder loads having more cars parked on them is that it will cause accidents as pedestrian visibility is reduced because of the increase in parked cars in surrounding streets and there will be more cars circling the streets looking for a parking spot.

Having put up with sixth formers parking on the streets in the afternoon and having no on-road parking on Fridays 1-2 because of the mosque users using our roads to park in, it is depressing to think we will have parking difficulty at the weekend also.

In our view, the parking arrangements that were only put into place in the last few years are working out well. There is no shortage of parking around York Road and Clarence Road and Clarence Park car park is tiny. There is no need to introduce additional parking restrictions as there are no parking issues that need to be resolved.

These restrictions will not be greener as park users will still drive but will park in our road and the ladder roads instead.

With regards to the issue of parking permits not being issued during the consultation, I think it is a disgrace because people move houses all the time.

I also think that potentially limiting the permits to one car per household is unreasonable.

We have two cars which get used mostly in the evenings/ at the weekends - we are very green as two in our household commute on the train and I walk into St Albans to work. We lift-share where we can with our team sports players and friends but we obviously need a car to offer lifts in return. Three of us share two cars at present

For people who have no choice but to drive to work, a car is essential. This includes many of my neighbours who park on-street.

I hope that parking permits for second cars will not further increase in price as issuing them are now being withheld (pending a price increase?/fund raising exercise) as we are suffering the cost of living rises. We have already suffered as we are now paying large increases in parking permits as it is. This is a tax on residents.

I have lived in my house since 1999 - 25 years - I didn't choose to live in a street with parking permits, it has developed over time.

Parking Consultation PPB01

I object wholly to the introduction of 20 minute free waiting only in York Road. The existing 2 hours free parking is working really well. We have never seen Clarence Park as well used in all 25 years we have lived here. Visitors to the football matches can park, friends and services can park while visiting us.

This seems to me to be purely a money making exercise for the council and totally ignores all the drawn out efforts by the council to get a good parking solution through the long consultation process we have already gone through, which finally arrived at a sensible 2 hours free waiting time.

I am disappointed we are having to go through this again.

We wish to wholly object to the proposed changes to parking restrictions in York Road. (We believe this has the map reference PPB/01.)

The proposal is said to be part of a review of high demand for car parking bays but there is no evidence of high demand in York Road. We live round the corner in Clarence Road and walk along York Road many times each week. Typically there are perhaps half-a-dozen cars parked near the Clarence Road end of York Road where there is a gate into Clarence Park and two or three cars in the remaining length of the road. That means that about three-quarters of the length of York Road is unoccupied, leaving room for more than twenty more cars to be parked if there were the demand, or if residents have tradesmen or visitors needing space.

The proposed changes would mainly affect people parking to enjoy Clarence Park and it surely conflicts with Council policy to discourage them. Either they would not come at all or, outside the hours of 11am to 1pm, they would park on busy Clarence Road or other roads in the area. This achieves nothing beneficial and pushes parking away from a quiet cul-de-sac on to more dangerous or higher demand locations such as Brampton Road.

The only time that there is high demand for parking on York Road is when St Albans City FC are playing at home on Saturday afternoons or weekday evenings. Football supporters then make full use of York Road and use available spaces on Clarence Road and roads further away. This is wholly reasonable. It's unclear whether the proposed changes are intended to apply on Saturdays but if so we would definitely oppose this too.

In sum, there is no justification to impose the proposed charges in York Road – to the extent that there might be a case for judicial review if the Council does not withdraw this proposal.

Dear all

I am writing to wholly object to the proposed parking changes in York and Clarence Roads.

Many people use the street parking at all times of the day to park their cars so that they can access the park to walk dogs, take children to school, go into town, watch football matches, visit friends, etc, all on foot.

I cannot see any benefit of charging for parking and moreover, I think it will deter park users and unfairly make using the park an expense for anyone that needs to drive to reach it.

It is well known that access to green spaces is one of the best things we can have for our physical and mental well-being. Additionally, a drop in the use of the park may result in the return of the very serious county lines drug problem that we had a few years ago.

