

## ST ALBANS CITY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:** Redacted Head of Commercial and Development

**DATE:** 27<sup>th</sup> October 2021

**REPORT TITLE:** Parking Scheme report, Traffic Regulation Order and Parking Places Order for Marshalswick South Ward, including Battlefield road and Charmouth Road

**WARD/S:** Marshalswick South

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER:** Councillor Anthony Rowlands, Lead Cllr for Public Realm

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Redacted Specialist TRO Officer (Parking)

### 1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Councils Lead for Public Realm responsible for parking, and the Councils named Head of Service with the background, consultation process and information relating to the proposals to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and Parking Places Order (PPO) to implement a Residents parking scheme in the Marshalswick South Ward, St Albans.

### 2. Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Councils Public Realm Committee Chair and the Councils Head of Service for Commercial and Development in consultation, agree to make the below named Orders with the recommendations provided within this report. This will introduce new resident permit only parking and waiting restrictions in various streets in the Marshalswick South Ward. The Orders were formally advertised on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2021:

- THE ST ALBANS CITY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL (BATTLEFIELD ROAD AND MARSHALSWICK SOUTH AREA, ST ALBANS) (RESTRICTION OF WAITING) ORDER 2021
- THE ST ALBANS CITY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL (BATTLEFIELD ROAD AND MARSHALSWICK SOUTH AREA, ST ALBANS) (RESIDENTS PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2021

### 3. Background Information and locations affected by this report

3.1 The parking issues in Marshalswick South were first raised in July 2017 from residents in Battlefield Road and Lancaster Road who complained that commuter parking was excessive and caused significant access and road safety concerns. The request was supported by the, then Ward Councillors. The area was added to the Councils pending work programme for future review.

In January 2019 the Council introduced a new residents parking scheme in the Clarence Ward of St Albans. This included roads on the north side of Hatfield Road between Clarence Road and Woodstock Road upwards to the boundary of Sandpit Lane. This followed an extensive consultation from 2017 to the end of 2018. Not all roads were finally included as the consultation identified some roads as not being supported. This scheme was labelled at the time as 'The Ladder Roads Scheme' due to its geographical layout resembling the shape of a Ladder.

Following the implementation of the scheme in early 2019, the Council started to receive complaints from Charmouth Road residents who complained about excessive parking from what they believed to be commuters. The Council's parking team investigated the parking issues and confirmed that some of the parking appeared to be commuters and parking from a local school. It was agreed that the additional parking was likely due to the new implemented 'Ladder Roads Parking Scheme'

As a result of the complaints, it was agreed that a review of the Ladder Roads scheme scheduled for 12 months, was to be brought forward to 6 months and include the Marshalswick South area. The review consultation did not provide a clear resolution to the parking issues being raised. It was apparent through the process that a vast number of residents in the newly affected area, desired the Ladder Roads scheme to be reversed / removed either entirely or partly. Officers had to look at both areas more objectively to provide a proposal that ensured traffic flow and road safety was the focus but at the same time ensuring that residents maintained available kerb space for parking by residents and their visitors.

Following several informal consultations, it was agreed to split the two areas, Marshalswick South and Clarence Wards back in to single consultation areas. This would allow us to make decisions based on the differing needs of the locations and avoid delays in implementing any restrictions that affect the safety and flow of road users.

Once the schemes were separately identified, we were able to make a final proposal for both which have now been advertised separately with The Clarence Ward Scheme being agreed and implemented in September 2021 with a go live date of 1<sup>st</sup> November 2021.

For this scheme 'Marshalswick South' which this report covers, it is recommended to monitor and review the scheme for a period of 18 months following implementation, with the proviso that any areas requiring amendments will be considered within that 18-month period without the need for the requested amendments being added to the Council's work programme.

Changes from the previously consulted informal proposals include.

- proposal to introduce pay by phone parking to allow some parking from non-residents has been removed. Recommended to make order/s for residents only parking as detailed in the orders.

## **4. Informal Consultation and Consultation Outcome**

4.1 Several informal consultations were undertaken.

4.2 Initial Review June 2019

The initial review was undertaken as a large consultation covering both Clarence Ward 'The Ladder Roads Scheme' and the Marshalswick South area following complaints from residents of the latter area.

The consultation was intended to.

