

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Battlefield Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Battlefield Road	<p>These look fine to us as Battlefield Road residents.</p> <p>We only have one comment which is that the double yellow lines at the south entrance to Battlefield Road should extend on the east side for the full length of house no. 29 as far as the boundary with no. 2B. This is because a driver's sight line on entering the road is hindered by cars parking on that side of the road (rather than on the west side of the road).</p>	<p>Unfortunately we are unable to make changes to the design of yellow lines and parking bays at this time. However, we will note this request as part of the ongoing review</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
2	Battlefield Road	<p>We are content with the current proposal.</p> <p>We have one concern. We applied for H bars for the short section of road between us and our neighbour. This is because if cars park there, access to our driveway is severely restricted and our view when reversing into the street is obscured which is dangerous. Can we please have double yellow lines on this section of road to prevent parking there?</p>	<p>Unfortunately we are unable to make changes to the design of yellow lines and parking bays at this time. However, we will note this request as part of the ongoing review</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
3	Battlefield Road	<p>We are writing in support of the proposed parking arrangements for Battlefield Road as set out in your letter of 28 July 2021 and its attachments. We are delighted that these arrangements for resident's only parking Monday to Friday 11 am to 1 pm are being proposed and hope that they will be able to be implemented as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
4	Battlefield Road.	<p>Many thanks for your recent communication concerning the latest parking proposal for Battlefield Road and the neighbouring streets which I very much support; it seems only fair and sensible to treat the roads north of Sandpit Lane the same as the majority of those to the south and is much in line with our original suggestions.</p> <p>I have no wish to hold up the scheme but am concerned that unlike Lancaster Road, Battlefield Road has yet to be resurfaced. We have been informed that the current double yellow lines at the junction with Sandpit Lane are unenforceable as the road surface is so rough and the lines so patchy. Obviously if there are no plans for resurfacing, the scheme should go ahead regardless, though there may be some difficulty in applying the lines effectively.</p> <p>Thank you for your help in this matter and I look forward to the implementation of your plans.</p>	<p>Consideration to road resurfacing will be given</p>
5	Battlefield Road	<p>My wife and I very much support the parking scheme described in your letter dated 28th July.</p> <p>We notice that the Nursing Home, Clare Lodge at 8 Battlefield Road is excluded from the scheme but we assume you will accommodate arrangements for them.</p> <p>All the neighbours I have spoken to in Battlefield Road are very much in favour of the scheme and we all want it to be implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>There remains a concern that there still may be objections from some residents located further away from the Station and Town Centre but is important that the scheme is implemented preferably as a whole without delay.</p>	<p>We are making provisions for the care home</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Battlefield Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
6	Battlefield Road	<p>I am writing on behalf of B&amp;M Care in relation to the attached Parking Consultation letter, dated 28th July 2021. The letter sets out proposals for resident permit parking schemes, including one along Battlefield Road in St Albans.</p> <p>As the owner and operator of Clare Lodge (located at No. 8 Battlefield Road), B&amp;M Care strongly objects to the proposals due to the significant detrimental impact that a permit parking scheme of this nature would have on the care home if insufficient permits were issued. Clare Lodge is a 24 bedded care home and has successfully operated in Battlefield Road for over 46 years. Staff, families, friends, professionals and other essential services have parked on Battlefield Road throughout this time when caring for the needs of the elderly residents and sufficient permits would have to be issued under the proposed scheme to ensure the service can continue to operate successfully.</p> <p>The Parking Consultation Letter, indicates that Clare Lodge (No.8 Battlefield Road) would not be eligible for permits and this gives us great cause for concern. The consequences of this would be catastrophic for the home and could well lead to its closure. On this basis we strongly object to the current proposals.</p> <p>Typically, around 10 of our staff park in Battlefield Road each day, together with a handful of visitors (families, friends, professionals). Furthermore, some of the essential services, such as waste and wastewater collections, pull up in the road immediately outside the home and permits would be needed to cover these activities. Taking into consideration the current and historic use of Battlefield Road for parking, an allocation of 12-15 permits (equivalent to c.50% to 60% of the care home residents) would be needed to safeguard the operations of the home.</p>	<p>Following a review of the area and the requirements of the care home, it has been agreed to include some provisions for the home.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
7	Battlefield Road	<p>I understand you are the person I need to contact re. parking on Battlefield Road, in particular for Clare Lodge staff and visitors. Please could you let me know how these proposed measures will affect us and if there's anything we need to be considering now.</p>	<p>Dealt with informally and formally outside of the process</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Charmouth Road	<p>We have lived at 1 Charmouth Road, next to the Sandpit Lane roundabout, for 23 years. Prior to the recent introduction of the council's Clarence Ward parking restrictions, we never experienced issues in our stretch of the road with commuter parking or had any grounds to question traffic safety. The only inconvenience was a build up of traffic waiting to get on to the roundabout in the morning c.8-8.30am during weekdays in school term time only.</p> <p>The implementation of revised Clarence Ward arrangements has created significant issues for us specifically and for Charmouth Road more generally. You will be aware of a number of general issues and concerns of Charmouth Road residents. These issues are mostly summarised in the attached emails from Gill Owen and Juliet Lyal, together with those of Kath Kearney- Croft just sent to you (17.41, 26/8/21) and we also strongly endorse these but have not repeated them here. In addition we echo and support the many comments you will have received regarding the proposed Charmouth Court arrangements regarding double yellow lines which would severely restrict parking for residents and their visitors, many of whom are elderly. It is very unfortunate that after considerable procrastination, cost and delay residents and voters continue to be in a position where they are worse off than before the original decision and are now deeply frustrated with the current situation. Key additional issues specific to us and our stretch of road are currently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*We regularly have commuter cars double parked outside our house. *This often creates potential dangers for cars and pedestrians at the Charmouth Road/ Sandpit Lane junction as there is insufficient room for two way traffic flow and drivers become impatient.</li> <li>*We have elderly parents with significant mobility issues who are often unable to park outside, or even near, our house either when driven themselves or by others. Our driveway cannot easily accommodate more than one car, particularly with more elderly and immobile drivers and passengers.</li> <li>*We and our visitors have been pressurised and sworn at by impatient drivers whilst trying to manoeuvre around parked vehicles to get in and out of our own house. The second and third of these points are however not addressed by the revised proposals. Our key comments and requests are therefore:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We previously had no issues arising from cars parked outside our property and access prior to the influx of commuter cars following the Ladder Scheme amendments. Therefore double yellow lines are unnecessary and excessive, particularly with the proposed introduction of residents parking.</li> <li>2. There should be residents parking only, not double yellow lines, from the currently painted double yellow lines on the 'odd' side of the road (i.e. on the side of traffic moving away from the roundabout). These would also enable our elderly parents and visitors to park closer to our property.</li> <li>3. The solution implemented must as a minimum ensure that there is restricted parking (i.e. as in the previous proposal of a single yellow line on the even side of the road) prior to 9am at the Charmouth Road roundabout approach on the evenly numbered side of the road (i.e. traffic approaching the roundabout), at least to number 10, whilst retaining close access and flexibility for tradespeople and other visitors of the affected residences.</li> <li>4. We are not generally in favour of extending double yellow lines beyond the currently painted ones, provided the rush hour traffic peak and double parking can be dealt with through single yellow lines and /or commuter parking restrictions as above.</li> <li>5. However if double yellow lines are to be extended anywhere it makes sense for this to be on the 'even' side of the road (i.e. approaching the roundabout where the traffic build up is more problematic).</li> <li>6. In particular we request that double yellow lines are not painted across our driveway as this is unnecessary and unsightly. With the addition of this emphasis we are otherwise supportive of the attached comments from Gill Owen and Juliet Lyal and for the avoidance of doubt Gill Owen's attached point 1 would still be a considerable improvement on the currently proposed scheme.</li> </ol>	<p>Parking restrictions will often cause vehicles to displace to other roads or areas. This is something that is considered within any scheme proposals. However, it is not always possible to resolve each and every issue or foresee what will happen every time. Therefore, further consultations are always likely and this forms part of the process and considerations. The scheme for Marshalswick South has been designed to improve safety, traffic flow and provide residents with parking amenities. Any areas where improvements can be made or should be made can be considered during the 18 month review</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
2	Charmouth Road	<p>If the Council insists on proceeding with these proposals (NB it should not - see below), then:</p> <p>1. What allowance will be made for bank and public holidays? These, being akin to Saturdays and Sundays, should similarly fall outside the restrictions. Will the Council give a binding commitment not to enforce on these days? It would be irrational not to address this, given the purported rationale for the scheme.</p> <p>2. There is in my opinion no need to extend the length of double yellows, where these are already in situ on corners. I live at the bottom of Charmouth Road and do not believe it is necessary to extend them, as planned, further up (northwards) from the mini roundabout with Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>On a more general footing (and as I had hoped to discuss with you - I'm awaiting your call back):</p> <p>This entire matter, of the Clarence and MS schemes and consultations, has all the hallmarks of a scandalous waste of public resource and an abuse of process.</p> <p>The current proposals should be dropped and the 2018 Clarence/Ladder Roads CPZ should be reversed.</p> <p>Why has the 2018 Clarence CPZ not been reversed? No scheme was needed (as was always clear and as was voted at the outset in 2015 consultation) and there will, if anything, be even less need now given the legacy of the pandemic.</p> <p>Why was the 2018 Clarence CPZ not reviewed, objectively and on its own merits, and six months from inception, as was provided? It has been the overwhelming, maybe even sole, cause of the problems we have experienced in these parts. They arose overnight, on implementation, as was so very predictable. Meanwhile, in Clarence, the roads remain deserted. They were never congested anyway, as your own survey in September 2018 clearly demonstrated, with up to 91% parking space availability. Our pleasant environment will be blighted with paint and signage. Everyday aspects of life will be regulated unnecessarily. We are owed convincing answers</p>	<p>Parking restrictions will often cause vehicles to displace to other roads or areas. This is something that is considered within any scheme proposals. However, it is not always possible to resolve each and every issue or foresee what will happen every time. Therefore, further consultations are always likely and this forms part of the process and considerations. The scheme for Marshalswick South has been designed to improve safety, traffic flow and provide residents with parking amenities. Any areas where improvements can be made or should be made can be considered during the 18 month review</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
3	Charmouth Road	<p>In relation to the planned resident-only parking area for Marshalswick South I have the following comments. Numbers 2 &amp; 5 also apply to the Clarence Ward which you are reviewing alongside this:</p> <p>1. The removal of the single yellow-line on the even numbered side of Charmouth Rd at the junction with Sandpit Lane is problematic. The proposed extension of the double yellow-lines at this junction would accommodate a queue of around 4 cars but the morning rush hours has 10 plus vehicles queuing, and often many more, so the single-yellows should be reinstated for the morning rush-hour period at least as far as no. 10 Charmouth Rd and preferably to Faircross Way. Any double sided parking here results in congestion, dangerous driving and noise and air pollution.</p> <p>2. The 11-1 restrictions across the zone makes it difficult and costly for residents to have visitors. Changing to 10-12 on the even side of the roads and 12-2 on the odd sides would solve this issue while still deterring commuter parking.</p> <p>3. Some parts of the town have permit parking with signage but without the boxes painted on the road. I would ask that our streets have this minimal approach too as the painted boxes are ugly and degrade the street-scene.</p> <p>4. Homewood Rd has not been allocated as a resident only area and I believe that this is a mistake, that they would suffer from immediate commuter displacement, and the road should be included. However, it would need a any 2 hours between 8-6 approach as the Homewood Rd church has a lot of use.</p> <p>5. Across both areas many roads have the capacity to provide some free spaces to accommodate commuters and the Council should keep the resident-only restriction to a minimum i.e. by driveways. I would ask, therefore, that where there are sections that run alongside gardens/Verulam school etc. are left/reinstated to be without restrictions. We should share wherever possible.</p>	<p>With the restrictions being set between 11am and 1pm, the scheme will still allow for local commuting, the intension is to stop all day or longer term commuter parking but still allow local businesses to function if required. In addition, the short restriction will still provide residents with options for their visitors at no additional cost but at the same time improve safety.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
4	Charmouth Road	<p>I'm writing in response to your update on the ladder roads consultation dated 28th July but only received 6th August.</p> <p>In general I'm opposed to the changes, I feel they are significant overkill. I appreciate the need to dissuade all day parking by commuters at dangerous pinch points near the junctions at Clarence road, but banning all day parking will have a detrimental effect on the residents' ability to use the road. Why were the parking restrictions extended all the way to the northern end of the ladder roads? Surely once more than 150-200m north of sandpit lane it would be possible to only put restrictions on one side of the road? Were ideas such as offsetting the hours on opposite sides of the roads considered? e.g. 10-12 on the easterly sides, and 12-2 to on the westerly sides? This would still dissuade all day parking, but still enable residents to have someone stop by for 15 minutes in the middle of the day without needing to pay £1.30 for the privilege.</p>	<p>It is not practical for various reasons to have different timed restrictions on the same road at various locations. This scheme is intended to stop all day or longer term parking from none residents, but at the same time allow more local parking. Any complicated system to achieve this goal would not be practical or justified and would only cause confusion to road users.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
5	Charmouth Court	<p>We wanted to feed back that we are in support of the proposals.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
6	Charmouth Road	<p>We have two main concerns that we would like to raise and suggest with regards to the above: The first being staggering the parking restriction times on both sides of the road. For example making one side of the road resident parking from 10-2 and the other side 12-2, or every few metres alternating between both of these times or something similar regarding timings. This would make it possible for residents to have family and friends visit during the week without fear of getting any parking enforcements, although would possibly mean people having to move cars if overlapping these times. This actually leads onto our second and final point that we would like to raise; As you will see from our previous response below we suggested that one free visitors pass could be given to each household (point 2 below) We feel that this would go along way to mitigate our concerns about the resident parking restrictions along with staggering parking times and would eliminate people having to move their cars. These simple two measures would be received more favourably by ourselves and we are sure by many of our neighbours too. We know that once things like parking schemes are implemented they are vary hard to change so please do take these points into serious consideration when deciding on a final plan for the ladder roads, as it is us as residents that have to live day to day with these plans.</p>	<p>It is not practical for various reasons to have different timed restrictions on the same road at various locations. This scheme is intended to stop all day or longer term parking from none residents, but at the same time allow more local parking. Any complicated system to achieve this goal would not be practical or justified and would only cause confusion to road users.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
7	Charmouth Court	<p>I object to the proposed changes in Charmouth Court, as they will very much reduce the parking available here. In effect, we shall be paying for the inconvenience of being unable to park near our homes.</p> <p>Non-resident parking is not the problem here. The situation is that all the space currently available in Charmouth Court is fully used by residents, and is yet insufficient. Removing all the spaces now in use, near the entrance to the south garages, will only exacerbate the problem. Two cars can park safely outside numbers 30 and 31, before the garage entrance narrows, but no bay has been indicated there.</p> <p>Furthermore, your map indicates a long extension to the existing double yellow lines in Charmouth Road, by the northern side of the entrance to Charmouth Court. This will prevent parking in front of those Charmouth Court properties with their front doors on Charmouth Road. This extension will remove even more spaces used by residents here.</p> <p>r would ask you to take into consideration the fact that we have no choice but to park on the road, unlike other local residents with their own driveways. Not everyone here has a garage, and many of those who do cannot house their cars in them, because the garages are too narrow for the accommodation of most modern vehicles.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the knock on effect of any parking scheme means that parking from none residents moves, whist residents at the moment in some areas do not feel the full effect of the issues raised elsewhere, by not including those areas in any scheme at this time would mean revisiting the area soon after. Residents parking is a positive step to ensuring residents have some priority over the available kerb space and will minimise any parking from none residents. In addition, as this would be a larger scheme, it would provide residents with other parking options in the wider area.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
8	Charmouth Court	<p>I have lived in the court for 32 years and have enjoyed my time there . All the parking is on street as these are flats . I totally oppose the proposal detailed in your so called plan as all the other roads detailed in your plan have off street parking / driveways etc . Are St. Albans council aware that originally there where 35 spaces in Charmouth court for 50 flats ? . This was reduced to 33 recently due to some worthless double yellow lines being put in place . Now you wish to introduce more yellow lines reducing this by a further 3 spaces including outside my flat where I have parked for nigh on 30 years . I find it incredible that we are being penalised due to commuters not wanting to pay your parking fees at the station . No commuters actually get into Charmouth court as there is no space . if St. Albans council wish to pursue this then the residents parking where we have no off road option should be issued free of charge as we all pay a large amount of council tax and do not need penalising by requests for payment to park in our own street . Or can St. Albans council find another 17 car spaces so each flat has a designated space and also repair the road which is breaking up and hasn't seen a single repair in 30 years . Parking in Charmouth court is tight but we are a great community and it works</p>	<p>Unfortunately the knock on effect of any parking scheme means that parking from none residents moves, whist residents at the moment in some areas do not feel the full effect of the issues raised elsewhere, by not including those areas in any scheme at this time would mean revisiting the area soon after. Residents parking is a positive step to ensuring residents have some priority over the available kerb space and will minimise any parking from none residents. In addition, as this would be a larger scheme, it would provide residents with other parking options in the wider area. In terms of permit costs to residents. The Council must be clear, residential streets are part of the highway, vehicle owners do not have a legitimate right to park on the highway and as such any parking related matters which includes residents using the highway, must be funded by those wishing to use that part of the highway. Unfortunately parking on the highway is not funded by Road Tax or Council Tax and therefore, Councils should not be in a position to use general funds. This is why all residential parking schemes are expected to reach a point where they can be self funded and not be funded by other tax payers.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
9	Charmouth Court	<p>I am writing as a resident of Charmouth Court. As far as I am aware, we do not suffer from a commuter problem up here. But we do suffer from insufficient space for residents' (and visitors') parking. If we lose the bends inside (i.e. the eastern end of) the Court, in front of Nos. 10,11,12 and 30,29,28 and the lines are extended further leading out of the Court (up and down Charmouth Road), as shown on the plans, then we will lose effectively 10 parking spaces for residents. Maybe more residents will use their garages. But some of us don't have one. At busy times we might find ourselves parking a very long way away from the Court.</p> <p>As for safety, I don't think our present parking practices at the East end cause any safety problems. Everyone seems sensible about leaving proper access for refuse lorries and emergency vehicles. Nor am I aware of any issues with scrapes or prangs among residents' cars. So, in my view the yellow line proposals for Charmouth Court achieve nothing other than to infuriate residents of the Court and exacerbate the existing parking problems in the Road.</p>	<p>Unfortunately to ensure a residential parking scheme is successful in removing all or some of the parking related issues, and not create additional problems, double or single yellow lines must be used to stop parking. This can sometimes be in locations that residents may feel is not appropriate because nobody parks there now. However, when implementing a scheme parking gets displaced and this parking will take place in any form that is easy and quick for those using it. Therefore, it is highly likely that by not adding lines here as proposed, residents would see parking which was not there before. These lines are to protect the residential area including verges and footways.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
10	Charmouth Court	<p>My wife has a Blue badge and a designated Disabled Parking Space outside out property No. 37 Charmouth Court, which has been omitted from your plan. Please reinstate it as she is severely disabled having COPD and asthma.</p>	<p>The disabled parking bays are not being removed and will be formalised accordingly.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