Please leave the parking as it is and let local people have fair and free access to a beautiful recreational facility.

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to you regarding the proposed changes to the parking restrictions and the introduction of new parking charges for map reference PPB/01.

The current systems works perfectly well and I don't think the reasons given by the Council for the proposed change are relevant and I wholly object to the proposals.

I would also like to point out with regards to parking permits that it says you are reviewing this but there is no mention of this in the consultation document? Why?

Extract Council website FAQ:

'Can I have more than 1 vehicle on my permit?

The Council is reviewing this option and will be unable to issue a permit with more than one vehicle whilst this review is undertaken.'

Dear Sir/Madam

In response to your proposed changes to parking on York Road (included here: <https://consultation.appyway.com/st-albans/order/35cb267f-ec41-4893-b1ce-ca6ee4ebb0cf>) I would like to respond to the consultation that I wholly object to the proposals.

My reasons are: It seems bizarre and perverse that a road which sits next to a recreational park, and has plenty of room, should not be free to park for any more than 20 minutes. It means no-one could spend time in the park without paying - and all the dampening effects that would have on the health and wellbeing that is well understood this park offers.

I also think it's odd to start charging on Saturdays for a road which is right outside the football ground.

The current system works perfectly well as it disrupts the commuter traffic which used to cause such problems in the road - thus allowing others access to the fresh air and exercise the park offers.

The road is very rarely full - there are usually places which suggest there is no need for tightening the regulations further.

It almost seems as though York Road has been included in this plan by mistake, as none of the reasons given in the council's reasons for the change here (<https://www.stalbans.gov.uk/news/review-high-demand-car-parking-bays-limited-waiting-times>) seem relevant to the road at all. The change would certainly do nothing to allow people to "make quick shopping trips or to drop off and pick up children to and from school".

I do hope you will reconsider this proposal.

I am writing to let you know that I strongly object to the proposals for parking charges for map reference PPB/01.

I write about the parking consultation and the proposed changes to restrictions and charging in York Road and the lower end of Clarence Road.

The proposals create problems to solve problems that don't exist!!

The proposals would constitute a huge loss of amenity for visitors to the Park, who come from all over St Albans. Why should Park users who can't get a space in the small Park car park now have to pay charges every time they want to bring their children to the playground or have a game of tennis or take the dog for walk for longer than 20 minutes? The result will be nonsensical because York Road will be empty of cars, whilst the surrounding roads (where parking is free and the only restriction is a prohibition on parking is between 11am – 1pm) will become clogged up with people trying to park in order to park near the Park.

In terms of the Council's stated objective to 'encourage active travel', the effect of introducing charging after 20 minutes in York Road will have the opposite effect and will discourage active travel. More people will drive into an already congested town centre to find parking there instead of parking in York Road and walking up to town over the railway footbridge. Every day we see shoppers walking back from town to their cars parked in York Road – the current 2 hours gives them sufficient time to go shopping, attend appointments in the town centre or run other errands. The fact that there is 2 hours free parking in York Road definitely encourages active travel. By stark contrast, introducing a 20 minute limit most certainly will not!

There are a couple of points which we would like you to clarify:

1. Is the deadline for responses midnight on Wednesday 14th August or Thursday 15 August? The Council's announcement on 18 July states:

<https://www.stalbans.gov.uk/news/review-high-demand-car-parking-bays-limited-waiting-times>

However, the consultation papers and on the public notices state that the deadline is midnight on 15 August.

2. Is the intention to re-introduce restrictions on Saturdays in York Road? Please see section 3 of my email below in which I explain the inconsistent information in the Council's consultation documents. Is the intention really to have a 2 hour limit on parking in York Road on FC match days?? The pressure on parking and traffic in Clarence Road and all surrounding roads (apart from York Road which would be empty!) would be intolerable.

I should be grateful if you could read my email below. PCP members and Clarence Park Resident Association members (and other residents in Clarence ward) are very concerned about the proposals and will be very interested to know your views.