- help the team understand the impact of the new Ladder Roads Scheme
- identify any areas where parking restrictions may help to resolve any parking concerns
- identify any areas in the new Ladder Roads Scheme which could benefit from amendments.
- help understand residents needs and concerns

The initial consultation received 1093 responses from 3181 addresses included in the consultation. 391 responses from 824 addresses in the Marshalswick South area.

4.3 Informal Consultation February 2020

From the initial review, we put together a proposal which included both wards, this proposal included several new parking zones meaning that the 2 wards would be split into around 4 new smaller zones. In addition, we promoted a pay by phone service which would allow some commuter parking across all the new smaller zones. The commuter parking would be managed due to parking only being available within marked parking bays.

A public forum was set up in February 2020 to allow residents the opportunity to review the maps in a larger form, ask questions and be better informed. This was followed by a 4-week consultation period.

The informal consultation received 365 responses from both wards, 169 responses from Marshalswick South.

Whilst the responses were not a majority response, it was clear that residents did not support the council's proposal for pay by phone within the residential areas. It was agreed to remove this from any future way forward. In addition, it was clear that any formal process should not be put forward with both areas included as one, it was therefore agreed that the formal process should be separated to ensure that the differing needs of the wards could be reviewed separately. From this a formal proposal was agreed and put forward.

**5. Formal Proposal to Make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and a Parking Places Order (PPO) to implement a resident permit parking scheme.**

5.1 Following careful consideration of all the responses from the various consultations and in consultation with the ward Councillors, the Council proposed to make the relevant orders on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2021. A public notice was displayed in the local Herts Advertiser newspaper and on lamp columns in the affected roads.

In addition, a letter to residents explaining the proposed changes was sent to all affected residents and businesses. The letter included a copy of the public notice.

Following the consultation period, the Council received 122 representations, due to the number of responses, the details of the individual comments can be read in Appendix B, However, A summary of the number of responses from each road is listed below.

There were no objections to the Orders as advertised. In general, the objections and representations were against the scheme overall or against specific elements of the scheme detail such as times and days.

**6. Formal Objections / Responses and Representations by Ward:** The below is a summary of the objections received. Appendix B provides a more detailed breakdown of each individual response and the Councils comments.

6.1 Objections by road.

Road Name	No. of Responses	Road Name	No. of Responses
Battlefield Road	7	Harptree Way	0
Charmouth Court	10	Homewood Road	18
Charmouth Road	26	Lancaster Road	6
Faircross Way	8	Marshal's Drive	13
Gurney Court Road	10	The Park	7
Hall Heath Close	1	Other or no address	16

6.2 In addition to the responses received, the Council received a multi-signed letter from residents of Gurney Court Road. This was delivered as a petition. However, after careful consideration it is not being dealt with as a petition under the Councils petition policy and process for the reason below.

The process for implementing parking restrictions is governed under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and any subsequent supporting legislation and or legislative processes. This already outlines how a consultation should be conducted and how objections and representations must be submitted. Anyone objecting must follow that process otherwise objections may not be included.

In addition, I believe the Councils policy on petitions is clear that a petition should contain a clear and concise statement covering the subject of the petition. It should state what action the petitioners wish the Council to take, the name, address and signature of any person supporting the petition and the petition Organisers contact details.

The letter containing the 13 questions which is labelled as a petition, does not meet that requirement on the grounds that.

1. it is not clear that the covering letter submitted with the 35 signed questions sheet, was part of the information provided to those who signed the individual sheets containing the questions. The date on the covering letter would suggest otherwise. Therefore, the covering letter must be treated as a single objection.
2. The sheet ladled petition does not provide a clear and concise statement covering the subject of the petition or what action the petitioners wish the Council to take.

Based on the above, I cannot consider this as a petition but an objection from 35 residents against the advertised orders. The list of questions submitted by the 35 residents will be responded to within the consultation process, whilst listed as being received from 35 residents. It will only be included once.

A response from the care home on Battlefield Road highlighted the need to accommodate care home staff to ensure that the care home remained an integral part of the local community. The suggested number of possible staff requiring a permit was 15. However, the number of staff currently is around 27.

It is recommended that the care home is added to the eligible properties with access to 20 permits. 15 of those permits should be provided to staff that require them and another 5 permits for the care home to maintain and manage.