11	Charmouth Court	<p>we moved to St Albans (Charmouth Court) last September, so missed the previous consultations on this matter. However, reading the parking consultation for Marshalswick South Ward, dated 28th July 2021, we are strongly opposed for the following reasons:  Double yellow lines on and next to Charmouth Court  *None of our maisonettes have driveways, and there are more cars than spaces on Charmouth Court already.  *The excessive double yellow lines, which treat Charmouth Court and the small roads to our garages like busy junctions rather than the quiet cull de sac it is, will remove at least 10 parking spots.  *This will force residents such as ourselves to park further from our properties, perhaps quite far down Charmouth Road as those double yellow lines will be lengthened too.  *For us, with a toddler and another one on the way, this is far from ideal. There are many young families like us here, and elderly people too, so although it may not seem like a big deal to park a bit further and walk a few minutes to our front doors, in reality this is going to make many of our lives much more inconvenient (for example, our toddler seems to take 10 minutes to walk what takes me 1 minute on my own, and that's not even taking into account carrying things including a new baby from the car to front door).  *Although it may look a little haphazard on our street sometimes with the parking on the corners, I've never seen anyone get stuck or park in a ridiculous manner - and I've been at home most of the time we've been here thanks to lockdown! The bin lorry drivers are expert at navigating along the street. I asked neighbours if ambulances have ever been stuck - the answer is no. So we are unsure why so many parking spots are being taken away. *Please note that although some of us have garage access, they are too small for most modern family cars (including ours, which isn't even very big). Ours is not close to our flat, and we have shared use with our landlords so are unable to park there. *In addition, two disabled parking spots have not been included in the plans - I assume this was a mistake as I know that at least one of them is still very much in use (I can't comment on the other), but it is misleading as it makes it look like there is going to be more available parking on the street than the reality. *Please do not remove our parking spaces!  Permits *Paying for parking permits for ourselves and visitors will affect residents on Charmouth Court the most, due to our lack of private driveways.  *From talking to neighbours I understand that these proposals all stem from issues with commuters parking at the bottom of Charmouth Road and other roads leading onto the north edge of Sandpit Lane, and before that in Clarence Ward. But we have not had issues with commuters parking this far up - a 25 minute walk to the station. *However I appreciate that if you just implemented the permits halfway up Charmouth Road, it would become a problem for us too, as commuters' only other option is overpriced parking near the station. *Therefore it seems that this is a much bigger issue and these parking proposals for Marshalswick South are tantamount to sticking a plaster on the initial problem, which hasn't properly been addressed. *To avoid having to organise permits and pay when the plumber can only come out at lunch time, or every time people are running errands for elderly neighbours, or visitors are helping with children during the week, could two different permit timings be implemented instead of a blanket 11-1? For example 11-12pm on one side or section of the road and 12-1pm on the other side? And is it really a bad thing, for those with driveways (often large ones on Clarence Road in particular!), to give up some street parking for commuters - as long as there are single/double yellow lines to ensure visibility and safety for when they leave those driveways, and for road/pavement users (including drivers, pedestrians and cyclists)? We are concerned that these proposals will cause more problems than they solve. Thank you for your time reading our objections, please take them seriously. I imagine working on issues like this probably makes you feel like the man with the son and a donkey in Aesop's fable, where he tries and fails to please everyone. But there must be a way to fix the issue of overcrowding and dangerous visibility at main junctions/driveways, in a sensible manner that doesn't disproportionately affect those residents, like us, who don't have the option to park in a private driveway.</p>	<p>The scheme is intended to reduce the number of vehicles from none residents who park currently. This will allow for more availability for residents inducing those in Charmouth Court. Whilst parking in the court may still be at a premium, parking on Charmouth Road on most occasions will be easier for residents as an alternative. In relation to different times on alternate sides of the road. This is not something the Council recommends as a solution and can be confusing for many road users.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
12	Charmouth Court	<p>As a current resident of Charmouth Court and a mum of two little kids I can't imagine being forced to park my car far from home. The cars we see on the driveway belongs to residents, I don't see a problem with commuters cars but definitely with decreasing parking spaces.</p> <p>Please review the different solutions for parking issues in our area. Previous respondent wrote: I have been a resident in Charmouth Court for 20 years, and can confidently say that we have never had a problem with commuter parking here, due to our distance from the station (@ 25 - 30 mins walk), and due to the lack of available parking. The acute parking issues here are down to lack of capacity and an increase in the number of residents with cars, we need more spaces not less.</p> <p>Given the above, the latest proposals for Charmouth Court which reduce the parking capacity even further will only exacerbate the situation. Residents will be forced to park on neighbouring roads at an unreasonable distance from their properties, adding further to the parking pressures elsewhere. Introducing resident permit parking for the Court will not solve the problem either, as the current proposals, if implemented, will mean that the demand for parking in the Court will exceed supply, leaving some residents paying for permits which they effectively cannot use. I can see no justification for the current parking proposals for Charmouth Court, and strongly object to these, knowing that this is not a solution, but rather just displacing the problem elsewhere. Please can you and your team look at measures to address the root cause of the parking issues in the Marshallswick South area to ensure an approach is implemented that benefits the residents rather detracts from them. I couldn't agree more with email below.</p> <p>As a current resident of Charmouth Court and a mum of two little kids I can't imagine being forced to park my car far from home. The cars we see on the driveway belongs to residents, I don't see a problem with commuters cars but definitely with decreasing parking spaces.</p> <p>Please review the different solutions for parking issues in our area.</p> <p><b>Another residents comments below</b></p> <p>I am writing with respect to the parking consultation MSW-21 documentation dated 28th July. I have been a resident in Charmouth Court for 20 years, and can confidently say that we have never had a problem with commuter parking here, due to our distance from the station (@ 25 - 30 mins walk), and due to the lack of available parking. The acute parking issues here are down to lack of capacity and an increase in the number of residents with cars, we need more spaces not less.</p> <p>Given the above, the latest proposals for Charmouth Court which reduce the parking capacity even further will only exacerbate the situation. Residents will be forced to park on neighbouring roads at an unreasonable distance from their properties, adding further to the parking pressures elsewhere. Introducing resident permit parking for the Court will not solve the problem either, as the current proposals, if implemented, will mean that the demand for parking in the Court will exceed supply, leaving some residents paying for permits which they effectively cannot use. Whilst parking in Charmouth Court is busy, the community is respectful of each other and overall we do not have an issue with inconsiderate parking. I can see no justification for the current parking proposals for Charmouth Court, and strongly object to these, knowing that this is not a solution, but rather just displacing the problem elsewhere.</p> <p>Please can you and your team look at measures to address the root cause of the parking issues in the Marshallswick South area to ensure an approach is implemented that benefits the residents rather detracts from them.</p>	<p>The scheme is intended to reduce the number of vehicles from none residents who park currently. This will allow for more availability for residents including those in Charmouth Court. Whilst parking in the court may still be at a premium, parking on Charmouth Road on most occasions will be easier for residents as an alternative.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
13	Charmouth Road	<p>There will be fewer commuters in future parking in local roads, because they will be part working from home, and don't want to pay £9 per day at the station. Part of Govia's income is parking revenue. Commuters will now park in Marshals Drive and Homewood Road, where there will be no restrictions - until they demand action. Most residents have large drives so the Council won't take much revenue on parking licences, and rain run-off should go into drains on the householders property, not into the street sewers. Cllr W hasn't changed Clarence Ward parking because he'd lose votes. The Libdems have replicated the same measures in M/South to avoid a riot. So, commuters will suffer.</p> <p>What we're not recognising is that there are too many cars!</p>	<p>Comments do not relate to the advertised orders and are not considered to oppose the orders or the process of making them.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>



Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
14	Charmouth Court	<p>I have recently moved to St Albans to be closer to my family and have therefore missed any prior communication on this matter. I currently reside in Charmouth Court. Having reviewed the documentation issued, I am concerned at the proposal for Charmouth Court as it seems to significantly reduce parking in an area that already has limited parking. As an OAP with limited mobility and assistance to live independently, I feel that the proposal will reduce the ease and flexibility my family / carers have in supporting me, in addition to adding an increased cost to me for this care. It is already difficult enough to find parking close to my property and the proposal to reduce the parking availability will exacerbate this issue. In addition, I do not have a car and therefore would need to pay daily for temporary parking for any visitor within the defined parking times given there is no flexibility for visitor parking within the immediate vicinity. As there are multiple carers it would not be possible to purchase a permit(s), if even eligible, as I could not guarantee that the car which is covered is the one that will be used. Aside from which the cost of permits appears to be far in excess of an administration charge which gives the impression that the Council is looking to profit from its residents who have no negotiating power. A significantly one sided situation! Whilst parking in Charmouth Court is busy, my observation is that the community is mindful of each other and we have not experienced inconsiderate parking. It is not clear why there is a desire to add double yellow lines at what is a curve in the road, not a junction. No explanation has been provided and will create more issues than those that you seem to, incorrectly, perceive exist. We have not experienced commuter parking issues but the real issue here is the lack of sufficient capacity at reasonable cost for a commuter belt city. Simply adding an incremental ladder parking scheme, which is not supported and profiteers, is not resolving the ultimate issue and requires a holistic strategic approach to commuter parking in the City. I request that you rejoin and reconsider the proposal to ensure that it is appropriate to the situation, as the currently proposal is significantly off the mark.</p>	<p>The Councils parking schemes support carers and family members who care for relatives. Any resident who requires support who does not have access to this information should contact the Councils permit team directly at <a href="mailto:parkingpermits@stalbens.gov.uk">parkingpermits@stalbens.gov.uk</a> who will be happy to provide information and offer assistance.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
15	Charmouth Road	<p>HARP TREE WAY  Although our house is numbered 61 Charmouth Road, we own the ONLY property with a front entrance opening unto Harp Tree way. We are in full support of all the plans especially relating to Harp Tree way. The road has become highly sought after by Van drivers who are not even local residents. They park their cars in the morning when they pick up their vans to go to their various work destinations. The reverse occur in the evening when they drop their vans and pick up the cars. None of them live in the vicinity otherwise they would have no reason to drive their cars to and from Harp Tree way. We know a particular couple who deal in second hand cars. They use the road as their car lot. Sometimes the vans and cars are left on the road for weeks or even months when the owners go on holiday. Local residents on Harp Tree and adjoining roads often struggle for parking space on Harp Tree way. Cars and vans are always parked on both sides of the road. he attached pictures taken at 8pm and 10am on a typical day speak for themselves. For all the above reasons, we are fully in support of the plans.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme is intended to remove long term parking and remove larger vehicles as permits are not available for most commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
16	Charmouth Road	<p>Please find below our response to the Parking Update/Review dated 28th July, 2021. We live at 63 Charmouth Road, on the corner of Harptree Way. Thank you for considering our views.  We support the council's aim to improve safety and traffic flow. We also want to ensure that any scheme puts residents first. The new proposal for Marshalswick South Ward does away with the yellow lines and the paid-for parking areas (in the previous proposal) to be replaced by blanket residents only parking and some introduction of double yellow lines.  Although we are a supporter of residents only parking, it does seem to have been applied in Marshalswick South Ward because commuter parking has not been included in Clarence Ward. We, along with most of the residents in Marshalswick South Ward, are very disappointed that the Clarence Ward parking scheme has been left "as is". The inclusion of some commuter parking in Clarence Ward would have ensured that Wards further out from the station (including Marshalswick South Ward) would not have required such severe parking restrictions. However, if no changes are going to be made in Clarence Ward then we are in agreement with the new proposal to include residents parking. With regard to the residents parking scheme, we have the following comments/suggestions: 1. Residents parking charges Most of the houses covered by the scheme have space for parking for one or more cars, off-street, to the front of the property on driveways. This means that these houses with driveways require fewer permits and would be unlikely to need more than 2 permits (some will choose not to have any). Where we live, we cannot have off-street parking to the front of our house as we are on the corner and have a post-box outside to the front. We will therefore have to pay for permits for all our cars and are more likely to have to purchase a third permit. Our house is a 4 double bedroom house (paying a high level of council tax) and we have 3 teenagers/young adults. Therefore it is very likely that we will need a third permit soon. As we have no option other than to pay for permits for all cars we have, we believe it is unfair for us to be pay such a high price for a third permit. We suggest that we receive a discount on any third permit we wish to purchase and this to be, at a minimum, no more than the price of a second permit. 2. Timing of the residents parking restrictions Rather than having one 11-1 residents parking it should be split across sides of the street i.e.. one side 10-12 and the other side 12-2. This would enable easier parking for resident's visitors and reduce the cost to residents of using the vouchers. We are aware that this might more difficult logistically for the council to implement, however this would really help the residents under this scheme.</p>	<p>The Councils decision to extend the Clarence Ward scheme and amend the original proposal for some pay by phone parking was made to support residents in both areas being consulted. Whilst the main factor in the proposals was road safety and traffic flow, the Council is also reacting to a climate change emergency. Parking schemes can play their part in climate change by restricting the number of permits that households can have. In addition the pricing of permits is set to discourage car ownership. Residents parking schemes can in most cases also improve air quality, this is because there is likely to be less vehicles using the road/s at slow speeds looking for parking and less congestion meaning that vehicles are not moving at slow speeds or queuing, this means that less emissions are produced.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
17	Charmouth Road	<p>I would like to add my view to those voiced by Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court residents regarding the planned resident-only parking area for Marshalswick South. Your proposals do not take account of likely congestion which is dangerous on a road with many young families and commuter cars. I have the following comments. Numbers 2 and 4 also apply to the Clarence Ward which you are reviewing alongside this: 1) The proposal to have double yellow lines at the top of the road does not recognise the number of vehicles often queuing at the bottom of the road, many more than 4 and after the double yellow lines proposed would encourage double sided parking to Faircross Way. The single-yellows should be reinstated for the morning rush-hour period at least as far as no. 10 Charmouth Rd &lt;x-apple-data-detectors://0&gt; and preferably to Faircross Way. 2) The 11-1 restrictions across the zone makes it difficult and costly for residents to have visitors. Changing to 10-12 on the even side of the roads and 12-2 on the odd sides would solve this issue while still deterring commuter parking. 3) Some parts of the town have permit parking with signage but without the boxes painted on the road. I would ask that our streets have this minimal approach too as the painted boxes are ugly and degrade the street-scene. 4) Across both Marshalswick South and Clarence Ward, roads have the capacity to provide free spaces to accommodate commuters and the Council should keep the resident-only restriction to a minimum but also shared equally. 5) Your proposals also affect adversely those who have the least parking space who live on Charmouth Court. This may well result in a discriminatory parking policy. 6) These proposals overall appear to have sprung from a badly implemented car parking policy at the station car park with exorbitant charges introduced there. This appears to be deterring people from parking there. If this can be reviewed, would not much of the above be unnecessary? It is disappointing that a Liberal Democrat run Council has implemented this scheme.</p> <p>I would be grateful for a demonstration of more flexibility in reviewing Council parking proposals to take account of the many reasons for an overhaul in your policy.</p>	
18	Charmouth Road	<p>I believe that these orders are excessively restrictive, premature and a misuse of ratepayers' money to protect a monopolistic business (the rail station car park operators). The orders will have no material impact on me, as I have off-street parking, am a long way from the station, and they will not discourage builders from blocking the roads and verges with multiple lorries and vans per site. As I understand it, the principal problem is commuters avoiding the high charges and capacity limits of the station car parks to park their cars all day in residential roads. Given the desire to minimise their walk to the station, they will park both sides of the closest usable road, which has the effect of reducing normally two-way roads to one-way traffic and sometimes blocking them altogether for access by larger vehicles. The scheme is excessively restrictive because all that is really needed is a mechanism to prevent parking that unnecessarily reduces the capacity and safety of residential roads. Alternate side parking schemes can be used to do this in roads where there is adequate off-street parking for residents, which is the case in much of the proposed area. The scheme is premature because it is not clear how commuter traffic will change with the resumption of business after Covid lockdown. There is a real possibility that the demand for commuter parking will fall well below the available capacity of the station car parks. There is some indication that this will be the case. In a recent weekday trip into London I found even the car park closest to the station was less than half full. If it turns out that the long-term demand for commuter parking is less than the existing station car park capacity, then the only reason commuters will choose to park in remote residential roads will be to save themselves the charges made by the car park operators. In this situation, the ratepayers will have paid for the capital and maintenance costs of road marking and enforcement to allow the car park operators to continue charging monopolistic rent-seeking prices. This is a misuse of ratepayers money. I strongly suggest that the council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postpones the implementation of the scheme until the future levels of commuter parking demand become clearer</li> <li>• Liberalises the proposed scheme in roads with adequate off-street parking to allow some day-long non-resident parking (which might also encourage the car park operators to reconsider their business model).</li> </ul>	<p>The scheme being implemented takes in to consideration the current global situation and it is recommended that an 18 month review looks at all of the possible changes that currently may or may not be permanent. However, the Council must consider road safety and traffic flow as the priority, the situation that was in place before the global pandemic was one that needed attention. Unfortunately, we do not know what changes will remain and what changes may occur once some form of normality is returned. Therefore, we have to continue with the road safety aspect of this proposal which can be amended easier than if we simply drop all proposals.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
19	Charmouth Road	<p>I am writing in response to the recent letter received regarding the proposed parking scheme for Marshalswick South to lodge my objection to the proposed scheme. My husband and I live halfway up Charmouth Road. We can park our cars on our drive but our visitors would encounter restrictions which should not be necessary on a residential street like this. The proposal is wrong on every level</p> <p>1. At a strategic level – a. The problem is caused by commuter parking and should be solved at the station by putting pressure on Govia Thameslink to establish adequate affordable parking rather than penalising residents. Please reply by letting us know what you are doing to put pressure on Govia Thameslink to establish adequate affordable parking. b. Trying to solve the station parking problem by gradually moving it away from the station makes no sense. If this proposal is implemented the current commuter parking problem will be displaced to surrounding roads e.g. Homewood Road. This outcome seems to be obvious to everyone except St Albans District Council. Don't you know that commuters from surrounding villages put bikes or scooters in their cars and park within scooting distance of the station?</p> <p>2. At the detailed level – A number of elements in the proposal would unnecessarily penalise residents and commuters.</p> <p>1. Having the restricted time at the same time in the whole road – if the time was staggered so that one side of the road was for example unavailable from 1000-1200 and the other 1300-1500, that would prevent commuter parking while still enabling visitor parking. 2. There are a number of sections of road in both Clarence Ward and Marshalswick South which are not busy, are not outside houses and could easily accommodate commuter cars. Those sections could be left unrestricted and probably cater for most of the commuters. 3. Charmouth Court is particularly problematic because unlike most of the roads involved, residents have no driveways. There are no safety issues there. The extra yellow lines would make their lives hell – do you really want to cause such anxiety and frustration to St Albans residents? Please reply by letting us know how you can justify these unnecessary restrictions.</p>	<p>It is not practical for various reasons to have different timed restrictions on the same road at various locations. This scheme is intended to stop all day or longer term parking from none residents, but at the same time allow more local parking. Any complicated system to achieve this goal would not be practical or justified and would only cause confusion to road users.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
20	Charmouth Road	<p>The proposals indicated in your letter dated 28th July, received by me on 8th August, seem like a decision already taken and a money raising measure for the Council disregarding the full environmental impact. They seem worthy of a judicial review of abuse of power and an inappropriate use of public funds, if implemented.</p> <p>The problem is commuter parking in our roads because of previous actions to limit commuter parking in streets closer to the station. Why are commuters not parking in car parks at the station? Please answer me and others that question first. That is the problem to address. The solution is not all these costly and inappropriate "proposed" parking restrictions in so called Ladder Roads.</p> <p>The intended "measures" will not improve road safety because the commuter cars should be parked in the station car parks, not on roads. The "measures" will not reduce instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking, because the commuter cars should be parked in the station car parks, not on roads. The same goes for the other so called "intentions".</p> <p>We who pay the Council Charge are being penalised because we seem an easier, soft target and the real problem is not being addressed and paid for by the appropriate offenders i.e. commuters or the railway bodies attracting commuters yet not providing appropriate parking arrangements.</p> <p>The full environmental impact of such measures will include more residents widening their driveways to accommodate cars off-road, which will lead to more water run off direct into sewers as well as more enforcement activities and parking fines in areas that were fine until commuter cars appeared in our roads, etc.</p> <p>What can we residents really do when impositions are made upon us like this, when other bodies should be held accountable and pay appropriately, other than remember what our elected members voted for when we consider who to vote for at the next election?</p>	<p>It is correct that a decision at this stage has already been made. That decision was and is our intention to implement Traffic Regulation Orders to manage parking issues in the areas concerned. That decision was made following various consultations in which we answered many of the questions and concerns raised by residents and other interested parties. However, whilst a decision on our intentions have been made, a final decision on implementation can only be made following this process. Any decision to proceed or not, would be made on the basis of any of the representations made at this stage.</p> <p>The station car parks are not managed by the Council. However, It should be noted that the cost of parking in the station is at the national average. Whilst the cost may appear to be excessive, there are running costs of a car park which must be met by any car park owner. In addition, car park owners have a responsibility to encourage other forms of sustainable transport. All of these considerations will be included in their pricing structure. In addition, the local Council is not able to force any business or organisation to change how they price a product including parking charges, this is done through other avenues and various legislative processes.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
21	Charmouth Road	<p>As yet the Commuter parking issue has not been a problem near us but I suspect that if the parking measures did not extend up this far then it would become one.</p> <p>With no allocation for commuters nearer the station and insufficient parking at reasonable cost at the station then this is always going to be an issue. The Sandpit Lane junction was a significant problem as all the Clarence Ward commuter parking was removed and therefore the commuters moved further towards us.</p> <p>I do have to comment that I do not agree with the reduction in parking in Charmouth Court. There are a number of properties and they need parking. There also appears to be an unnecessary extension of the double yellow lines exiting the Court. These new proposed double yellows now extend all the way in front of the 'green' and the 3 blocks of flats that face onto Charmouth Road. Both of these areas tended to benefit the residents of the flats enabling to park close to their properties. They also mean that there is little parking of other people's cars in front of properties.</p> <p>All this part of the proposal will do is push at least 10-12 further cars out of Charmouth Court onto Charmouth Road and further more as the double yellow lines have extended past where they are currently the residents of Charmouth Court will end up parking on Charmouth Road. We don't have a commuter problem but we will have a residents overflow parking problem especially in the evenings and overnight. Charmouth Court residents will now be parking in front of other people's houses in Charmouth Road blocking driveways and giving us a new problem. I already have neighbours with three and four cars that always park in the road. There are always visitors and work vans in the road but they go at night. The last thing Charmouth Road needs is more residents parking in the street making accessing driveways more dangerous. Also I would like to know what you intend to do about the very small distances between driveways where it is dangerous to park will any white lines painted to protect driveways extend into these if they are very small distances that cannot accommodate a car without impeding the ability of the driveway owner to get in and out?</p>	<p>The proposals take in to consideration many factors. This includes road safety, traffic movements and parking displacement. We are also recommending an 18 month review period and will be monitoring all of the issues that are raised during this period.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
22	Charmouth Road	<p>I write as a resident of Charmouth Road in regard to the above parking consultation. I welcome measures to prevent commuter parking (resulting in dangerous double parking and speeding) which had been displaced from surrounding roads following the implementation of parking restrictions. Whilst only the Sandpit Lane end of Charmouth Road is really affected by commuter parking, I welcome the implementation of the same restrictions along the whole of Charmouth Road to avoid pushing the problem to the other end of the road. However, I would like to raise some points to consider :</p> <p>1. Would it be possible to alternate restriction times on different parts of the road so that genuine visitors are able to park freely at all times of the day eg 10am-12pm on even side and 12-2pm on odd side? This would prevent commuter parking without residents having to incur the hassle or expensive of buying visitor permits.</p> <p>2. I'd echo other residents concerns re the proposals for double yellow lines in Charmouth Court and Charmouth Road opposite. I have never witnessed inconsiderate parking around this area. The proposal will simply displace resident parking from the Court onto Charmouth Road. There is already insufficient parking in the Court but residents tend to park respectfully.</p>	
23	Charmouth Road	<p>The proposal is going to be unsafe for the residents of Charmouth Court, we are going to be reduced to hunting around the road for parking spaces in front of other properties, since none of the Charmouth Court has a drive to park on, if they have a garage – they are not wide enough for modern cars. I have sent an email last year objecting to the proposals then, the new proposal is even less workable, in fact I would say it is very ill advised – whoever came up with this proposal has no consideration for the residents living there. If this proposal is approved and goes ahead the situation on the Charmouth Road is going to be very dangerous indeed! Please refer to the attached email for previous correspondence. The Officer stated in one of the emails that:</p> <p>'Marshalswick South - In relation to the MWS scheme which is currently out to publication. Unfortunately the time cannot be extended as it is at a formal stage, the advertising of our intention to make the orders has already considered all of the comments from previous consultations which is why we have chosen to follow the formal process.' Please respond outlining and stating what considerations were taken ? My feedback and request for consideration during consultation a year ago evidently have not been taken into account. How can it be stated that they have? I ask you to seriously reconsider your proposal, and especially for the residents of Charmouth Court development think on their behalf and as per my suggestion – make arrangements so that we have residents only parking in front of our properties on Charmouth Court as well as relevant stretch of Charmouth Road, in the example of my property this is in front.</p>	<p>The proposals take in to consideration many factors. This includes road safety, traffic movements and parking displacement. We are also recommending an 18 month review period and will be monitoring all of the issues that are raised during this period.</p> <p>The Council has been consulting with residents over a 2 year period. All responses to informal consultations have been made available and will be available following the recommendation for the advertised orders.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
24	Charmouth Road	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed parking changes in Marshalswick South and would be grateful if you would take the following comments into consideration. Time zones – the proposal is for time restrictions across the area to be 11am-1pm only. This means that it is not possible to have regular visitors in the mornings - for example where a household meets regularly with a few friends for coffee, or hosts a weekly book club it would not be possible to continue due the fact that even a small number of regular visitors would exceed the number of resident permits allowed over the year. Even to meet less frequently would be costly. Such groups are vital to peoples well being and the time zones should take into consideration what works for the residents not only on what is the cheapest to monitor by the council. As far as I am aware zones are not patrolled every day, so the parking attendants could sometimes check in the mornings and sometimes in the afternoons at random. Having morning restrictions on one side of the road and afternoon restrictions on the other side would mean that commuter parking is managed without inflicting unnecessary parking difficulties on residents. Allowing Commuter Parking where there is capacity. – Commuters do need somewhere to park as there are not sufficient places in the station car parks. There are various areas, for example at the back of Verulam school and alongside long gardens at the end of some roads where there could be unrestricted parking that could be used by anyone including commuters without causing any problems. Areas with large houses and ample drives/off road car parking spaces could also accommodate short stretches of unrestricted parking without causing difficulties. Using these spaces would help to reduce the displacement effect into areas further from the station. Parking in Charmouth Court – Double yellow lines have only recently been put on the junction of Charmouth Court/Charmouth Road and there is not currently a problem with visibility or with parking there. However extending the double yellow lines as proposed on and around Charmouth Court will restrict the number of parking places available to the residents, many of whom are elderly and will have difficulty walking longer distances from their cars. The consequential overspill onto Charmouth Road will also mean more congestion and impact on the free/safe movement of traffic including busses.</p>	<p>The times of the restrictions only apply for a period of 2 hours during the day. Residents are able to make use of visitor parking and where they exceed the number of permits available in a year, can ask for additional allocation. Residents, may also consider alternative arrangements. Commuter parking is not being removed in its entirety, the intension is to remove all day and long term parking. Local businesses with part time workers or other hours of working, will still benefit from any parking provisions.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
25	Charmouth Road	<p>I object to the proposal in its entirety. It avoids any attempt at addressing the root cause of the problem (the discredited Clarence Ward scheme). If implemented, it will certainly worsen congestion where I live (eg, from other residents, displaced from nearby Charmouth Court). I object to being expected to bear further cost for the Clarence Ward scheme, on top of the inconvenience it has already caused. In any case, I would suggest that a moratorium is placed on this proposal until clear readings of commuter traffic trends can be made. For the record, I am one of a number of residents in the road who is extremely concerned by the proposal.</p> <p>1. I understood that – following feedback at the open day held at the city centre over 2 years ago – the Council was going to look at how the deleterious impact of the CPZ on neighbouring areas could be mitigated – eg, by freeing-up surplus spaces for unregulated parking; reviewing the time periods during which residents' parking applies etc. By amending the Clarence Ward scheme, you would minimise any "load" Marshalswick South will have to bear. I regularly walk through the CPZ – mainly Blenheim Ave, Jennings Rd, Clarence Rd, Gainsborough Ave. I always see lots of empty parking spaces that could – and should – be used. It's wasteful and wrong that these roads have become substantially the exclusive preserve of their residents. What progress has been made here in amending the CPZ, please?</p> <p>2. I have noticed that – excluding works vehicles – this, and neighbouring roads, have been much quieter than pre-pandemic. The latest research that I have seen suggests that there has been a significant structural reduction in commuter volumes, and that we may be seeing a permanent change in behaviour. If this is the case, surely it dilutes the rationale for the proposed scheme, which is expressly targeted at managing commuter parking. What are the council's commuter traffic volume assumptions and how have these changed as a result of the long-term impact of covid?</p> <p>3. If the focus of this proposal is to manage commuter parking, why does "residents only" parking apply 11:00am to 1:00pm, instead of, say, 8:00am to 10:00am? Surely, 8:00 am to 10:00am would deter the vast bulk of commuters, and leave the roads available for visitors, and shoppers. Is the intention to block out free parking for the whole day and make these roads effectively "resident only"?</p> <p>4. I already pay a surcharge for the police, and another for our green bin; this would mean I would have to pay just to park in my road. Given that all these problems arise from the CPZ, maybe the Council should approach the Clarence Ward residents and ask them to pay for the collateral damage that the CPZ has caused everyone else.</p> <p>5. How much will the Marshalswick South scheme cost and how have the parking fees been arrived at? (I know that several of my neighbours see this as a stealth revenue-generation scheme.)</p> <p>6. Surely, once the cost of implementation have been covered, the charges should be reduced. When will they be reduced/ phased out?</p> <p>7. Re point (4), at the very least, shouldn't the charges in Clarence Ward be higher than those for Marshalswick South – to reflect the cost they have imposed on other neighbouring residents?</p> <p>8. Why are Clarence and Marshalswick South being treated as separate schemes? Your scheme would be more palatable to people in Marshalswick South if they could use their residents parking to use surplus spaces in Clarence Ward (and there are plenty of these, believe me!).</p> <p>9. On the principle of not making the same mistake twice, I assume you have notified the people on Marshals Drive and Homewood Road of this proposal? If not, what makes you think that commuters aren't going to be displaced to these roads? As you can see, I am really quite bitter about this. It's as if everybody in the neighbouring roads is having to dance to Clarence Ward's tune – as if we're second class citizens. You are supposed to be St Albans City and District council – ie, operating for the community as a whole – not just pandering to the demands of one ward. The council is not inspiring confidence.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, St Albans City has a high number of commuter parking for what is relatively a small geographic area. The issues, therefore, do affect all residents. The Clarence Ward scheme is not the cause of the parking concerns across the district or indeed those faced by residents of Marshalswick South. The cause is commuters who do not wish to pay to park a vehicle or choose alternative Transport options. The decision not to proceed with the pay by phone option for commuters or free up space to allow commuters was made for various reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It did not fit with the Hertfordshire County Councils Local Transport Plan 2018 which encourages parking authorities to refrain from providing additional parking from parking already available. It also encourages authorities to promote more sustainable transport.</li> <li>• The environmental impact on residents and the environment in general</li> <li>• Lack of support from residents in both scheme areas</li> <li>• It was against the intentions of residents parking schemes due to the impact on residents</li> </ul> <p>The station car parks are not managed by the Council. Their car parks are run by private companies – without any link to the public sector. Therefore, the local Council is not able to become involved in their operations, pricing structure or the day to day business. You may wish to approach the train companies directly to answer your queries but unfortunately the Council are unable to become involved in the station(s) company business.</p> <p>The cost of the scheme is outlined in the Council final report which will be published upon any final decision. These charges are based on the number of hours restricted and match those across the district. In terms of revenue, the Council accepts that this scheme is unlikely to self-fund and it is more likely that the costs of maintaining and managing the scheme will be funded from other parking related income. However, it is important to ensure that road safety is the main consideration in any residents parking scheme. The main reason for the areas being separated and considered separate schemes, is the size of the area, the differing needs, and requirements.</p>
26	Charmouth Road	<p>Please can you advise</p> <p>1 how many cars usually park in Charmouth Court and how many cars will there be space for in the new residents parking area - the concern is that they will park in Charmouth Road and reduce spaces for residents</p> <p>2 why is there such an extensive double yellow area around the junction- we have concerns that traffic will speed up and there are regularly cars that drive too fast Leading to</p> <p>3 will you consider speed bumps or 20mph limit to slow traffic down</p>	<p>The Council cannot give exact figures of the number of cars that park in Charmouth Court. This is a figure that will regularly change. The number of available spaces within the scheme is approximately 27. It is likely that residents across the scheme will make use of other areas of parking. However, it is unlikely that residents parking will impact other residents significantly. This is because many residents have off street parking in place. All yellow lines suggested in this scheme are to ensure road safety and traffic flows are maintained under this scheme. The district Council does not have within its remit the ability to implement speed restrictions as requested.</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
27	Charmouth Road	<p>We object to the proposal to extend the current existing parking restrictions between 113 and 93 Charmouth Road. The current double yellow lines around the corners of Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court have already made great improvements that are sufficient. Extending these restrictions are completely unnecessary and will create more issues - like where residents of Charmouth Court will park or any visitors we/our neighbours have can park. The proposed changes would force residents to park even further away from their houses which will have a further knock-on effect to any visitors we have. My Parents regularly look after our children and with our driveway in use, they park at the front of our house to drop off the kids. The proposal forces them to have to park a minimum of 3 houses away but in reality, it would be much further away. I understand the need for restrictions generally however my understanding is the key issue is safety driven by the following: 1) train station parking and 2) emergency services accessibility. Number 1) is not applicable as I don't see commuters parking a 30 min walk from the station and this risk can be resolved by converting the proposed double yellow line extension into permit parking. Number 2) is not an issue as the current double yellows around the corners have resolved any risk by allowing for a good passing area as is witnessed by the bus coming down the road regularly.</p>	<p>All yellow lines suggested in this scheme are to ensure road safety and traffic flows are maintained under this scheme. However, we will review any issues and comments over the 18 month review period.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
28	Charmouth Road	<p>As a resident, I would like to comment on the proposed yellow lines for the junction between Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court.</p> <p>My concern is the yellow lines in front of 95 and 97 will endanger the residents and visitors of 99,101,103 and possibly 105 from cars undertaking (i.e. overtaking on the inside) which currently is a huge risk and has happened. Turning into these house drives when approaching from the south requires vehicles to position towards the middle of the road. Currently, the cars parked on the road act as blockers to this happening. Once yellow lines are painted as illustrated in your plan, the opportunity for the parked vehicles to act as blockers will go.</p> <p>Over the years, the number of cars parked on Charmouth Road by residents of Charmouth Court has increased (our blocker cars). The proposed yellow lines in front of the court seem excessive. Creating such a long stretch of clear road encourages speeding and increases the risk to those turning in or out of the cull de sac or using the drives in Charmouth Road and is thus not going to improve safety!</p> <p>Would you please review the excessive use of yellow lines in the area of Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court?</p>	<p>All yellow lines suggested in this scheme are to ensure road safety and traffic flows are maintained under this scheme. However, we will review any issues and comments over the 18 month review period.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
29	Charmouth Road	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed parking measures for Charmouth Rd. In my opinion it is completely over the top to expect residents to pay for parking permits. Many of us have moved out of the town centre in order to avoid parking issues in the first place. I live nearer the Marshals Drive end of Charmouth Rd and I think it's ridiculous to ask us to pay for a permit when we are just over a mile from the station and a mile and a half from the town centre. By enforcing these new parking rules you are encouraging us all to completely pave our front gardens for off-street parking. Not good for the environment or the appearance of our streets. I wholeheartedly disapprove of the proposals.</p>	<p>The proposals for parking restrictions in this area are required to improve road safety and traffic flow at the same time as improving the environmental impact of vehicles driving around looking to park and that of slower traffic due to congestion.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
30	Charmouth Road	<p>Recommendation summary: create individual residents' parking bays where there are no dropped kerbs but only on one side of the road. Include Homewood in this.</p> <p>Repaint the roundabout at Clarence, Charmouth and Sandpit. 1) These proposals do not wholly fix the reduction to one way traffic with associated obstruction to travel currently experienced by drivers in the Faircross Way to Sandpit Lane section of Charmouth Road as a result of both sides of the road currently being used for parking. The answer is already in place south of Sandpit on Clarence Road where parking is permitted only on alternate sides of the road. Again one detects 'one rule for them and one for us' between the two CPZs! Formalising parking on both sides of Charmouth Road could well lead to further obstruction further north than there currently is as it would encourage drivers to park opposite each other on opposite sides of the road, reducing useable roadway to a single track wherever this occurs. 2) Much of the kerbside in Charmouth Road (and throughout much of the new CPZ) is unusable for parking (resident or otherwise) due to the large number of pavement crossovers necessary to access private drives and the narrow gaps between them. Again creating one continuous permit holder zone is flawed. Especially with the length of many modern vehicles those formally given permission to park in a continuous bay are more likely to cause obstruction to driveway access creating more disadvantaged residents. A much better solution would be to create as many designated single vehicle residents' parking bays of sufficient length as any road can carry but only on one side of the road. This would also serve to remove the need to road mark every driveway's dropped kerb. 3) If the unloved Ladder Road Scheme taught us anything it is that parking expands into the nearest uncontrolled area. Surely, not including Homewood within the scheme can be expected to lead to a new bottleneck at its junction with Sandpit. 4) Could the repainting of the roundabout at the junction of Charmouth, Sandpit and Clarence please be included within these works? The raised centre is largely invisible at present with the result that drivers, especially on Sandpit heading East are unaware of it and just drive straight through: an accident waiting to happen, if it has not already done so!</p>	<p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Charmouth Road and Charmouth Court	Council Response and Recommendation/s
31	Charmouth Court	<p>I live in Charmouth Court and it does not seem right that parking restrictions should be enforced here in the same way as in surrounding roads where houses have driveways for parking.</p> <p>In Charmouth Court spaces are filled with residents' cars at night and as some of them leave in the day there are then limited spaces for visitors, tradespeople, etc. Delivery vans and Council refuse vehicles come in but of course do not park. There is no room for commuters. The lines shown on your charts are not necessary in Charmouth Court - they would merely reduce the spaces available for residents' parking, with no advantage to your scheme.</p> <p>Charmouth Court is not of course a through road.</p>	<p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
32	Charmouth Court	<p>I am a resident of Charmouth Court and am noting my objection to the current proposals. We have very little space for car parking at the moment and with the addition of more double yellow lines we will have less spaces available. I also feel that the permit parking restricted hours will impact any visitors who want to visit and feel the restrictions should be re-thought. I know many of my neighbours have submitted their objection to the proposals too and some have made suggestions. I look forward to the further proposals for our area.</p>	<p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
33	Charmouth Road	<p>1. Most houses in the area covered have off-road parking, so the proposals seem excessive in relation to the original desire to limit Station commuter parking. It is again a shame that certain roads can't facilitate some suitable, limited commuter or shopping parking. 2. Commuter parking in local roads is entirely down to excessive parking charges at the Station (c£9.00 per day), although most Station spaces have been empty during the Pandemic. With many people now working from home for some of the week, it is unlikely that parking will return to pre-Covid levels. 3. The proposals seem only to leave Marshals Drive, Homewood Road, and Sandpit Lane without Residents' Parking only. Thus, commuter parking may probably revert to the first two, and these roads might be complaining at some point, albeit, they are long roads. 4. The lower end of Charmouth Road should have the double yellow lines extended further north, as there has invariably been congestion here. A pedestrian crossing should also be considered, as it is difficult and risky to cross at busy times, particularly for those with prams. 5. Harptree Way has become a parking place for a number of commercial vehicles, which I believe is inappropriate. If they are owned by residents, they should not be allowed to use Residents' Parking permits. 6. White lines across driveways should be extended, as egress sightlines can currently be dangerously restricted if large cars/vans are parked either side.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
34	Hall Heath Close	<p>Thanks for the detailed letter. I am supportive of the proposals.</p> <p>While you are doing this work can anything be done in parallel to stop people parking/driving on the verges at Hall Heath Close? They are destroyed every winter.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>



Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Faircross Way	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Faircross Way	I and my wife are owners and residents of the property which is close to the junction with Charmouth Road. We have suffered over the last two years with commuter parking near to our house, since the start of the ladder roads scheme for residents parking south of Sandpit Lane. The consultation for this scheme did not include residents of our street and neighbouring streets although it should have been clear that these streets would have been impacted. This problem has abated during the lockdown, but has recently restarted. We expect it to resume the full extent experienced previously, in due course. We fully support the changes proposed in your recent letter and announcements, and would appreciate their introduction at the earliest opportunity.	
2	Faircross Way	Thank you for the consultation document. We only have one comment. Other than the double yellow lines at the junctions, we do not see the point in carrying out any of the other proposed works. The proposals were drawn up in 2019 in response to parking close to junctions, particularly the one between Charmouth Road and Sandpit lane ( which was relevant to us). It is now 2021 and the situation is completely different. The parking was predominantly due to commuters. The commuting numbers are vastly reduced and will probably remain so. The whole area will have parking restrictions in place at great expense for no reason whatsoever. In these times of trying to conserve Council funds this seems a complete waste of money. We do not agree with it	An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
3	Faircross Way	As a result of Covid and the resulting change in commuter patterns the need for parking restrictions is no longer required. All the information collected on this matter is out of date and no longer relevant to the current situation. Do not waste rate payers money on this project which could be better used in other places.	An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
4	Faircross Way	In my opinion there is no parking issue on Faircross Way and therefore the double yellow lines and parking restrictions are unnecessary.	
5	Faircross Way	We are in general agreement with the latest proposals that are a significant improvement on the previous proposals. However, we have the following comment: 1. We would strongly urge you not to install dotted white lines to indicate resident parking areas. By placing parking signs opposite these areas (i.e. areas between the double yellow lines), there should be no need to also add dotted white lines. This situation applies in Monks Horton Way. Faircross Way is a pleasant road, currently without any parking signs or lines on the road. Whilst we accept the new parking restrictions in principle and the need for double yellow lines at the ends of the road, we really want to avoid any (unnecessary) additional lines that look unsightly and spoil the current appearance of the road.	Unfortunately due to the nature and size of the area, we have no option but to include painted markings and signs. This is of course regrettable but the legislation is clear in when you can and cannot omit lines.
6	Faircross Way	I support your plan. It's clear that action needs to be taken on Charmouth Road for safety reasons. The issue was worse pre-Covid, but traffic levels are gradually increasing again and the problems have reappeared. If you fix that problem but then don't take action on Faircross Way, which joins it, then we will soon be parked up both sides and the road will become a dangerous tunnel. That's a problem you've managed to get rid of on other streets, but you will just displace it to ours if we are not included in the scheme. So I think your action is necessary (and also sufficient). I have heard one or two people say that actions are no longer necessary because of reduced traffic post Covid. I don't agree with that view. I think traffic is already coming back (witness the Charmouth situation) and as life hopefully returns to more like normal, it will only increase. If we miss this chance to act, we'll in due course find ourselves with the same problems that originally resulted in a survey of the residents in Faircross Way showing a strong majority for action. I would like to thank you also for taking on board feedback from the initial consultation. In my response to that I argued that the original proposal of yellow line no parking on one side and mixed use/resident parking on the other was unnecessarily severe and it would be sufficient to go with mixed use/resident parking on both sides. I notice that the scheme has been amended and has picked up that suggestion. I'm really grateful that you listened.	An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Faircross Way	Council Response and Recommendation/s
7	Faircross Way	<p>We live opposite one of the islands at the entrance to The Park. We see that outside our house you propose to paint double yellow lines but nothing around the island, where as the other island at the opposite end of The Park has them. If the island is not to have double yellows around them, wouldn't it make more sense to move the ones proposed outside our house to be around the island? We sincerely hope that you have marked double yellow lines in mistake outside our property as Faircross Way is a very quiet road, especially at the weekends, and commuters have never tried to park outside our house, but to be fair we wouldn't mind if they did. By having double yellow lines it feels like a sledge hammer to crack a nut as there will be no parking allowed even at the weekends when there is hardly any traffic, teenagers and children play and skateboard in the road, it is so quiet! The proposed double yellow lines mean all our friends and family will have to park outside other houses in the street, which isn't a major problem apart from for my 90 year old father but will annoy our neighbours unnecessarily. Also meaning any tradesmen/workmen would not be able to park outside our property at anytime, forcing them to park outside our neighbours, causing potential conflict.</p> <p>We do appreciate that something needed to be done after the original fiasco which caused a knock on effect for certain residents and we supported some measures but feel this is all getting out of hand. If you had just allowed parking on one side of every road you mention and double yellows at major junctions there wouldn't be a problem and would remove the need for overregulation and expense for all.</p>	Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
8	Faircross Way	<p>As residents of Faircross Way we will restrict our comments to the impact of the proposals on that road.</p> <p>We understand the need to introduce some parking restrictions on our road to curb commuter parking a result of restrictions nearer to the station and welcome the provision of double yellow lines at the junctions of Faircross Way with both Charmouth Road and Homewood Road. However we doubt the need for any other double yellow lines on the south side of Faircross Way (evens). The junctions between Faircross Way and The Park can hardly be described as busy. To have double yellow lines outside our (and nearby properties) would make it difficult for visitors to park at other times eg evenings and weekends, which seems an unnecessary inconvenience when we do not perceive there to be a problem at these junctions. We would suggest Zone MS applies to all of our side of the road. Secondly, we think it would be beneficial to treat both islands at each of the two entrances to The Park the same with both having double yellow lines being provided rather than just at the eastern junction. We had previously highlighted both points at the last consultation and if there are reasons behind why they have not been addressed it would be helpful to be advised.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to deal with any displacement as well as existing issues. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Gurney Court Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Gurney Court Road	<p>As far as we can see the Council has seriously lost the plot. I will start by reminding you of the PROBLEM. St Albans and its surrounding villages have a large commuter population. The commuters need somewhere to park and not all can afford the high cost of the station car parks. The effective banning of commuter cars from parking in the "Ladder Roads" simply led to commuters parking further out and hence parking in what you have called the "New Zone MS". Our road, Gurney Court Road, suffered particularly badly. We had cars parked very tight up to either side of our crossover with a car parked opposite. This made it very dangerous since in reversing out of our driveway you simply could not see in either direction and there was little room to manoeuvre. This was all against a background of there being virtually no cars parked in the ladder roads during the day with many, many spaces simply being left empty. The SOLUTION should be to share out commuter parking between the ladder roads and the New Zone MS so that every road has some parking available to commuters and some for residents. This is why we say the council has lost the plot since the latest proposal takes no account of the needs of commuters. On street parking is a resource for the whole community.</p> <p>In any event:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have not seen hide nor hair of a commuter car since March 2020. There is therefore absolutely no current need for any parking restrictions. There are currently no problems that need fixing. Any restrictions should only be implemented once commuter parking returns to pre-pandemic levels which, of course, it may never do. Any consultation, in the current circumstances, is vastly premature.</li> <li>2. Why does the pay period need to be two hours (11am to 1pm)? Why cannot it just be for, say, half an hour (11am to 11.30am)?</li> <li>3. In the current circumstances this whole exercise appears to be a total waste of time and resources which could, no doubt, be put to better use.</li> <li>4. The timing of this consultation is appalling in that many affected people will be on holiday during the response period and will miss responding.</li> <li>5. We think the long term effect of any restrictions will simply encourage people to eradicate front gardens in favour of hardstanding for cars. The loss of planting should not be underestimated.</li> <li>6. This just seems to be designed as a money making exercise and is simply not wanted by the residents in this form.</li> </ol>	<p>Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
2	Gurney Court Road	<p>We live towards the south end of Gurney Court Road and have the following comments. We fully support the introduction of double yellow lines in the places indicated. In respect of the proposed "residents only parking" restriction between 11am and 1pm on weekdays, we believe it is too early yet to judge whether this is still necessary. <input type="checkbox"/> Certainly, if it hadn't been for the pandemic, we would be strongly supportive of this proposal, subject to our additional comments below. However, parking in our road has not been a problem in the last 18 months. It may only be this autumn as employees start to return to offices that we find out to what extent the parking problem returns or not, given possible permanent changes in working habits as a result of the pandemic. <input type="checkbox"/> We therefore suggest that it would be an irresponsible use of scarce council funds to implement a scheme at this stage which may subsequently prove to be unnecessary, quite apart from the cost and inconvenience to residents and their visitors. Instead, we suggest that the Council: o finalises the scheme so that it is "ready to go" at short notice if required undertakes regular monitoring meanwhile of the extent of any parking problems in our Ward to determine whether and when the scheme might need to be implemented. <input type="checkbox"/> These comments make the assumption that the proposed changes in Clarence Ward will have no knock-on impact on parking in Marshalswick South Ward. We are of course unable to verify this as you have chosen not to tell us about the proposed changes in Clarence Ward. In the event that the parking problem does return in our Ward, we broadly support the proposals as a "least of evils", with the aim of discouraging commuters etc from clogging up residential streets by parking during the day, subject to the specific points below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 Proposed restriction window We host up to 9 people each Wednesday morning to play Bridge, and have done so for many years. Some of our Bridge friends have difficulty walking. Would it be possible please for the Gurney Court Road restrictions to cover an afternoon slot – say 2pm to 4pm – rather than the 11am to 1pm period? This would have the added advantage of not penalising residents' visitors during the peak lunch-time period. Number of visitor permits The document indicates a maximum of 180 resident permits per year, or around 3.5 per week, which would not be enough for our Bridge visitors. In exceptional circumstances such as this, would it be possible for us to purchase additional visitor permits should you decide to stick with the 11am to 1pm slot for our road? Elderly and disabled residents Will there be any concessions for elderly or disabled residents who may require daily visits (e.g by carers) during the 11am to 1pm restriction, and could therefore face an annual additional cost of nearly £500 over which they have no control? 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. Consultation process short-comings Finally, we would observe that the timing of this survey during the August holidays is unfortunate. The failure to provide any outline details of the Clarence Ward proposals, which are not even accessible on the Council website, is also thoroughly unhelpful, particularly as the parking problems in our Ward resulted from the introduction of the Clarence Ward scheme. This just creates suspicion of a "divide and rule" approach.</li> </ol>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
3	Gurney Court Road	<p>We feel nobody is listening to the residents that are, or will be affected by this proposed scheme and to date we have not found a single resident in our area who wants these changes. Having looked through the information provided it is incomplete and not at all clear exactly what the proposals are. As an example not all affected roads are shown and maps vary in scale. We have not been provided with any tangible evidence or research that has led to these latest proposals. In the original survey the majority of residents did not want these changes but safety was cited as the reason for implementation. With the post covid-19 change in working practices the parking in our road (Gurney Court Road) is now negligible as a large proportion of those commuters are able to work from home. This is unlikely to change significantly and therefore the parking no longer presents a hazard. The parking of cars close to junctions (highlighted in a previous communication) has already been addressed by yellow lines. These proposals are now completely unnecessary and we do not want resident permits or restrictions in our roads. If these proposals are implemented then as an affected resident we will ultimately be paying towards the implementation, the administration and also for parking permits. This is a waste of resources, particularly when our pavements have in the last month been completely resurfaced with tarmac- this will have to be dug up to provide signage as seen in other local roads. We are copying this to our local council representatives as a simple straw poll would show that these proposals go against the wishes of the majority of residents.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Gurney Court Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
4	Gurney Court Road	<p>Overall comments / Background The main issues , pre COVID affecting unwelcome commuter parking in the roads north of Sandpit Lane were almost entirely driven by the imposition of restrictions in the Clarence Ward area , which displaced those seeking free parking (to avoid very high charges in the underused car parks at St Albans City station). For commuters , paying in excess of £4000 per annum , further £1500 cost of taxed income is quite clearly very high and not insignificant. Please note that under the present rail franchise system , (to be replaced by the Schapps - Williams revue by a series of concessions) station car parking is not regulated in any way , and there has been an emphasis on train operators and the effectively nationalised Network Rail to extract as much commercial revenue as possible from this activity. Whilst St Albans had a high percentage of commuters and travellers walking or cycling to the station , the percentage of car journeys towards the stations has always been quite high , and there is clearly some degree of "rail heading" from various parts of the city and district. You will probably have some idea (or someone should have) , of modal split between walking, cycling , bus and motorized access to the station. Having used these services since 1990 , and having been employed as professional railway manager for well over 3 decades , I have some knowledge of this , and in particular the compound passenger growth on rail demand from St Albans City station. which until recently was a major driver in local modal journeys. Obviously - various Thameslink route upgrades and the recent provision of high capacity rolling stock has emphasised this process. Generally , despite a very decent bus interchange , the use of bus transport to and from the station has never been very high. Impacts and observations on Gurney Court Road. The imposition of restrictions , south of Sandpit Lane - despite an average walk time to the station of 17 or so mins , caused an immediate and very unwelcome surge of commuter parking , often in badly parked cars intruding onto the modest verges and causing worrying issues of exiting drives , and in effect reducing the road to a single lane. Sighting distances were reduced and compromised .This caused not only transit time issues , but issues for delivery vehicles and the inevitable building and other vehicles , which though annoying , are usually of short term duration Difficult to prove , but from observation, there grew some awkward "confrontations" from time to time , with an already poor level of road traffic civility even more challenged. The proposals Marking junction areas with double yellow lines at junctions is very much welcomed. Residents only parking is (reluctantly) accepted , as the City has effectively caused the problem , it has to be dealt with. Removal of pay by phone / and shared parking bays again is accepted. The financial balance between commuters between paid for station parking / free on road parking / paying "something" to park is clearly something that is an individual decision is quite easily made and "free and paying something" is a temptation for some. A discouragement policy seems therefore to be the better option. Going forward There ca be some "harmless" parking south of Sandpit Lane on non through roads where some latitude could be allowed - particularly where housing is on one side only and there is no real imposition on residents. A simple walk around can identify these "patches" and could provide maybe 50 or 60 spaces. Whilst rail commuting from the station will probably take some years to reach pre March 2020 levels , it will (at best industry estimates) - reach around 65% over the medium term. It is wise to consider this. I would suggest a review of the 11 am to 1 pm timescales - to something like 10 am to 1400 pm as a "discouragement". Parking enforcement will be important , and I am sure many residents would like to know how you propose to do this.? Not necessarily your concern , but with much reduced levels of rail usage (all day traffic is at best 50% at the moment - with but a slow return to commuting) - there is clearly a significant loss of non rail revenue (parking) to train operators which are presently picked up by central government. Nationally there is considerable sunk costs in underused car parks , and one would hope that some efforts will be made to attract some parking off the streets to bespoke car parks , but it needs to be at affordable rates to maximise this. City and District planning needs to be aware of , and perhaps encourage better use of these facilities that have been provided.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses. This response is relevant to some of the comments submitted.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
5	Gurney Court Road	<p>Your consultation process was triggered by the problem of all-day commuter parking impacting residents in streets within walking distance of the St Albans City Station. This problem only ever affected a few houses at the Sandpit Lane end of Gurney Court Road. Since Covid there has been NO PROBLEM due to a massive reduction in commuting. Following Covid and with changes in working practices due to increased working from home, it is very unlikely that there will be any significant problem in the foreseeable future. I would, therefore strongly recommend that this proposal for residents only parking, in as far as it relates to Gurney Court Road, is SHELVED FOR AT LEAST 5 YEARS and only readdressed if, by any chance, the issue reappears after that time.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
6	Gurney Court Road	<p>I refer to proposed alterations in Gurney Court Road and the Marshalswick South Scheme. Firstly thank you for arranging the long overdue yellow lines on the corner junctions to enforce compliance with the Highway Code. As to the proposed Parking Schemes, I would suggest that the necessity for these has gone away along with the commuters travelling to London from the station. It seems likely that it may be many months/years before this may again become an issue in the future. Is it still valid to spend our money now on line painting and on going staffing by a traffic warden when the parking here is already in effect residents only, with some extra parking by contractors or welfare visitors? As many houses in this area have the drives to accommodate at least two cars, and therefore will not require a Parking Permit how much profit do you anticipate from Visitor permits, limited third car permits and occasional parking fines? I believe the proposal should be reconsidered for use in the future should it be required.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
7	Gurney Court Road	<p>I just received this petition request from the residents of 28 Gurney Court Road. As it regards the upcoming resident parking permit scheme in Gurney Court Road, I'm submitting it as 'comments and objections' as per your letter from the 28th July. It is a detailed list and I would support the concerns about provision for residents with complex needs, and the request for multiple carers' permits.</p>	<p>Please see the councils response in objection 11 of Gurney Court Road responses. This objection responds to the multi-signed Letter referenced. Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
8	Gurney Court Road	<p>Objection to the parking proposals to Marshalswick South Ward Further to your letter dated 28 July 2021 I write to formally object to the proposals contained within your communication. Considering the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the working patterns of many people in the community, it is premature to believe that pre pandemic travel routines will return to 'normal'. Transport, working from home and commuting will undoubtedly be different post pandemic and to push on regardless with this parking scheme on old out dated information is hasty, irresponsible and a waste of money. Surely the sensible thing to do is to postpone the plans until such time as the major impact of the pandemic on peoples working lives/commuting has abated. If there is still considered to be a need to introduce parking restrictions at this time then the process can recommence. Otherwise the costs of implementing a scheme that is potentially redundant before it is implemented will be a complete waste of tax payers money and a dereliction of your duty as an officer of the Council. Whilst writing I feel it important to query the rationale for separating the two schemes of Marshalswick South Ward and Clarence Ward. If it wasn't for the implementation of parking restriction in the Clarence Ward, which I question the need for, there would be no need for any parking restriction in Marshalswick South Ward.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Gurney Court Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
9	Gurney Court Road	<p>I am afraid that many residents believe that the proposal simply addresses a problem which the Council itself created. More than that, that it opportunistically turns the Council-created mess into a money-raising scheme. On that basis it would be far better to scrap the ladder scheme, identify the problem and tackle it properly.</p> <p>As it stands, the Council should at the very least give residents a break by waiving the cost to them of parking in their own street.</p> <p>Further, double yellow lines should be staggered on either side of the road to prevent 'tunnelling'. We have seen what happens when cars are parked all the way on both sides, effectively leaving stretches of single track road - aggressive stand-offs between drivers anxious about catching their trains.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
10	Gurney Court Road	<p>Whilst these proposals would solve the issues we had pre pandemic, would it not be reasonable to wait and see what happens as "normal" life returns before establishing a residents only parking scheme.</p> <p>At the moment the commuters parking regularly could be counted on one hand which is clearly not a problem.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
11	Gurney Court Road	<p>Questions which the council must answer: We have experienced how badly Gurney Court Road was affected when proposals for roads south of Sandpit Lane were implemented. Resident parking only was introduced and commuter parking was banned. Commuters migrated in force to Gurney Court Road. Here there was no ban on parking and the sudden influx of commuters created dangerous and congested parking. The Equality Act 2010: The Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination. It is against the law to discriminate against anyone because of age and disability and those dependent on carers. These people have 'protected characteristics'. Communities are protected from both direct and indirect discrimination and should not be treated less favourably than others, including harassment and victimisation, violating a person's dignity and creating an offensive environment around them. The Public Sector Equality Duty means that public bodies have to consider all individuals when carrying out their work in shaping policy, in delivering services and in the duty to make reasonable adjustments in the interests of fairness and equality of treatment. Questions which require answers: 1.Does the Council accept that they are required by law to comply with the provisions of the Equality Act 2010 both in their public sector duty and in the letter and spirit of the Act ? The Equality Act 2010 replaced many previous equality laws with a single Act. This has helped to simplify the law, remove inconsistencies, and make it a lot easier for organisations and individuals to understand. It strengthens the law tacking discrimination and inequality across all of the 'protected characteristics' set out in the Act. The Council is committed to promoting equality and diversity and meeting its duties as a community leader, service provider and local employer. As part of the final process of all our parking schemes, The Council must have due regard to the need to: •Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act. •Improve equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. •Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. 2.What does the council have to say to explain the differences in treatment between the roads south of sandpit lane (almost empty of parked cars and residents' only parking) and Gurney Court Road north of Sandpit lane (no ban on parking and dangerous and congested parking by commuters). 3.Does the council put the interests of non-residents against the interests of residents when the council has the prospect of financial gain? 4.What has the council done to gather information about residents who have 'protected characteristics' ? 5.Why have the council decided to make residents pay for visitor permits? A disabled resident needing 3 carer visits per day for every day of the year could face a bill of about £500 for visitor permits. 6.It is a human right to have visits from friends and family, from medical practitioners, such as physiotherapists, hairdressers, cleaners etc. To have to pay for visitor permits is an attack on individual people's health, welfare and damaging to mental health, ultimately an attack on their human rights. Each household should have two medical and mental health permits provided at no cost. Does the council understand that their permits for visitors with costs means less favourable treatment than others, violating a person's dignity and creating an offensive environment for their after months of lockdown and isolation? 7.Why have the council decided that when the pandemic is over there will be a return to the world we knew before covid 19. We cannot know what the future holds. Transport, working from home and commuting may have changed permanently. The present proposals are premature and should be set aside until we know what will happen in the future. Is this not reasonable? 8.Why have the council chosen to present new proposals in the middle of August when most people are on holiday and may not be able to participate in consultations? It is only reasonable to extend the deadlines for reply by at least 2 weeks. 9.Why have the council not provided any information about what is happening in Clarence Ward to allow comparison and informed opinion? 10.Why do we have no information about passing places on the maps? Is parking to be on both sides of the road? 11.What rights do residents have for parking outside the restricted hours 11am - 1pm 12.Could we please call on the Freedom of Information Act to have access to all the council's plans especially financial estimates for implementation, signage and the role of parking wardens and fines, both expected income and final costs? 13.Why have the council decided to ruin the pleasant character of our residential road by these proposals and downgraded the value of all our homes?</p>	<p>Note we have not been able to accept the 35 copies of the letter as a petition, this is because there is a legislative process in place already and residents and the Council must follow that process, we have included all 35 under this response to minimise the number of responses displayed. 1.The Council is committed to promoting equality and diversity and meeting its duties as a community leader, service provider and local employer. In terms of what actions are taken on the Highway, the Council must consider the underlying fact that Highway is governed by various legislation including the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 and any subsequent legislation and guidance. The Equality Act 2010 prohibits discrimination against people with the protected characteristics that are specified in the Act. Protection from discrimination applies to people in a range of circumstances, covering the provision of goods, facilities and services, the exercise of public functions, premises, work, education, and associations. The Act also provides protection for people who are subjected to direct discrimination or harassment because of their association with a person with any of those protected characteristics. The Equality Act 2010 replaced many previous equality laws with a single Act. This has helped to simplify the law, remove inconsistencies, and make it a lot easier for organisations and individuals to understand. It strengthens the law tacking discrimination and inequality across all of the 'protected characteristics' set out in the Act. When looking at the Highway and possible changes to the highway, the Council will consider how those changes affect all of the listed characteristics within the Act 2010. This is documented within an appendix to the Councils final report, this appendix is called a Community and Equality Impact Assessment. I would encourage residents to refer to this report for more information. 2.The Council has shown that all parking issues across the City and District are dealt with accordingly and within the legislative processes set down by central government and any associated services. The consultations in both Clarence and Marshalswick South Wards have looked at road safety, traffic flow and provision of parking for residents. At the same time, we have considered the impact on commuters as part of our community. 3. It should be noted that the Council does not gain financially from residential parking schemes. In fact, the legislation which governs parking schemes specifically states that Parking Authorities must not profit and that any surplus must be ringfenced back to Highway related projects. In direct response, the Council must consider all community groups including residents and non-residents as all these community groups are likely to also sit within the specific characteristic groups detailed within the Equalities act 2010. 4. The Council cannot undertake any research or conduct any surveys which specifically ask for residents to provide details of their personal circumstances. In addition, by doing so we would be in direct conflict with the equalities act as we would not be able to conduct the same research or surveys with all community groups including those using the highway that we have no contact information for. The Act also protects people from having to disclose their personal information and the Council could again be in violation of the act by conducting such a process. In short, the Council must consider all of the Act 2010 characteristic groups to ensure that what ever actions are taken, they are able to provide evidence of How the changes will benefit, be enhanced and how any negative impacts are minimised or eliminated 5. A parking scheme must be self-funding; this is because they are not funded within the general funds. In addition, as car owners we do not have the legitimate right to park on the Highway, in general we chose to do so. However, there are times when that choice is made due to circumstances out of our control. This includes those with disabilities. Therefore, our schemes offer permits for disabled drivers and disabled badge holders also have free provisions with the badge. Other provisions are made for carers and health care workers. This information is available on our website and through our permit processing teams. 6. Unfortunately it is not within the Human Rights Act that we must have a vehicle, permit schemes do not stop residents from having visitors or health care workers visiting their homes. During these times of uncertainty relating to our current environmental emergency, it is encouraged that we all make changes to how we chose to travel. Parking schemes are designed to encourage less car ownership and encourage sustainable travel. However, there are provisions within parking schemes to assist residents who do have certain needs 7. The Council is intending to resolve many safety concerns relating to parking issues. Whilst this may have depleted due to the global pandemic, we of course do not know what the outcome will be once and if people return to the old way of working. The issue is that the Council cannot decide based on what may or may not change at this time. This is mainly because any return to the parking as we had prior, would mean that the process, which is laid down in legislation, would need to start from the beginning. For residents this means a possible number of years before any changes. This is one of the main reasons for the consideration and recommendation of an 18-month review period. 8. These are not new proposals, they are amended from comments made by residents and presented as the final scheme from the consultations previously undertaken. As this part of the process falls within the legislative boundaries, we can only advertise the making of the orders for a period of 21 days. This is not a negotiable time frame as it is set within the legislation. The timing of the advert is purely in line with the process as it has unfolded. However, with the current position on travel (at the time) it was not considered an exceptional time. We also must consider that by accepting people take holidays as an exceptional circumstance, this would mean making such exceptions all year, otherwise we could be discriminating those that take holidays outside of the UK summer holidays. The number of people who may or may not take holidays cannot be relevant. 9. The Council have informed the Marshalswick South area of the proposals and within our letter we explained that those changes had proceeded. However, the two areas have been separated to ensure that the differing needs of the 2 areas are met accordingly. 10. We believe the maps are clear. However, we also must consider that residents know the roads in which they live. Unfortunately, if we were to map every driveway location as a passing point, the maps would be more confusing and would take 100s of hours of officer time. 11. Essentially no road users have a right to park on the Highway. However, if there are no restrictions in place as is proposed outside of those times, residents can use the highway in the same way as they did before. However, some restrictions such as the double yellow lines, remain active 24/7 12. The information you request is detailed in the Councils final report which will be available on our website under the parking consultation page or residents can request a copy by contacting us direct in the normal ways. 13. The Council must follow the legislation when implementing residents parking schemes. There is no evidence that parking schemes or road markings affect the value of a property. In fact, in many cases residents parking schemes have added to the value of properties as it provides residents with some assurance that parking is available and removes many negative aspects that come with parking issues. Not least the environmental improvements.</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Homewood Road	<p>Please amend the proposed plan to protect the residents at the south end of HOMEWOOD ROAD. we are supportive of the efforts to address parking concerns and improve visibility and safety at key intersections in Marshalswick South Ward, but we believe strongly that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the combined impact of the current proposals for Markshalswick South Ward and Clarence Ward will exacerbate problems already experienced at the south end of Homewood Road, and</li> <li>2. the proposal for the intersection of Homewood Road and Faircross Way will make the intersection more dangerous than today. These are discussed further below, followed by recommendations to address our concerns.</li> </ol> <p>The South-end of Homewood Road - Why punish these residents? The south-end of Homewood Road lacks road markings and at times already experiences significant parking, traffic, and speeding problems that warrant attention. Residents have regularly suffered from cars blocking the road and driveways on both sides, making it difficult or impossible at times to safely exit driveways. Parking at this end of Homewood Road has been modest during most of the day, but it becomes unruly when non-religious events are held at the United Reform Church on the corner of Homewood Road and Sandpit Lane. You propose to add restrictions on all the roads leading up to Homewood Road, but no restrictions on Homewood Road itself, other than changes to the intersections with Faircross Way and Sandpit Lane. The proposals will of course push more cars to park on the south end of Homewood Road (from Sandpit Lane to the Faircross Way junction) at all times of the day, as this will become nearest unrestricted parking to Verulam school and the railway station. Rather than solve the parking issue you seek to address, we believe you will simply be pushing the problem to another neighbourhood (ours). It is unclear why you would not afford the residents of this section of Homewood Road the same protections as houses on the adjacent blocks, but this seem inherently unfair given that it will adversely impact residents on this street who bought homes without the inconvenience that will be created if these proposals proceed.</p> <p>Homewood Road &amp; Faircross Way, proposed double yellow lines – Increased risk of accidents</p> <p>We are supportive of adding double yellow lines to this intersection. However, we believe the lines in your proposed drawing on the side of Homewood Road opposite Faircross Way will actually increase rather than decrease the risk of accidents occurring at this junction. As shown, the double yellow lines lack symmetry in relation to the intersection itself, favouring the upper end of Homewood Road at the expense of the south end. The plans will also eliminate parking in front of three houses on this road (No's 20, 18, and 18A), which seems very unfair. They will also ensure that there is back-to-back parking on what you propose to be a completely unrestricted section of road in front of No. 16 Homewood Road, which is also directly in front of our driveway on the corner of this busy intersection. Emerging from our drive on this corner requires a great deal of caution owing to (i) the heavy use of this as a short-cut to avoid the traffic light at Sandpit Lane and Marshalswick Drive, (ii) the excessive speeds that cars travel up this road, and (iii) the close proximity of our driveway to intersection of Homewood Road and Faircross Way. Implementing the 28 July 2021 proposals will make emerging from our driveway even more dangerous. At present, automobiles approach this intersection with a degree of caution, emerging slowly from Faircross Way onto Homewood Road as they consider approaching traffic. Cars turning onto Homewood Road from Faircross Way are mindful of oncoming traffic, but show little consideration of the possibility that automobiles will emerge onto this road from driveways, particularly those adjacent to the intersection. Indeed, entering Homewood Road from our drive requires us to take account of traffic approaching from three directions (both directions of Homewood Road and turnings from Faircross Way), whilst negotiating any cars parked directly across from our drive. The double yellow lines you propose at this intersection should make it easier for drivers to see oncoming traffic when turning onto Homewood Road from Faircross Way, but this will also make these drivers more confident to proceed through the intersection with greater pace as they turn onto Homewood Road and past our driveway just a few meters from the turning. It is also likely to increase the confidence and speed of motorist coming down Homewood Road, as they will now have clearer sight of potential traffic emerging from Faircross Way. Unfortunately, this combination will increase the likelihood of collision automobiles emerging from driveways, particularly ours and others close to the intersection. Ironically, during the twenty five years that we have lived at 11 Homewood Road, we are not aware of a single traffic accident between cars heading down Homewood Road and those turning from Faircross Way, but we have personally been involved in two accidents emerging from our drive, and a number of near misses. So please don't make things more difficult and dangerous for us. We request the following amendments to plans for Marshalswick South Ward plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extend parking restrictions (similar to those proposed for Faircross Way, Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Roads) to the south-end of Homewood Road,</li> <li>2. Extend or rebalance the proposed double yellow line running perpendicular to Faircross Way, so that the restrictions will extend to the section of the road across us .</li> <li>3. Do not eliminate the available parking in front of No's 20, 18 and 18A of Homewood Road.</li> </ol> <p>Lastly, a plea regarding road safety. Over the last few decades Homewood Road has become a short-cut (often more an expressway) 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 centre. Over the same period, we have also seen an influx of young families moving to this and the neighbouring roads, and a heavy stream of pedestrians (young and old) and cyclists out and about on this and surrounding roads. As a result of these developments, we are very concerned that a tragic accident is increasingly likely on Homewood Road. As noted above, the increased visibility at key intersections such as Faircross Way and Homewood Road will no doubt embolden drivers to accelerate rather than calm their speeds. This may increase their mindfulness of oncoming vehicles but not necessarily those emerging from driveways or travelling on bicycles or by foot, often accompanied by the family dog. Please don't make the likelihood of tragedy greater. We propose that traffic calming measures (for example the installation of a few speed humps, or a raised intersection at Homewood Road &amp; Faircross Way) be incorporated into this plan or otherwise implemented in the near future to avoid a future tragedy in which life is needlessly but irreparably damaged or lost.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
2	Homewood Road	<p>Re your parking consultation if I have understood the document correctly you have said that there will be no parking restrictions in Homewood Road, for residents or visitors. If this is what you are saying then I agree. If you are saying there are to be restrictions of any sort I disagree.</p>	<p>There are no restrictions proposed in Homewood road</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
3	Homewood Road	<p>We are emailing in response to the parking consultation for Marshalswick South Ward (dated 28th July 2021). As residents of Homewood Road, we strongly oppose the proposal.</p> <p>As we have set out in previous responses, the preferable response to the parking situation would be for the Council to address the high, monopolistic pricing of car park spaces at St Albans City station. If that was addressed, the Council would not have to incur the costs of the parking restrictions you are proposing in Marshalswick South Ward (MSW).</p> <p>Assuming however that you intend to go ahead with parking restrictions on the roads in the MSW area, we support Homewood Road being included in the list of roads to which parking restrictions would apply. It is inevitable that, under your proposal, a significant number of cars (for people using the train station or Verulam school) will look to park on Homewood Road since they will be unable to do so on other roads in MSW. This just transfers the problem from Clarence Ward, and other roads in MSW that have suffered with parking problems to Homewood Road. It seems completely unreasonable for Homewood Road to be largely singled out to become the local car park for the area, particularly since parking problems already arise on the road when the United Reformed Church holds a practice or event.</p> <p>Based on our conversations and interactions with other residents on Homewood Road, we believe that a majority are opposed to Homewood Road being treated differently to the other MSW roads that are in the parking restrictions and we would urge you therefore to include Homewood Road in the scheme, with residents only parking at certain times.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses as the Councils response is relevant to your comments.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
4	Homewood road	<p>The majority of parking on local streets related to this proposal are probably connected to station parking . Two points</p> <p>1. this proposal should be postponed until the longer term effects of Covid on office working scan be determined. Currently trains are running largely quiet and the parking at the station similarly quiet.</p> <p>2.I note the price of parking has risen at the station recently from £7.60 to £8.70. This is probably main reason why some park on local streets. What control has local council have on the car park charges. Does a local monopoly exist exasperated by local parking regulations? Legal case surely? Yellow lines to avoid corner parking is welcome. I live in Homewood road and although annoying at times the street car parking related to services at Homewood Road can only be welcome. The church was there before most house owners bought their homes. Apart from normal church services it provides a venue for local communities like choirs etc. These have to be encouraged. An article in the Times highlighted the increased income local councils generate from car parking and schemes such as that proposed. Pushing ahead with this scheme supports the Times article.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
5	Homewood Road	<p>I am writing to object to the above parking proposal, previously named Ladder Roads scheme. I also suggest the Council fundamentally rethinks its parking strategy. Each time parking restrictions are amended, the main impact is to move the (parking) problem on to another area/road(s).</p> <p>My comments/observations:</p> <p>1.If the proposal is to proceed, then Homewood Road should be added to the scheme:</p> <p>a.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 to park and have a shorter walk. I say that given the fact that a large number of commuters (pre-Covid) were willing to walk for 15 minutes to avoid a circa £8.00 daily charge.</p> <p>b.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 £8.50 a day, it seems highly likely that some will undertake a circa 20 minute walk to avoid parking charges. Although there may be less commuter journeys post Covid, it is inevitable that commuter parking will remain an issue.</p> <p>c.Surely (under the current proposals) no commuter will pay to park in The Park or the far end of Charmouth Road/Gurney Court Road (included in the proposed plan) 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>d.If Homewood Road is not included, the Parking Team can expect to receive a number of complaints and pressure to extend the scheme further. At additional cost.</p> <p>2.I am truly surprised with the details of the revised proposals. The council officers volunteered, at the open day held circa 18 months ago, that it was a mistake to have not included Homewood Road in the initial draft. Nothing has changed since this time, other than the revised plan that deviates from the information provided back in 2020.</p> <p>It seems to me to be likely for you to receive a number of objections to be received from residents in Homewood Road with lower house numbers as they are clearly going to be the most heavily impacted. I do not believe silence from Homewood Road residents living at higher numbers can be taken as a sign of approval (i.e. if the proposal was to bring restrictions in for half of the road then the other half would likely be more vocal.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
6	Homewood Road	<p>It is very difficult for the residents of Homewood Road to comment on the Council's proposals without knowing what is proposed for Woodstock Road North. Most residents of Homewood Road don't want restrictions at the moment. However, if controls are introduced in Woodstock Road North, more people will park in Homewood Road and residents are likely to change their minds about restrictions.</p> <p>If restrictions are not introduced in Homewood Road it will be all the more important to have double yellow lines at the southern end of Homewood Road, both at the junction with Sandpit Lane and by the traffic island. There would be no logical reason for having double yellow lines at every junction with Sandpit Lane except Homewood Road. We were pleased that St Albans Council voted for 20 mph speed limits across the District. Since Hertfordshire County Council are restricting funding for 20 mph limits, perhaps St Albans should approach the Government to fund Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in the District.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
7	Homewood Road	<p>we are pleased to note that double yellow lines are planned for the intersection of Faircross Way and Homewood Road. However it would seem logical for double yellow lines also to be provided at the busy intersection with Sandpit Lane where there is also a traffic island to negotiate. In the same way the corner at the North end of Homewood Road is usually taken fast by traffic entering the road from Marshals Drive and here double yellow lines would provide greater safety.</p> <p>We are surprised to see we are being asked to comment on the proposed traffic scheme without knowledge of the views of the residents of Woodstock Road North as your reaction to their views may well further affect the management of traffic in Homewood Road.</p> <p>It is noted that your proposals have taken no account of the affect on the South part of Homewood Road of the proposed parking restrictions in Faircross Way.</p> <p>It seems almost inevitable that as drivers return to working in London their cars will be parked in Homewood Road and Marshals Drive as these will be the only roads without parking restrictions. We would therefore ask that that you consider providing at least some restricted parking in at least the South part of Homewood Road.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that it is intended to implement a 20 mph speed limit as this should contribute to greater road safety.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>



Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
8	Homewood Road	<p>We are writing to express our deep disappointment that Homewood Road has been removed again from the proposed residents permits in the new Marshalswick South Scheme.</p> <p>We have written previously to express why we think this is absolutely the wrong thing to do and these reasons are set out in the email below. We were very happy with the previous amendments to include Homewood Road in the scheme and cannot fathom why it has been removed again. We can only assume there was a lack of support from those further up the road who are not affected by the dangerous church parking, or those who think the current situation with lack of commuters will prevail. It won't, and when life does return to normal for commuters, students are parking for Verulam School and church-goers are parking even more on our road when Faircross Way is prohibited it will be an accident waiting to happen and it will be on your shoulders. Please don't let this happen when it is so easily preventable. If you don't think there's a problem just come and observe the road for a few hours when there is an event on at the church - if no-one from your department has done this I don't know how you can possibly proceed with these proposals.</p> <p>Please PLEASE reconsider including Homewood Road in the scheme. It is crazy in the whole of this area to leave out just two roads - please just look at a map! Marshalswick Lane is the logical boundary around all of these roads and they should all be treated the same way, or not at all. All you are doing is moving the problem elsewhere - it is NOT a solution.</p> <p>For what it's worth we are very happy with the proposed double yellow lines at the end of Faircross Way which are much needed and long overdue from a safety point of view.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
9	Homewood Road	<p>I object to the exclusion of Homewood Road from full implementation of the proposals. Implementing the proposal as currently set out will have serious negative consequences for Homewood Road as a whole, seriously exacerbating the unsafe parking that already happens when the church near Sandpit Road has an event on.</p> <p>I believe the only way the scheme can safely proceed is with the full inclusion of Homewood Road and Marshalls Drive</p>	<p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
10	Homewood Road	<p>I have just read your letter regarding parking consultation Marshalswick South Ward Update. I am very disappointed to note that Homewood Road has not been added to the restricted parking scheme. This is going to result in commuter parking being displaced along Homewood Road as the closest non restricted free parking. I have seen commuters park up on Charmouth Road and then get on their e-scooter to get to the station. Please refer to my previous comments and objections to you which are attached below. We would request that you reconsider and extend the scheme 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 making it difficult to get on and off our driveway. 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, Charmouth 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.</p> <p>The knock-on effect of the recently introduced parking zone south of Sandpit Lane has changed the nature of Charmouth 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 Charmouth 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 Charmouth 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.</p> <p>We not a parking experts but would hazard a guess that the commuter cars currently parking on Charmouth 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. For some reason, we currently have a problem with learner drivers pulling over and sitting across our driveway for periods of time, which is bizarre as it occurs frequently and the instructors don't seem to notice the difference between the street parking and driveways (breaching the highway code!), which I guess means that our driveway appears to be concealed and at risk of being parked across. 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.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
11	Homewood Road	<p>Homewood Road residents agree that we should be included in the Residents Parking only proposals and cannot understand why the road has been dropped from the original suggestion. We absolutely cannot be excluded and request that Homewood Road is added to the list of roads to be included in the new Marshalswick South Scheme. Please let us know if you require any further communication in this regard.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
12	Homewood Road	<p>Thank you very much for your letter 28th July 2021 with a proposal outlining the new parking scheme for the Marshalswick South Ward. I will urge the Council to expand the parking zone to include both 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. If the proposed parking zone is adopted without including both roads, the problem will get even worse. 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. If it would be helpful, I am happy to discuss my concerns in person or over the phone.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
13	Homewood Road	<p>We are logging an objection to your Parking Scheme Ref MSW-21 as detailed below and in the original objection letters attached.</p> <p>In response to the letter sent 28th July 2021, to our shock, surprise and disappointment you have reneged on your revised proposal in which you had included Homewood Road after you had listened and addressed the concerns that the residents had expressed from the south end of Homewood Road (between Sandpit and Faircross Way). The original objection letters 28th Feb 2020 are attached. These key points are still valid and have now been ignored. There is no safety rationale for this, for example the junction across Sandpit Lane already has long double yellow lines on the Woodstock Road end and Homewood Road would have none in your current proposal: it should mirror the already existing lines on the Woodstock Road side. It is an unsafe junction already and your current proposal would make this even worse as even more cars would park on Homewood Road. There are double yellow lines on every other junction apart from Homewood Road to Sandpit Lane. They need to be at least the same length as those on Woodstock as the design of the road is the same.</p> <p>All the other points in the attached letters are also still valid, so our objections still stand. Please also accept the attached letters together with this email as current objections to the latest plan :-</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We have first-hand experience with cars regularly blocking the road on both sides causing a significant safety issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Inconsiderate parking with the inability to safely exit drives, if at all</li> <li>o It is unacceptable that we have to go into the Church Hall to request people to move their cars to exit our house</li> <li>o Considerably reduced visibility at the road junction, which is well known as an accident hotspot</li> <li>o All caused by parked cars during week days and in the evenings, resulting in safety issues.</li> </ul> <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. 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.</p> <p>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. As you previously agreed to do so.</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. 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. I initially expressed our concern a few weeks ago and his response was that there had been a change in wishes from residents on Homewood Road. We do not believe this is the case (after canvassing the neighbours) particularly on the south end of the road that is currently and would be in the future most significantly impacted. The road should be considered in 2 parts and not as a whole as the southern end is very different to the north end. Safety should not be compromised, so the plan needs to be amended.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
14	Homewood Road	<p>Re - your Parking Consultation Marshalswick South Ward Update dated 28th July 2021. I would comment as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Does anybody really know what the demand for parking facilities will be like in the long or short-term following the changes in working practices due to the Covid Epidemic ?</li> <li>2.Could the changes proposed (with the exception of the double yellow lines) be delayed until the pattern requirement for parking restrictions becomes more evident?</li> </ol>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
15	Homewood Road	<p>I live at and am writing to say that I support the proposal to keep Homewood Road out of the restricted parking scheme planned for the area.</p> <p>Fundamentally, I disagree with the notion that parking problems, that start with too-expensive parking at the station, can be solved by pushing the problem further and further out. It seems that roads like Charmouth are paying the price for ill-conceived restrictions in places I don't believe need restriction, like the non-residential sides of York, Clarence and Jennings Roads. Why are we not allowing people to freely park in these spaces, where houses opposite all have driveways? Pushing the problem further and further out is not the answer. Not only do I not wish to have lines and signs in Homewood Road, I have a driveway and so have no issue with people parking on the road.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses as the Council's response is relevant to your comments.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Homewood Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
16	Homewood Road	<p>We are writing to confirm our objection to the proposed plans for the Marshalswick South Ward and Clarence Ward.</p> <p>We are residents of Homewood Road. With the new proposals and the exclusion of residents only parking on Homewood Road, we feel that we are only going to encounter even more parking problems than we do now. All commuters to the train station and 6th formers from Verulum boys School will come and park on our road only, making it impossible for residents to park either on the road or safely access their driveways. This is already a problem and will only get worse with the new proposals. Along with the Church parkers and learner drivers this will also make the road a busy and tight road to drive along.</p> <p>With this in mind, we urge you to amend the proposals to also include residential parking restrictions on Homewood Road.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
17	Homewood Road	<p>I am writing to question why Homewood Road has been omitted from the residents only parking scheme in the updated parking consultation, given that parts of roads further away from the station are indeed included in the residents only parking scheme (e.g. Hall Heath Close and The Park). The omission of Homewood Road clearly means that the problem of cars using the likes of Charmouth Road for free parking in order to access the station, will simply move to the southern end of Homewood Road instead, thereby simply placing the same problem in a new location.</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
18	Homewood Road	<p>This email is to lodge our objection to the parking consultation for Marshalswick South Ward (MSW-21) This is because Homewood Rd is treated inconsistently with the other roads in surrounding area, and so will be adversely effected.</p> <p>I believe the inconsistent treatment will have a significant negative impact on the residents of Homewood Rd. It is likely to result in the road becoming a car park for many non-resident's vehicles, as it will be an obvious alternative for people displaced from the newly controlled roads. Like many of our neighbours we have young children, and I am concerned that this proposal will make the road less safe for both pedestrians and cyclists. It appears to prioritise parking for non-residents over the interests of the families that live on the road. Homewood Road is essentially equivalent to the other roads within the scheme, in terms of the parking pressures on it. Much of Homewood Rd is in fact closer to key destinations (such as St Albans station and Verulam school) than much of Charmouth Rd or Gurney Court Rd. Despite this, Charmouth and Gurney Court Roads are proposed for parking controls that will prevent full-day parking, but Homewood Rd is largely left free for anyone to use.</p> <p>Any justification for parking restrictions on these other roads should equally apply to Homewood Rd. Treating this road differently, without a reason to justify the different treatment, will result in vehicles being displaced from the surrounding roads and concentrated into this one area. Please can you amend the scheme to treat Homewood Road consistently with the surrounding roads. Either these restrictions are not justified at all, or they are justified for Homewood Road as well. Treating one road differently without a reason for doing so is not reasonable</p>	<p>There was no desire from the residents as a whole to be included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Lancaster Road	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Lancaster Road	<p>My original comments to previous schemes was that your proposals were not thought through and not based on any evidence that they would work.</p> <p>This scheme is a tried and tested solution so I have no doubt it will work. However due to the pandemic there is now a marked drop in commuter parking, such that outside my house (No 32) there is no commuter parking at 11.15 on a Monday morning and not even past no 12 to 18.</p> <p>I would like to see some evidence that this whole step to introduce restricted parking is actually required. Have you, for instance, personally assessed the train usage from St Albans station? Is this not a scheme that needs to be put on hold until it is required because I do not believe it is worth ratepayers investment at present.</p> <p>In fact the majority of vehicles in Lancaster Road at present is not commuters or residents but tradesmen such as builders etc!</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
2	Lancaster Road	<p>I believe the proposed resident parking for Lancaster Road where I live will turn Lancaster Road into a racetrack.</p> <p>It is a wide straight road connecting Sandridge road to Sandpit lane .</p> <p>Every home on Lancaster has at least 2 off road parking bays on their properties.</p> <p>A far better solution is for the council to mark out designated parking bays on both sides of the street as has been done successfully on Langley Crescent ( near St Albans City hospital).</p> <p>I'm lucky to live on Lancaster Road which is a just an easy walk to St Albans train station and town and this option to park and walk should be available to everyone not just those who happen to live on Lancaster Road.</p> <p>I look forward to a positive response.</p>	<p>Whist speed can be a factor when removing parking from roads, this would be a Police consideration and the Highways Authority to consider what further action should be taken if any. The purpose of this scheme is to remove excessive dangerous parking. The Police and Highways Authority have raised no concerns or objections to the proposed scheme or Orders</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
3	Lancaster Road	<p>We have reviewed the new proposals for parking restrictions on Lancaster Road and support these.</p>	
4	Lancaster Road	<p>We are writing to formally object to your proposal to put unsightly double yellow lines immediately in front of our home. We live on the corner of Lancaster Road and Battlefield Road. We have lived here continuously for 18 years and nobody has ever parked on the corner outside our house. Furthermore, Rule 243 of the Highway Code clearly states that you must not park opposite or within 10 meters (32 feet) of a junction except in an authorised parking space. You, therefore, do not require double yellow lines to make this enforceable. The double yellow lines would be both a waste of tax payers money and visually detract from our lovely residential road.</p>	<p>Rule 243 of the Highway code is unfortunately not a legislative rule and therefore does rely on additional restrictions to be in place. The double yellow lines proposed are intended to ensure safety is maintained at key points across the scheme.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
5	Lancaster Road	<p>This plan looks very good. It should relieve most of the traffic problems experienced in the past few years, certainly in Lancaster Road and Battlefield Road. You have clearly listened to residents' concerns, and I like the fact the plan is for "Residents Only" parking. The Residents Parking Permits charges are fair and reasonable. We hope you implement this plan as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
6	Lancaster Road	<p>I wanted to lodge my support for the revised parking proposals on Lancaster Road (Marshalswick South). The much more "light-handed" approach of two hours permit only will have the desired effect of stopping all day parking (this is necessary as parts of the road were turned into a dangerous car park by people from outside the area using the road all day). And this new approach will revoke the need for a complicated and unsightly mixture of road markings and payment machines.</p> <p>Many thanks for taking on board residents' comments after the last proposal was issued.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Marshal's Drive	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Marshal's Drive	<p>We refer to your "Parking Consultation" letter dated 30 July 2021, and this is to provide an objection and comments before the deadline of 26 August 2021. As long-time residents on Marshals Drive, we are appalled by the potential negative impact on our Road of the new restrictions in our area. We object to not implementing the resident only parking on Marshals Drive. By excluding us from this it will almost certainly turn Marshals Drive into a congested parking zone. Not only will station commuters want to park free on Marshals Drive, but much more likely is that residents of the nearby " Ladder Roads" will park their cars free on Marshals Drive to save the Resident Permit Costs. This will destroy the nature of Marshals Drive and have a negative impact on our quality of life. It will also cause a major safety issue with parked cars up to our driveways blocking our safe exits. I strongly urge you to include Marshals Drive as a resident only parking road.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
2	Marshal's Drive	<p>I am e-mailing to say that I object to the proposed parking plans for New Zone MS. Especially to make parking unrestricted in Marshal's Drive. Given that it is planned to make parking unrestricted in three roads in New Zone MS (M-D, Homewood Road and Sandpit Lane) parking will tend be displaced into them from the nine where restrictions are planned. For example:  1) Commuter parking in the south end of Charmouth and Gurney Court Roads, and along Faircross Way, will move into Sandpit Lane, a busy through route, causing traffic hazards and possibly diverting through traffic into side roads.  2) Many households near the north end of Charmouth and Curney Court have inadequate parking space on their own property and regularly park on the highway. (On several occasions earlier this week I counted between fifteen and twenty cars parked to the north of Charmouth Court in Charmouth Road and to the north of Harptree Way. In Gurney Court road.) If those householders don't care to pay for a residents permit they will be tempted to park just a short walk away in Marshal's Drive. 3) Charmouth Court will be a major source of displaced vehicles. The garages are inconveniently sited and too small for most modern cars, there is too little parking space for cars in the Court, and so some residents already park in Charmouth Road, where they compete for space with residents - they may see M-D as a solution. 4) M-D already suffers from parking at its east and west ends, by people who catch a bus from the Quadrant to the City Railway Station and from Sandpit Lane into the city centre. These plans will make that situation worse. 5) I have not seen the plans for the roads to the south of Sandpit Lane but suspect that if restrictions are to be wide-spread there, then they will displace a lot of commuter cars to S-P Lane and to Homewood Road and Marshal's Drive. I sign off by repeated that I oppose these plans and suggest that you introduce residents only parking Monday to Friday 11 am to 1 pm in M-D, Homewood Road and Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>P.S. I advise you to check the plans for disabled parking spaces in Charmouth Court. The plans seem to show two, but I think that at present there are at least three, those two plus another near the south east end of the Court.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
3	Marshal's Drive	<p>I am writing in response to your letter re. Parking Consultation Marshalswick South Ward  I am a resident of no. 18 Marshals Drive – the small section of road between Gurney Court Road and Charmouth Road.  Firstly, thank you for your putting together this parking consultation which was clearly much needed for the residents of the south end of Charmouth Road / Gurney Court Road who were impacted by the introduction of the parking scheme within the ladder roads. I recall seeing many occasions where residents were unable to leave their drives due to the poor parking on the roads by members of the public probably using the train station.  As you will be aware, the consultation will ensure that every road in the area between Marshalswick Lane, Sandpit Lane and Sandridge Road will enjoy permitted parking with the exception of Marshals Drive. I cannot understand why we have been omitted from the permitted parking scheme? It seems quite clear to me that by omitting Marshals Drive- it will of course enable all road users to park on our section of the road where they were previously parking nearby. We will inevitably suffer the same as the south end of Charmouth when you implemented the ladder road parking scheme. We already have a number of public cars park on our road- however the exclusion of our road will cause us to suffer from a congested road. My primary concerns from this are:  1. We will struggle to exit our own driveway if people park up to drive way borders and opposite our driveway entrance. Furthermore - the presence of tall trees along the road can often already make visibility poor whilst exiting our drive. Added parking will only add to that difficulty and potentially be unsafe. 2. The short part of Marshals drive between Gurney Court and Charmouth Road already serves as a 'cut through' for many road users. The congestion of parked cars with this volume of traffic adds to an unsafe environment for both road users and pedestrians trying to cross the road there. We have 3 young children who walk to school and need to cross the road here – it will not be safe for them  3. The entrance to Gurney Court Road from Marshals Drive can be a blind spot as fast cars turn quickly down Gurney Court from Marshalswick Lane. Added parking congestion on Marshals Drive will cause traffic blocks and is likely to be unsafe and cause delays  4. Finally – our section of Marshals Drive (between Charmouth and Gurney Court) is also a bus route. It is the same bus route that Charmouth Road have. There were several instances in the last year or so where buses got stuck on Charmouth due to the volume of parking – this will undoubtedly cause the same issue here. Whilst I appreciate the introduction of double yellows- that only protects the junction points. I ask that you please include Marshals Drive (at least the section between Gurney Court and Charmouth which I describe above) in the resident permit scheme</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Marshal's Drive	Council Response and Recommendation/s
4	Marshal's Drive	<p>I believe this is the 3rd time you have brought this forward and although there are some changes you have not provided feedback on the last consultation nor provided a revised social or financial case for the scheme. Our local councillors advised residents in September 2020 that the 2nd proposal made in August 2020 was made by council parking officers and not councillors. It stated that any decision on a parking scheme would be made by all Cabinet members. Is this still the case? Clarence ward CPZ This appears to have been driven by a need to restrict all day parking by train users which affected roads with terraced houses having no off-street parking and also larger houses with drives which were 'locked in' by tight street parking. Observation The terraced roads have benefited, the double yellow lines have made corners safer and the introduction of white lines across drives and parking lines has as stopped 'lock in'. However the open parking areas that have 11.00am – 1.00pm residents' restriction remain unused most of the time. Questions 1.How much did the scheme cost to set up and what are the running costs? 2.Has a cost benefit analysis been completed before extending the scheme? 3. What is the rationale for denying the use of empty spaces to other road users? These could be people working locally without easy access to public transport or people using local facilities, all contributing to the local economy? Marshalswick South proposed scheme Observation the Clarence Ward CPZ did push parking into roads north of Sandpit lane causing traffic congestion and 'lock in' to some drives. However, the Ward does not have roads with tightly packed terraced homes and there is a lot of off-street parking. There are therefore grounds to deal with safety and social issues by :<input type="checkbox"/>Extending double yellow lines to corners <input type="checkbox"/>White line markings across drives to deal with 'lock in' but limited to locations that could be affected. This is far less than the current plans. A residents parking scheme does involve using public funds and at a time of cuts in services it is important that there is transparency and clear reasons to proceed. Questions 1.What is the cost of setting up a residents parking scheme? 2.What are the ongoing costs of enforcement and who will be doing this? Is it the council or a private contractor in which case what controls do you retain. 3.How many spaces are being used for 'all day' parking by drivers from outside the ward, how was this figure arrived at and what is the breakdown between people working locally and those commuting? 4.Does this exceed the number of free spaces in the roads after the safety markings are introduced? 5.What adjustments have been made for the change in rail use taking into account: <input type="checkbox"/>The Office of Rail and Road reporting that rail passenger journeys in the year April 2020- March 2021 were about 77% down on the previous year. <input type="checkbox"/>Most employers expecting more staff to 'work from home' 6.How many more cycle spaces have been introduced at the station since the Clarence ward consultation and what effect will that have on car usage? 7.Do you have control over station parking charges? These are extraordinarily high and this must contribute to congestion in local roads so reducing charges will assist the community. I support the spending on safety measures but do not believe you have made a case for using scarce resources on a parking scheme that will not improve the lives of most residents. I also feel there is a strong case for removing residents only parking to a number of roads in Clarence Ward that have not demonstrated a need, thus denying other road users. I am also disappointed that this consultation was received at the beginning of August with a closing date of 23rd August considering that so many people will have decided to take a holiday after lockdown rules eased on 19th July.</p>	<p>Parking schemes are not decided by full council and are subject to a full consultation. Feedback to residents on the consultation process has been provided throughout and any responses to residents comments will be made available on the Councils website. In response to the number of questions submitted, these do not constitute objections to the legal orders or the consultations undertaken. The proposed and agreed scheme is intended to improve road safety, traffic flow and improve the amenity of the area. However, an 18 month review period has been agreed to monitor any issues or look at any suggested amendments.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
5	Marshal's Drive	<p>My wife and I would like our opinions to be recorded regarding the latest iteration of the Parking restrictions in Marshalswick South. We are totally opposed to the exclusion of Marshals Dive and Homewood road from the 11-1pm restrictions. To leave these roads as a what will amount to a free all day car park when all others between them and the station are restricted, is totally unacceptable, and amounts to discriminatory behaviour against these residents. You have also removed the option of pay by phone, which means that commuters don't even have the option of paying a reduced sum to park elsewhere. Instead you are saying "pay the full rate and park at the station or leave your car in Marshal's Drive and either share a lift to the station or go to the Quadrant and catch the bus." You must be aware that The Quadrant had to put restrictions in place to stop the very car pooling you are now encouraging in Marshal's Drive. The daily cost of parking at the station means that four people sharing a lift to the station, having left their cars in the free Marshal's Drive car park, will save about £100 per week - sufficiently tempting I would argue to encourage such behaviour. The top of the Drive between Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road is already dangerously plagued by cars parked from the industrial estate, and when one adds in the bus trying to navigate from Charmouth Road through to Marshalswick Lane...The bottom is similarly home to many cars whose owners work in the Quadrant shops.. I have personally spoken to 45 households so far in Marshal's Drive and only one supports this scheme. I will be handing in a petition soon, which simply asks for fair treatment. Not a lot to expect for what is generally considered to be one of St Albans premier locations.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
6	Marshal's Drive	<p>I am writing to object to your proposals for parking in Marshalswick South contained in your letter of 30th July. The inevitable consequence of these measures will be to displace parking to Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road. You have made a bad situation even worse by abandoning the option for people to pay by phone in other roads. It is particularly unfair not to extend residents only parking to these roads as there are very few residents who park on the road : most have sufficient off-street parking on their property. In other words, buy an expensive property where you can park your vehicles on site only to have the road outside clogged up with non-residents ! Judging from the residents I have spoken to this view is pretty widespread.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Marshal's Drive	Council Response and Recommendation/s
7	Marshal's Drive	<p>I am a resident of Marshals Drive and would like to object to the proposed changes to the parking regulations in Marshalswick South. While the overall scheme seems very sensible and carefully designed, the predictable effect of restricting parking in the roads between Marshal's Drive and the station will be to displace commuter parking from Charmouth Road to round the corner onto Marshals Drive. The walk to the station from Marshals Drive takes only 20 minutes (I and many other Marshals Drive residents walk to the station so we can attest that the additional distance will not seriously disincentivise parking by commuters). In addition, our house will be just beyond the double yellow lines proposed at the junction between Marshals Drive and Charmouth Road and commuters will inevitably park just beyond those lines outside our house - causing congestion and access problems on Marshals Drive that will disproportionately affect residents at the west end of the road. If the purpose of the proposed changes is to disincentivise on-street parking by commuters then the residents-only parking restrictions need to extend beyond reasonable walking distance of the station - which means, in my opinion, they should extend beyond Marshalswick Lane. The marginal increase in distance from the station proposed will simply displace commuter parking from Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road onto Marshals Drive.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
8	Marshal's Drive	<p>As a long-time resident of Marshal's Drive, I am writing to record my total opposition to the proposed exclusion of Marshal's Drive from the 11am–1pm parking restrictions. With restrictions on roads between here and the station, exclusion of Marshal's Drive will turn it into a FREE (or PaybyPhone) all-day car park for commuters, as well as residents/visitors from Charmouth Road and Gurney Court Road. With car sharing, frequent buses to the station and town from Marshalswick Lane, and buses, though less frequent, from Sandridge Road, plus the option of walking to the station, commuters will naturally take advantage of FREE parking 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year!</p> <p>Over a period of many months recently, I had great difficulty backing out of my drive safely as I was unable to see approaching traffic due to builders', working nearby, parking their cars and vans outside my property and that of several neighbours. However, I knew it would eventually stop, but with FREE (or Payby Phone) parking, it will be never ending. Why should Marshal's Drive, a prime residential road in St Albans, be used as a free car park for commuters wanting to avoid paying to park at the station.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
9	Marshal's Drive	<p>I am writing to object to this scheme for the obvious reason that it does not address the root cause of the problem (overly expensive parking at the station and inadequate public transport to get people to the station without them driving) but simply passes the problem elsewhere, most notably to Marshal's Drive, the road where I live.</p> <p>If you introduce this scheme to Homewood Road, Faircross Way, Charmouth Avenue and Gurney Court Rd, what possible justification can you have for not extending the scheme to Marshals Drive? Or is it simply that you have some more vocal residents or councillors that live on the streets included in the proposal?</p> <p>Had you made any attempt to monitor the impact of the decision to restrict parking at the Quadrant, you would have noticed that there has been a considerable increase in parking on Marshal's Drive, including at the end furthest from the station. Whilst you might have excluded Marshal's Drive on the basis that it was further from the station (albeit hardly much further than Homewood!), in fact a number of innovative commuters meet in Marshal's Drive, park one car and then share the cost of the car that they then use to travel to and park at the station.</p> <p>So this proposal is completely unfair to residents of Marshal's Drive - if this is felt to be a necessary initiative then it must be extended to Marshal's Drive out of fairness to the residents of that road.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
10	Marshal's Drive	<p>We would like to repeat comments we sent in previously regarding the exclusion of Marshals Drive (and Homewood Road) from the proposed parking restrictions in the Marshakswick area.</p> <p>It does not make any sense to leave out Marshals Drive - it is clear that commuters are prepared to park a considerable distance from the station to avoid paying any parking charges. Not so long ago, a 3 hour restriction was introduced at Marshalswick Quadrant to stop all day parking by commuters.</p> <p>The congestion pre-Covid at the far end of Charmouth Road as a result of all day commuter parking made driving dangerous. We do not wish this to now be moved to Marshals Drive and the junctions with neighbouring roads.</p> <p>Painting double yellow lines at the junctions with adjacent roads suggests that you are expecting increased traffic and parking along Marshals Drive. We do not think that Marshals Drive should be treated any differently from Charmouth, Gurney Court and The Park. We kindly request that the same parking restrictions are applied to Marshals Drive as currently proposed for the above mentioned roads.</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>



Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Marshal's Drive	Council Response and Recommendation/s
12	Marshal's Drive	<p>Response to the Parking Consultation for the Marshalswick South Ward  I wish to respond to the consultation and particularly to the letter of 30 July 2021. I wish to object to these proposals. I have copied this email to the councillors listed so that they are aware of the issues.</p> <p>1, The proposal to impose restrictions on certain roads (e.g. Charmouth and Gurney Court Rd) whilst applying only the limited restrictions proposed for Marshal's Drive will inevitably move parking to Marshal's Drive. We object to these proposals. Marshal's Drive is a busy road with particularly busy points where Gurney Court Rd, Charmouth Rd and Marshalswick Lane meet it. Queues form at all these junctions at morning and evening rush hours and at school times. The proposals will inevitably add to traffic at these points. They will be unsafe.</p> <p>2. Marshal's Drive should be treated in the same way as the streets that run between it and Sandpit Lane with restricted parking, not a free-for-all.</p> <p>3. The specific proposal regarding provision of yellow lines at the junction of Marshal's Drive and Gurney Court provides for yellow lines down Marshal's Drive away from Gurney Court Road towards Charmouth. These proposed yellow lines stop far too soon. They should finish much closer to the junction between Marshal's Drive and Charmouth Rd. to ensure safety for road users and pedestrians. Many drivers stop to drop off children at busy times and there are already frequent traffic jams at this point. If yellow lines are to be introduced they should be extended down Marshal's Drive to provide safer conditions.</p> <p>4. None of these proposals solve the parking problems in these two wards. They merely move it. It would be far better to resolve it at source by extra provision near the station which could then be paid for by the users rather than the residents.</p> <p>5. i. Your letter refers to next steps. It specifically suggests further action 'if the scheme is agreed'. Is there to be a public meeting to gauge the strength of feeling regarding the proposals?</p> <p>5. ii. Have any assumptions been made concerning future demand and likely traffic flows? If so, how have they been affected by the Covid pandemic?</p> <p>5. iii. What assumptions have been made regarding speed limits in this area?</p> <p>5. iiiii. When will the public's responses be made public</p>	<p>Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Councils work programme as new requests.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From The Park	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	The Park	<p>My main objection is that there is currently no need for further parking restrictions in this area. Since the Covid Pandemic , far less people are commuting to work and therefore parking in our roads is not a problem. In the coming months, people will be encouraged to return to the office for a few days a week, but numbers will not return to the pre-pandemic levels. Councils around the country are complaining about lack of money to complete required projects.</p> <p>This parking project is something that you could save money on and use the money for more deserving causes.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
2	The Park	<p>I would like to voice my objection to the change in parking arrangements including the introduction of parking restrictions and permits.</p> <p>My objection is on the basis of the following;</p> <p>1. Need There isn't a need for these changes. Parking is not an existing issue on the road which is wide, with good visibility.</p> <p>2. Cost to implement &amp; enforce Taxpayer money would need to be spent to undertake this work. There are many other priorities at the moment as we look to support communities and community services post the pandemic. It is not definable to spend public money where there is no demonstrable need. The ongoing cost to enforce and the cost to residents cannot be defended.</p> <p>3. Concentrating parking The introduction of extended double lines could cause street parking to be congested rather than spread out as currently. This could introduce a health and safety risk which does not currently exist.</p> <p>It seems that a decision has been made to look at a whole geographical area on a map without taking into consideration the individual streets and circumstances. This suggests that the appropriate safety and risk assessments have not been undertaken for each road. This is not an appropriate approach for adding additional cost to the taxpayer to undertake these works and to add an ongoing maintenance and enforcement cost to the local council.</p>	<p>The proposed restrictions for The Park are intended to minimise any impact from neighbouring roads once restrictions are implemented. It is recognised that The Park does not currently have parking issues. However, the proposals will ensure this remains the case for residents.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
3	The Park	<p>I object the proposal on the following grounds</p> <p>1)There has never been a problem with commuters parking in this road THE PARK</p> <p>0)Since Covid 19 and the change in working patterns I consider this scheme should be postponed for 18 months until a revised parking situation has been established</p> <p>I also consider the overall parking problem has been caused by</p> <p>a ) Lack of affordable parking at St Albans and Harpenden train stations</p> <p>b ) Since the longer trains can not stop in the short Harpenden station many Harpenden commuters are driving to St Albans and parking in our residential roads and catching the train here</p> <p>Solutions</p> <p>1) Increase affordable parking at the stations</p> <p>2 ) Lengthen Harpenden station so the longer trains can stop there</p> <p>I do appreciate that both of these solutions are the rail companies to resolve but surely the council must consider that their solution to keep implementing progressively expanding is not a solution ( SET UP TALK WITH THE RAILWAY COMPANY )</p> <p>These schemes will be costly to install ,maintain and manage add to the pollution and traffic congestion</p> <p>The money spent on repairing our dilapidated roads</p>	<p>The proposed restrictions for The Park are intended to minimise any impact from neighbouring roads once restrictions are implemented. It is recognised that The Park does not currently have parking issues. However, the proposals will ensure this remains the case for residents.</p> <p>The Council is in discussion with the railway companies in terms of many aspects relating to our community. However, solutions to parking matters are more complicated. Residents parking schemes provide a solution that is both affordable and practical whilst ensuring road safety and traffic flow is maintained.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From The Park	Council Response and Recommendation/s
4	The Park	<p>I strongly object to the proposed revisions to the parking scheme for the Ladder Roads, and the imposition of a parking scheme north of Sandpit Lane.</p> <p>No restrictions are necessary in either of these areas, and I feel that the Council has been unduly influenced by a few sharp-elbowed and entitled residents close to Clarence Park, and installed a ridiculous scheme in that area, which has then had knock on effects causing safety problems in Charmouth Road.</p> <p>The 8pm-6.30 restrictions in York Road are especially objectionable – reducing access to the public open space of Clarence Park. The restrictions in the Ladder Roads area were also introduced with no consultation of residents north of Sandpit Lane, and so I would question their legality.</p> <p>I am amazed that you still intend to proceed with the schemes, given that around 75% of respondents to your previous consultation objected to it. In fact you seem to have only taken into account the views of the Ladder Road residents objecting to some paid parking for other St Albans residents.</p> <p>Your completely imbalanced response (listening only to a small number of entitled NIMBY households close to Clarence Park) to the previous consultation is highly objectionable.</p>	<p>The Council's responsibility is to ensure that Traffic flow and road safety is maintained across the Highway network in the district. Unfortunately that means that sometimes that does mean parking restrictions that help maintain this are essential. This is the case for the areas concerned.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
5	The Park	<p>Re: Parking Consultation Marshalswick South Ward. Thank you for the update documents on this subject. I have three comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We do not currently have a problem with non resident parking, the railway station is probably too far away for it to become an issue here. And as every household has a driveway there is very little resident parking on the road.</li> <li>2. Such parking as does take place consists mostly of trades people's vans. How will these measures affect them, must they too have permits to park between 11.00 am and 1.00 pm?</li> <li>3. It seems unnecessary to have yellow no parking lines at the entrances to The Park as nobody ever parks there, it is probably unsafe to do so.</li> </ol> <p>I am unable to see merit in this scheme for residents of The Park</p>	<p>The proposed restrictions for The Park are intended to minimise any impact from neighbouring roads once restrictions are implemented. It is recognised that The Park does not currently have parking issues. However, the proposals will ensure this remains the case for residents.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
6	The Park	<p>You have made it clear that any objections except the most minor will be ignored in this consultation, and accordingly I have only one point to make which is to reiterate the request for 2 different times across roads in the parking scheme. For example 11 - noon on one side of the road and 1 - 2 pm on the other.</p>	<p>All objections and representations are and have been considered as they are with all parking consultations. However, the overriding factor must be that traffic flow and road safety are maintained. In addition, the scheme must be consistent and workable. To have different times and days on different sides of the road would make the scheme complicated and confusing for other road users. It is also not practical in terms of how a scheme can be enforced. Therefore the proposed times are considered appropriate for this scheme.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
7	The Park	<p>In response to the above parking consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is unclear what parking issues the proposed scheme is trying to resolve. Without a clear aim, it is difficult to assess the merits of the proposed scheme.</li> <li>2. As it stands, the changes yield two effects: no non-resident cars can park around here between 11 and 1 and the only people are required to pay for the new scheme are the residents for off-street parking.</li> <li>3. How do you justify the residents to pay for off-street parking (for own cars, visitors and workmen) when we in The Park do not see parking issues on our road at the moment?</li> <li>4. I don't know if the current parking situation reflects the effects of COVID and if the effects will be permanent or short-term. There is merit to put the scheme on hold and review the situation later.</li> <li>5. I have no objection with the double yellow lines.</li> </ol>	<p>The proposed restrictions for The Park are intended to minimise any impact from neighbouring roads once restrictions are implemented. It is recognised that The Park does not currently have parking issues. However, the proposals will ensure this remains the case for residents.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Other or Not Provided	Council Response and Recommendation/s
1	Marshalswick Lane	I am writing in relation to the recent proposal for adding double yellow lines as part of the Marshalswick South Ward Scheme. I want to register my objection for the application of such yellow lines on Marshals Drive / Charmouth Road Junction. We have a garage at the back of the house, on Marshals Drive, opposite the Charmouth Road junction and at times need to park outside the back of the house, or allow service vehicles to do so. Generally we see no build up of cars on this area of the road and would seek further clarification as to why these yellow lines are necessary at this juncture	Double yellow lines are proposed to enforce the Highway Code. In most cases this is 10 metres of a junction but can be expanded depending on the road layout. The Council cannot consider this request on the basis of its location  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
2	Cedarwood Drive	As a St Albans resident as owner-occupier (Cedarwood Drive, St Albans ) for 25 years, I would like to record my objection to the proposed extension of parking restrictions to roads in Marshalswick South including Gurney Court Road, Lancaster Road, Charmouth Road. You will be aware that, since the last extension of parking restrictions in Clarence ward, rail commuters have been faced with having to park in these roads and walk approximately 15-20 minutes if they are unable to afford the extortionate parking fees charged at St Albans City Station. However, the capacity and amenity of the roads mentioned has in fact been affected very little: *Houses in these roads already have generous off-road parking for at least 2 cars. *Even with the increased commuter parking, there remain plenty of spaces for casual use during the day. *The roads are wide, with good sight lines. Meanwhile, in my area of St Albans - with no parking restrictions, but too far from the station to walk daily - we have a high level of inconsiderate and dangerous parking, including blocking private hardstandings/driveways, extensive parking on pavements forcing pedestrians, those with children in pushchairs and wheelchair users into the path of traffic. Vehicles are driven at speed down this narrow and congested road, where sight lines are now extremely poor (due to the inconsiderate and dangerous parking). There can be no practical justification for effectively privatising the publicly funded roads of Marshalswick South, when other areas are left in a far more dangerous and challenging situation. So, the reasoning behind this proposal appears to be to promote the interests of those who live in the most expensive houses in the district over those who struggle to afford the cost of living in St Albans, and so have to work in London and live in far less favourable environments. We all pay council tax and contribute to the upkeep of these roads and other council services. St Albans District Council has a duty to provide an equitable approach to all its citizens, but is failing to do so in this instance.	The proposals are intended to improve road safety, traffic movement and support the Council's climate emergency. Whilst this would not remove traffic in many of the roads, it will encourage vehicles to use other routes and remove those driving around looking for spaces, this would improve the environmental impact from emissions  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
3	Not Provided	As the parking consultation has been amended to remove PayByPhone/ resident shared bays and replaced by residents only parking it confirms the scheme's purpose is to stop street commuter parking entirely within the noted ward.  Why then have two roads, which were within the first consultation as restricted parking, now excluded from any restrictions. It seems that Marshalswick Lane is the logical boundary to the south marshals wick permit parking so why stop restrictions for roads within this boundary. This consultation is suggesting that double yellow lines will be placed at the junction between Charmouth road/ Gueney court road and Marshals drive. The reasoning being to stop people parking on the corner creating blind spots. This is an admission that commuter parking is expected to migrate to Marshals drive. In effect you will be pushing all commuter parking to two roads in south marshalswick. We are all aware that commuter cars are parked along at least half the length of Charmouth road and it's another 5 minute walk for them to park in Marshals drive. If you are committed to not allowing street based commuter parking then Marshals drive and Homewood should fall into a permit area. You will simply create a greater problem and safety issue condensed into a very small area. Please solve the problem entirely by including Marshals drive and Homewood.	There was little to no support for the roads to be included. However, an 18 month review will be undertaken to establish what impact the scheme will have and allow for amendments where appropriate.  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
4	Not Provided	I am writing strongly opposing the latest review. Can you tell me why it has changed since the last review we received? From what I read, there will be parking restrictions in place on all roads in the Marshalswick South Scheme with the exception of Marshals Drive and Homewood Road. When the scheme was first implemented on roads such as Clarence Road, Sunderland Ave etc the train commuters simply moved further out parking in Charmouth Road, Gurney Court etc. This has caused big problems to road users and householders trying to get out of their driveways, especially during rush hours. What you've proposed will do exactly the same thing to Marshals Drive and Homewood Road, you will simply be pushing the problem to the next road. I have seen people parking in these roads and taking bikes out the back of the cars, so they are certainly not too far away from the station for commuters. To solve the problem these two roads must be included in parking restrictions. The natural cut off line would surely be Marshalswick Lane?	Whilst displacement is likely, due to many factors the displacement is likely to be more dispersed and less disruptive. However, the Council is recommending a review period of 18 months in which amendments can be considered and implemented without the need of adding to the Council's work programme as new requests.  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
6	Not Provided	I still have many concerns about this parking scheme. The lack of honest detail being the most concerning. Why have you changed the proposals to a much simpler area division. There is no explanation as to why you have made such drastic changes to the initial suggestion? It suggests a lack of confidence - please explain why changes were made (what data was looked at etc). You have stated that any changes implemented will be reviewed for 18 months - please can you tell us exactly how you plan to review them, what data you will collect, and what limits are placed which need to be exceeded in order to implement further changes. This is a legal requirement given you have already stated reviews will be taking place. What is the cost of carrying out the changes and how will they be covered. In addition, what is the cost of monitoring the parking bays and how will this be met for the next 2 years. What calculations have you done to show the approximate income you expect to generate from this scheme. Please can you summarise the support both for and against the scheme to date from the residents. If we know how much mathematical support there is from people living on these roads, it will help the proposals be accepted. What alternative plans have been looked at to change the current parking situation? A local free station bus running every few mins through the area between 7am-9am, and 4pm-6pm (for example) might be a cheaper alternative?	The main reason for the changes are simply down to the differing needs of the areas concerned. It was not deemed beneficial to continue the consultation as it was originally. Road safety and traffic movements are the main objective and must be the focus of improvement in any scheme.  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised
7	Not Provided	I am submitting a comment in support of the proposed Marshalswick South Parking Scheme. I particularly would emphasize the need for double yellow lines across from T-junctions. Parking there forces cars to cross into the opposing lane while making right turns off the higher priority road and reducing visibility from the minor road, making turning hazardous. Homewood Rd + Faircross Way is particularly dangerous in this manner and I have personally witnessed several near-collisions due to cars parked across the junction. Furthermore, vehicles are often made to randomly pull over to allow passing traffic as cars and vans are parked on both sides of the road, making two lane roads effectively a bi-directional single lane. This increases risk to vehicle drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike through decreased visibility and potential driving aggression. While the proposed parking changes would not completely ameliorate this issue, it should help along the section of Charmouth Rd near the roundabout and the west side of Faircross Way, which seems to be used as all-day parking by train commuters. As most, if not all, houses in the area have their own driveways, the practical impact on residents should be minimal with the restrictions for two hours in the middle of the day even if they choose to not pay for resident parking permits. Therefore, I strongly support this initiative and feel it would make the roads a lot safer for vehicular navigation and pedestrian visibility.	An 18 month review will be undertaken to establish what impact the scheme will have and allow for amendments where appropriate.  Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Other or Not Provided	Council Response and Recommendation/s
8	Not provided	<p>I refer to the letter to residents dated 30 July 2021 (but received several days later) and Public Notice referred to therein, relating to proposals to introduce residents only parking in Marshalswick South. I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals as put forward. My objection is not only to the proposals themselves but also as to the process by which the Council has arrived at this position. I deal with both below. The proposals There is no way of putting it other than to say that the Council seem to have tried hard to take a really bad idea and see what is the worst possible way to implement it, at the wrong time. That's how bad these proposals are. You have had my views in full in the emails below. As I note below under "Process" I have had no response whatsoever to those emails. But to rehearse the points made: - Kerbside parking is a resource that should be properly managed, like any other. - Managing that resource should take account of under-utilisation as well as over-utilisation, particularly where parking does not cause detriment. - It should be managed on a basis of appropriate and tailored decisions, taking account of specific needs and identifying places to which parking may be directed without detriment not a blunderbuss "one size fits all". - The original mistake the Council made was applying a "one size fits all" approach to the original Ladder Roads scheme to areas (in essence north and south of Blandford Road) with very divergent housing density and needs. - The result diverted parking away from places in the northern area (and others, identified in my emails below) where it in essence did no harm (below for emphasis is the photograph attached to my first email of Jennings Road at 9am on a Saturday to show the lack of resident parking need and availability of resource) and displaced it into an area of more congestion and greater housing density. - Instead of admitting the error of its ways and seeking a more holistic solution to the problem it has inadvertently itself created, the Council proposes to compound its mistake by displacing a greater volume of parking into a smaller area To this I would add that life has moved on since the proposals were originally formulated. The pandemic has changed work patterns and particularly those of commuters. There is currently nowhere near the volume of issue that there was eighteen months ago. Even if the Council were to consider this scheme in its current (misguided) form to be an appropriate solution to the problems (it created) of two years ago, it must surely recognise that now is not the time to push it through, but that it must take time to monitor and evaluate whether the expense and disruption of this scheme can be justified. So, my view remains that the entire Scheme for Marshalswick South is to be resisted and replaced by a properly tailored approach to the parking resource available in the norther Ladder Roads area, Clarence Road and the roads to the west of Clarence Road and address the under-utilisation of the available resource in those areas. However, if it has to be proceeded with, it is incomprehensible that the Council has seen fit to take the retrograde step of taking Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road out of the plans, with no explanation given. It would be ridiculous for the Scheme to proceed without their inclusion. They would simply become the free car parks for the entire area. As I noted in my first email below (and I direct you to all the comments in that email in this regard), Marshal's Drive is a very short distance from the area with the highest housing density and highest on-street car parking in the whole of the subject areas, with the highest risk of large volume of displaced parking, and yet having listened to those concerns the Council has simply backtracked and taken it out. It makes no sense whatsoever. If you live at the top end of Charmouth Road/ Gurney Court Road or in Charmouth Court, why would you bother to pay for a permit, particularly for a second car at higher price, or for visitors, when free parking is just yards away? The Council seems to think that commuters are prepared to walk a good couple of miles to save money, why would residents not walk a hundred metres? It really does seem that the Council has not learned any lessons from the effects of displaced parking caused by the misguided approach to the Ladder Roads scheme, and insists on solving that problem by creating a bigger one. Make no mistake, displacing the parking from the entire area and concentrating it into Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road will create a bigger problem than was either solved by the Ladder Roads scheme in the first place or by the Scheme under consideration now. At the end of the day, the Council should be asking itself why these roads should be blighted simply to preserve the vast expanses of empty, traffic-free roads for the NIMBYs of Jennings Road, Sunderland Avenue and the like? Bear in mind also that these roads are much busier in terms of traffic than the Ladder area. Further, some explanation must be given as to why the concept of shared use bays has been dropped. Presumably the Council had done some research to justify its inclusion before? What has changed? This again seems a retrograde step that will lead to greater under-utilisation and hence displacement.. Are there seriously not areas on even Battlefield Road, and Harptree Way where shared use would not be possible? What drives the clamour for resident on-street parking in locations such as these that means that shared use cannot be accommodated? How does one justify residents only parking on a road (Harptree Way) with no residents? Should I also assume that my suggestions for expansion of shared use in the Ladder Roads area has not been taken up? At the end of the day, why have swathes of empty roads when the Council could make money from utilising the resource in appropriate places? Finally, it's not my battle to fight but it still seems to me to be that those households in the area, and particularly Charmouth Court, that do not have driveways should be entitled to free or subsidised permits. As I noted previously:"We are not talking about a city centre location here, people living here need a car and without a driveway should expect to be able to park on-street in this sort of location . It is not their fault that displaced parking to please others in a location some distance away has required controls to be brought into this area". The process The process has at various times been labelled a "consultation". It is a strange consultation that provides no feedback or visibility on the rationale for decisions taken. The emails I wrote below were the product of a lot of considered thought and research. However I received no response to them- not even an acknowledgement. The impression given is that the consultation is simply a camouflage of taking opinion into account while railroading through to suit the agenda/opinion/beliefs of the proposers. A proper consultation should involve engagement, dialogue, understanding and explanation, not simply pronouncements of what has been "decided". Otherwise what is the point? I accept that if there are volumes of lengthy commentaries then it is not feasible to reply to each individually but (a) they should at least be acknowledged- to not even do that is, frankly, insulting (b) There is no reason not to produce a generic publication of reasons for conclusions, particularly where the Council has changed its mind (c) I rather doubt that that would leave many considered representations that require response. The failure of the process is shown by the Marshals's Drive/ Homewood Road hokey-cokey-out, in, out...When the scheme was first put forward my understanding from anecdotal evidence, was that a large number of people (like me) expressed the view, either through comments or through a petition, that it would be improper to proceed without their inclusion, . One assumes that the volume was sufficient to persuade the Council to include them within the scheme, a decision to be applauded. Then what happened? If objections were received how were they balanced against the views expressed in the first consultation? Was it taken into account that those who were content to see inclusion would have been less inclined to comment, particularly if they had done so before? So at least one other petition has been sourced, and here we go again, round in a circle because the Council hasn't engaged and hasn't explained (and it seems, does not think things through, or why change tack every few months?) The further flaw in the process has come with the separation of the "consultation" into two parts. This makes no sense. The two are interlinked. The only reason for the parking issues in Marshalswick South was the introduction of restrictions to northern part of the Ladder Roads area. The two need to be considered together. It is not possible to comment on one without seeing the proposals for the other. It goes back to my points above that the issues need a holistic solution, not dissection into what "works" for each without regard for the whole. You may well say that of course you have regard for the whole but (a) the evidence for that on past record, and with the Marshal's Drive/Homewood Road exclusion, isn't strong (b) It's supposed to be a consultation, so the residents need to see the whole scheme not just a part. How can we tell whether the Scheme is needed/appropriate/fair without seeing what is proposed for the other half of it? For example, the Council previously seemed to indicate that it was prepared to address under-utilisation in the Ladder Roads area. Is that still on the agenda? How far does that go? Why is that not tried first to see what the effect is, particularly in light of changed working practices? Given the inability of the Council to identify a proposal that endures beyond the next batch of responses, the flaws in process and the timing points made above, I would strongly urge that Council shelve its current timetable and takes the time to reflect and evaluate to produce a better Scheme, rather than feel obliged to plunge headlong at haste. So to sum up my views: -The Council should be thinking more creatively to create a bespoke and holistic solution that (properly) tackles under-utilisation as well as over-utilisation for the whole area, rather than sticking with its previous blunderbuss approach that caused the issues and now applying blunderbuss 2.0 to cause even more issues -The timing of the Scheme is inappropriate without an assessment of (a) what is the "new normal" as working patterns and practices change (b) the effect of (what are hopefully still) proposals to address, in a limited way, under-utilisation in the Ladder Roads area - The process has been flawed and the Council owes it to residents to take the time to produce a settled set of proposals rather than railroad through on what happened to be the last set of voices listened to - If the Council does insist in pursuing with this Scheme it cannot conscionably do so without the inclusion of Marshal's Drive and Homewood Road.</p>	<p>In general this objection and representation does not provide an objection against the Traffic Orders which were advertised. However, Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses. This response is relevant to some of the comments submitted.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Other or Not Provided	Council Response and Recommendation/s
9	Not Provided	<p>I have included the councillors of the Public Realms Committee which this will be discussed at, for reference, as well as those of Marshalswick North Ward. I would preface that many of the criticisms below I believe are not due to the Parking Development Team, but have come about due to a small group of residents who are continually pushing for a way to exclude all others from parking on the public road that their property happens to sit upon, and are doing so under the guise of safety and other legitimate concerns. I would like to see the current proposal put on hold indefinitely (especially in light of changes due to the pandemic) and new discussions be started to address all problems of travel in St Albans that actively involve all members of the community. Not a Balanced Approach - Using a sledgehammer to open a walnut: Overall, the proposal seems an unbalanced and an overarching approach that will cause unneeded disruption and negatively impact those within the area, as well as residents in the surrounding roads. It does not seek to develop parking but instead just remove it for a certain cohort of user. It could be said that this is a case of 'using a sledgehammer to open a walnut'. Does not necessarily meet the four objectives/Not in the most sensible way: The proposal will not necessarily meet the four objectives (including safety, inappropriate parking, access to property and parking provision for residents), if they do it will not be by the most direct and sensible means and will instead cause undue disruption to many people not just in the proposal area but across the City and District. Smaller scale restrictions to parts of the roads, additional markings or speed bumps and pedestrian crossings are ideas of things that would meet one or more of the objectives, without causing such wide disruption. Proposed because of a small haughty group of residents not wanting others to park near them. Has been piggy backed under the guise of Safety, Residents Parking etc.: It is said to be done under the guise of the 4 outlined objectives including safety, inappropriate parking, access to property and parking provision for residents. However, having followed the case from the early years and having spoken to fellow residents, seen their interactions at meetings and from the current and past proposals, it is clear that these concerns, though perhaps not illegitimate, are being inflated, in order to have sweeping changes enacted that would deprive the public from parking on public roads for unjustified reasons. Instead it is quite clear this stem from a small vocal group or residents that are aghast that anyone other than them and their neighbours should park on the public road that their house happens to sit upon, They attribute solely to day commuters to the station and the city centre. The fact that the discussions that led to this proposal only started after the introduction of other parking restrictions in surrounding streets, led to an increase in parking in the current proposal's area, supports this. The fact that the recent proposal was rejected, that would've seen Pay by Phone being introduced, (that would've still allowed some who needed to park, while dissuading others and thinning the numbers) also supports this. Objective 1 - Makes Road Safety Worse: Reducing/removing all Parked cars along long roads leads to increased speeds by motorists, making road safety worse. As mentioned by a member of the Parking Development Team at a public meeting. Objective 1 - Road Safety not tackled in focused/localised manner, due to small vocal group not wanting measures placed next to them: Issues related to pedestrian safety and visibility when crossing can be alleviated by other means. (e.g. having alternating bays, for parked cars on the left side of the road for a distance, then on the right of the road for a distance, having crossing areas, having speed bumps. These measures, which are less severe, causing less trouble to City and District as a whole, should be first implemented first in areas of significant danger. From past interaction with small vocal group of residents, they do not wish for these to be put in place, either because safety is not in fact their primary concern (They simply do not want cars parked near them) or they do not care enough for safety to shoulder the slight increase in noise. If safety is the true concern of the residents they should be welcoming measures such as the above. There should not be any concern from them about the negatives of speed bumps. The fact that this approach has not been accepted further supports that they are pushing for drastic changes to stop all people, that are not residents parking on a public road as is their right. I would ask that this proposal is scrapped and traffic calming measures, crossings or other more localised amenities are put in place at the place the danger is required rather than disrupting the lives of people across the City and District. Objectives 2 and 3 - Inconsiderate Parking and Property Access not tackled in most direct way: Inappropriate and Inconsiderate parking and access to property is obviously a concern wherever it happens. This however can be tackled by other means. Some of them have already been partially put in place such as White Bars across residents driveways. A combination of other methods, for example: Street signage informing road users of the rules and fines for parking violations. *More White Bars on driveways or similar markings. *Informing and educating residents of action to take when effected by inconsiderate parking. *Closer working with Civil Enforcement Officers and/or Police *Other methods that Parking Development might be able to suggest that deal with the problem at the source, in the vicinity of the parking violations, rather than making wider changes as in the current proposal. The above methods or those that are similar, should first be trialed first, before anything even approximating the current proposal is suggested again. I would ask that the current proposal is scrapped (or Councillors reject to allow it) and that the less extreme measures which impact fewer are put in place instead. Objectives 4 - Inflated issue of Residents Parking Provision: There is not a need for provision of resident parking spaces along most of the areas covered in the proposal, many of the properties have driveways and it is clear from travelling along the roads that the proposal covers, at many times of the day/week/year, that there is ample parking in a vast majority of the lengths. There may be acute problems in certain areas. However, even within those areas, many properties have driveways. As stated before the idea that this is a major problem would seem to stem from a small group that are aghast that anyone other than them and their neighbours should park on the public road that their house happens to sit on, and which they attribute solely to day commuters to the station and the city centre. Furthermore for those areas that are underprovisioned, more localised measures can be put in place to improve parking provision. Simply Moving the Problem: As previously mentioned this proposal came about due to other parking measures being put in place. This wide scale proposal simply would move a portion of the parking elsewhere. In some cases this would be to tighter more compact roads upon which sit houses on less wide plots of land than can be found on the roads in the proposed area (Battlefield Road, Lancaster Road, etc). As a result there are more houses, individuals and cars in these areas and the slightest amount of extra parking would lead to problems in these areas. Resident Permit Holders Timing - The 4 Concerns can still happen during the other hours of the day: The same 4 problems could just exist outside the proposed hours. In the case of the current proposal, 22hrs in a day. This would not necessarily lead to the solving of the four objectives at those times. And as stated before it would seem this is put in place to appease a small vocal group that are aghast that anyone other than them and their neighbours should be able to park on the public road that their house happens to sit on, and which they attribute solely to day commuters to the station and the city centre. I would ask that timing based restrictions are not used and instead other actions are put in place to tackle any issues more directly and locally at the areas of concern. Overly annoying Resident Permit Holders Timing of 11:00 to 13:00: The time is overly annoying to road users. If the intention was to deter long term parking for some reason, a shorter time (1hr earlier in the day), (e.g 10:00-11:00) would deter long term parking. But still allow people to park in the area to visit homes and use services with lesser disruption to their day, including at lunchtime. I would ask if any measures are proposed that do make use of such a time that they use a less egregious time. Callous disregard of road users. The proposal will, overnight, remove several hundred potential parking spots, for no good reason with a callous disregard for residents and visitors, some of who provide vital services to the city. The proposal does not provide any alternatives for the road users who do need to park in this area for a duration before and after the time. Users of the area who are not residents of the area, who may not have seen the public notices (see next section), or who do not realise they themselves can comment on the proposal may not submit comments or otherwise get involved in the process. I would ask that in drafting any idea for proposals such as this, (which would make such drastic changes with no easy alternatives for most) that an active effort be made to engage road users who may be affected and have them become involved in the process. These efforts would go above and beyond the statutory consultees. Consultation placement during Summer Holiday season: The posting of the proposal's public notices and letters to residents during these months has not undoubtedly not allowed enough time for those who are away on Summer Holidays to make comments and get involved with the process. I have spoken to residents who received the letters sometime after the 5th August. Longer than it should have taken for them to have reached them by Royal Mail, if they were posted on the 5th August. Applying proposals to entirety of named roads: Considering the same restrictions for long roads such as Gurney Court Road, Charmouth Road, etc simply because they are a single named road does not make sense, The situation at one end of the road (i.e. The South) would not necessarily be the same as the the other sections, (that is halfway up, or the North). This approach would cause unneeded disruption for those further away from affected area, both within the area and further afield. (e.g should people have more than 3 cars or a full driveway or simply have a car/s they wish to park long term and/or not buy a permit for, this would lead to parking on non-permitted roads, such as Chalk Fields, Chalkdell Fields, Dymoke Green, Furse Avenue, Homewood Road, Marshals Lane, Marten Gate and others. Pandemic: Things have changed due to the Pandemic and any statistics the proposal is based on may not hold true in the future, with many people working from home or having moved home/changed jobs. I would ask that the proposal be put on hold indefinitely and a more all encompassing approach to travel be discussed once the post-pandemic world is clear. Alternative Ideas Summary: Develop a district wide parking plan that solves issues rather than just moving them. No Restrictions but more White Bars on Driveways. 1hr RPH at 10:00 to 11:00 Restrictions along single side. Alternating Restrictions from Left to Right to allow for pedestrians to cross. Formal Pedestrian Crossings with Lights.</p>	<p>In general this objection and representation does not provide an objection against the Traffic Orders which were advertised. However, Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses. This response is relevant to some of the comments submitted.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
10	Sandpit Lane	<p>We have received details of the proposed parking changes as we live at which is the corner house at the end of Charmouth rd on the right hand side as you come up the road from sandpit lane. We are pleased to see an extension of the double yellow lines to ensure that our drive entrance does not get blocked ( as it has done several times in the past) however it would seem that we are not eligible for any resident or visitor parking permits. We do have some off road parking, however we would want to be eligible for one resident permit and visitor permits. I anticipate that our neighbours at 41 sandpit lane will feel the same way. We look forward to hearing from you</p>	<p>An 18 month review will be undertaken to establish what impact the scheme will have and allow for amendments where appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
11	Sandpit Lane	<p>our property is on the corner of Hall Heath Close. Our house and garden occupy half of Hall Heath Close on the left side of the close. We have a driveway and entry/ exit onto Hall Heath Close. However we have been omitted from your allocation of parking permits and vouchers. We feel this must be an omission by your department and we should be grateful if you could rectify this.</p> <p>Yours sincerely ,</p>	<p>Following a review, we have agreed to amend the eligible properties to account for this property.</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Other or Not Provided	Council Response and Recommendation/s
12	Sandpit Lane	<p>My family and I reside at Sandpit Lane, located at the corner of Sandpit Lane and Charmouth Road with the driveway positioned on Charmouth Road. We have lived at this property for twelve years and until the introduction of parking restrictions in Clarence Road and surrounding areas had experienced no issues with respect to commuters parking in Charmouth Road. I have also personally seen visitors (not commuters) for Clarence Road parking at the end of Charmouth Road and walking back to Clarence to complete their business. It is clear to us that these issues are directly related to this implementation and rather than reflecting on the negative impact of this and correcting for it, it appears that the intent is to inflict the restrictive freedoms with respect to parking in our locale and unwelcome cost of resident parking on our community. In response to the proposal, I make the following points: 1. Whilst we are fortunate enough to be able to park two cars on our drive, there are often occasions where additional parking is required which is not available on the driveway e.g. workmen requiring parking, visitors to drop off / pick up people / packages, home help etc. A significant issue under the current proposal is the omission for #41 &amp; #43 Sandpit Lane being eligible to be considered for either a permit or to purchase temporary visitor permits for any location around our homes. Please explain why this is so and we are being treated less favourably to other properties in the vicinity? 2. I would like to understand why residents should now have to pay for the privilege of parking on a public highway which we are already paying for through various taxes etc. particularly when this was not in place when properties were purchased. Please explain. The permit fees noted are more than an administrative cost which is wholly unacceptable. I have previously lived in an area with residents parking where a small (single digit) fee was charged for administration for all permits and it is not clear how your team have arrived at the cost structure. This should be transparent for a system that is being forced on the community and ensure that any cost is minimal with no profit. 3. I also note the article in The Times newspaper on Tuesday 24th August which highlights the fact that local authorities are bringing in so much money from car parking that it matches three quarters of their council tax income, the significant profit made when operating costs are removed and the fact that income from parking is supposed to be invested in transport. I have seen no evidence or explanation as to the improved measures that St Albans is implementing with respect to transport from the parking fees that are already in place or planned from the extension of parking schemes. As residents we are within our rights to request such explanation and I therefore respectfully request one is provided. 4. The current rules provide no flexibility for residents to live freely without parking concerns for visitors as all parking is restricted at the same time. If your intention is to "help" alleviate the commuter parking issue then it is not clear why parking restrictions are not staggered to allow the community to continue to be able to function without enforced payment at some point in the day. As per examples provided by others in my community, one side of the road could be restricted 10am-11am and the other side 1-2pm, this would ensure commuters could not park all day but enable the community to operate in a way that is not possible with the current proposal. However, sometimes it is necessary to park your own car on the road for a number of days and if you are away, how are you supposed to manage this if you do not need an annual permit? A line of temporary visitor permits in the window is hardly a good solution. Please do not take this example as agreement to the proposal but merely as an explanation, in the absence of any considered thought to such, of how an unwanted and unnecessary scheme could be introduced. Ask explain how the proposed measures were arrived at and the consideration / 5. With respect to the introduction of additional yellow lines and the extension of existing double yellow lines, please can you explain how these have been decided? The extension of the double yellow lines at the southern end of Charmouth Road next to Sandpit Lane are considerably in excess of Highway Code Rule 243's restriction of not parking within 10m of a junction, although it is worth noting it states "EXCEPT IN AN AUTHORISED PARKING SPACE". Given the issues experienced in this area are directly related to the transplanted commuter parking issue, which the proposal is attempting to remove and not experienced previously or at weekends, it's not clear why there is a requirement for this extension further reducing flexibility for community parking. In fact, the addition of a significant number of additional yellow lines makes one wonder whether there is a job lot of yellow paint that needs to be used before expiry! It would be a better use of public funds, and the community would be better served, by repainting the mini-roundabout at this junction so that it is clear that this is what it is and improve road safety. 6. As I am sure you can appreciate, the choice of location for a house purchase balances a number of requirements one of which personally was the absence of restrictive parking having previously experienced this elsewhere in St Albans and other locations. Had we wished to be encumbered by these and been made to feel that we lived in the middle of the city with restrictions and associated parking boxes painted on the road, we could have chosen any number of other locations. One of the attractions of this area was the absence of this and your proposal significantly detracts from the area and has the potential to devalue our properties due to these restrictions. Please explain how this impact has been taken into consideration? Will property value reductions result in reduced council tax charges? 7. As one of my neighbours has pointed out in an earlier email, these restrictions will force residents to enlarge their driveways to mitigate the impact on their and their visitors' parking freedoms which will have a negative environmental effect but will be necessary for peace of mind with respect to living their lives free from parking concerns. How has the potential tail environmental impact of this been considered in the proposed scheme? 8. I note that Homewood Road and Marshall's Drive are not included in the parking consultation and believe the team are being naive if it is believed the issue will not move to these roads. The commuters who park in Marshallwick South area and then continue on bikes / scooters will not be deterred by a few more minutes commute if the alternative is paying for commuter parking at the station. If indeed there is even sufficient space should we return to pre-pandemic commuter levels. Being a commuting family ourselves and previously parking at the station, it is clear that there are insufficient parking facilities when Station Road car park is full before 8am and the new car park in Victoria Street is almost full. The expansion of St Albans with new builds (e.g. Taylor Wimpey on Sandpit Lane, Charles Church on Hatfield Road, the new 150 housing scheme recently approved on Harpenden Road to name a few) is not being matched with new infrastructure (any!) which is going to create increasing issues on an already pressurised system (all! Parking, schools etc.). St Albans needs a holistic strategy not a piecemeal approach to its infrastructure, in this case parking which is shifting the problem from one area to another, significantly inconveniencing previously happy residents and seemingly implementing a money making scheme which becomes more lucrative for the Council the more the scheme has to extend to remove the issue that wasn't managed properly in the first instance. Please explain how this proposed scheme is reflected in St Albans infrastructure strategy which reflects its place as a commuter city. I feel it would be remiss of me to not comment on your disingenuous response to my neighbour with respect to the timing of the consultation. If the parking team are incapable of recognising that July &amp; August is the peak holiday season in the year then they do not deserve to represent and make decisions on behalf of the St Albans residents. One only has to open any national newspaper to understand the challenges with holidays during this peak season. I recognise that your intentions are to alleviate the commuter parking issues however the current proposal is fraught with additional issues that will cause more problems / upset and transplant the commuter parking issue elsewhere. I believe a different approach is needed for St Albans as a whole and cannot be addressed in a piecemeal fashion. Given the significance and negative impact of your proposed solution I request a response, with the right to reply, to myself and the Charmouth Road community (on cc) to my detailed points by 5pm on 17th September and in any event before any parking measures are implemented.</p>	<p>In general this objection and representation does not provide an objection against the Traffic Orders which were advertised. However, Please refer to the Council comments under objection 25 of the Charmouth Road responses. This response is relevant to some of the comments submitted.</p> <p>An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>
13	Sandpit Lane	<p>I have just looked at the Parking Consultation Marshalwick South Ward letter you have sent. I would like to make an objection to the resident permit holder zones you have listed. My family lives on 91 sandpit Lane AL14BJ, the house found in the middle of Hall Heath's cottages overlooking onto Sandpit Lane- which is a double yellow line road. This means that we do not have our own private driveway like our neighbours where we can park our car. This meant that we have had to park on Hall Heath Close. I would like to have our household to be registered on the permit holders list on Hall Heath Close to avoid any fines we can be subjected to as we have nowhere to park our car. I have attached an image of our house plan, The areas highlighted are our property.</p>	<p>Following a review, we have agreed to amend the eligible properties to account for this property.</p>
14	Sandridge Road	<p>Thank you for the consultation documents sent by post. This scheme appears to be a more straightforward and workable solution than previously. We're writing to ask if you would please follow the example of other Councils and make the allocation of permits and vouchers available online. This makes the schemes easy to manage and check, for parking wardens, and importantly it also saves paper and trees. We would also ask that the option be available to purchase single visitor permits online as needed, rather than a whole book of 10 permits. (garage entry/exit on Lancaster Road)</p>	
15		<p>I strongly believe that the whole of this road should be included in the scheme as it will be very unfair on residents and particularly those at the southern end.</p>	<p>No road details are included. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>

Col No.	Road	Comments and Representation From Other or Not Provided	Council Response and Recommendation/s
16		<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposed parking permit scheme due to be implemented in Marshalswick South .</p> <p>It would be sensible to have the results of the Clarence Ward published prior to any decision being made in the Marshalswick South area. Once that decision is known then an informed decision can be made for the surrounding area, as to whether any parking scheme is necessary.</p> <p>COVID has changed the situation in these areas with far less parking on the roads as more people are working from home and are travelling less frequently. It would be better to reduce the cost of the car parking at the station to a reasonable level to encourage more people to use it..</p> <p>The council should be making better use of tax payers money, by repairing the roads in these areas which are in a very poor state of affairs.</p>	<p>We are aware of the changes as a result of the global pandemic. However, it would not be possible to consider putting any implementation on hold due to the possibility of the issues not returning. We have to consider that it is more likely than not at this stage. If we stop the process and the issues return to the levels as before, it could be a number of years and even more expense before any actions could be taken. However, An 18 month review period is recommended and any concerns will be monitored and considered over this period</p> <p>Recommendation: Make Orders as advertised</p>