The 15 staff permits must be registered to a vehicle and would be costed at the normal price for a 1<sup>st</sup> car permit. The additional 5 permits, if required will be provided for use in any vehicle. However, these would need to be costed differently. It would be the recommendation that these are costed at the second car permit price £70.04 pence. The reason for the additional cost represents the value of a permit not registered to a specific vehicle.

## 8. Ward and County Councillor Comments following the formal consultation and review of this report.

- 8.1 Councillor have engaged with the consultation throughout and have shown support for the scheme at various stages. They have received a copy of this report and have not made any further comments.
- 8.2 No further comments have been received from the Ward Councillors.

## 9. Finance

- 9.1 The cost to implement the scheme is estimated as follows.

Materials or Service	Number required	Cost Per Unit	Total Cost
Lining	Various	£16,000.00	£16,000.00
Signs	185	£55.00	£10,000.00
Posts	100	£110.00	£11,000.00
Advertising	2	£496.65	£ 993.30
Officer Time	444 Hrs	£21.19	£9,408.36
		<b>Total:</b>	<b>£47,401.66</b>

9.2 **Note:** These costings are based on previous quotations and may be subject to price changes once a decision is made on the way forward. It is recommended that a contingency percentage of 20% is added to cover any new quotations or unforeseen Officer time or other costings that may be required. Therefore, a figure calculated as below is recommended for this scheme: £47,401.66 + 20% approximately £9,480.33 = £56,881.99 (approximately)

## 10. Projected income of the scheme

10.1 It is difficult to project resident permit scheme income as each scheme will have different needs and requirements, for example, some residents will have off street parking and will not require a permit. In the first-year uptake of permits can be limited. However, this scheme is unique in that most households within the affected areas do have available off-street parking and in most cases for 2 or more vehicles.

This makes it even more difficult to make any projection. It would not be helpful to make a calculation based on previous schemes which is the normal process. This is because any projected figure will give a false increase in future budgeted income. Whilst some income is likely, it is not expected to be significant.

To help I have provided the usual average permit 'take up' in the first 12 months of most schemes in St Albans, this is normally based on around 62% of properties purchasing the first permit and then the projected income is calculated based on an adjustment to take account of the differences in this scheme.

The total number of properties eligible is approximately 640. On this basis we would normally expect, based on the 62% 397 1<sup>st</sup> permits to be sold. This would be a projected income of £8,007.49 However, we estimate that the percentage of permit take up for this scheme will be a lot lower. Based on those properties who do not have available parking, we estimate that figure to be around 20% which correlates to 128 properties purchasing permits and a projected income of £2,581.76

We have used the same figure of 128 properties to calculate the number of visitor permits. It should be noted that residents can purchase up to 12 books per year with each book costing £13.00. Visitor permits are likely to be in higher demand than resident permits but, it is unlikely that every resident will require them. Therefore, we have calculated the income based on the same 20% uptake.

### **Calculation and Projected income.**

Residents Permits (1<sup>st</sup> permit only) Cost per permit £20.17 per annum.

20% of 640 is 128, 128 permits at £20.17 is £2,581.76

Visitor permits sold at 12 books per property costing £13 per book is £156.00 per property.

The number of properties at 20% of 640 is 128

12 books at £13.00 per book is £156.00

£156.00 x 128 is £19,968.00

This gives a projected income overall of £22,549.76

It is recommended to review the income after the first 18 months before any permanent adjustments are made to future budgets.

**11. Will there be Implications for St Albans Council?**

Issue	Yes/No	Reference
Policy	No	Unchanged
Financial	Yes	See Paragraph 9 and 10 of this report.
Impact on the Community	Yes	See Appendix A
Legal and Property	Yes	TRO/S to be sealed
HR/Workforce	Yes	Minimal additional enforcement estimated at 5 - 7 hours per week
Risk Assessment	Yes	See Appendix A
Environmental Sustainability	Yes	See Appendix A

**12. Further Information/Appendices**

- Appendix A: Equality and Impact Assessment
- Appendix B: Formal Consultation responses
- Appendix C: Final copies of the Order/s for sealing including maps

**13. Report Sign Off –**

Lead Councillor for Public Realm	Head of Services or relevant Council decision Maker
Name: <b>Redacted</b>	Name: <b>Redacted</b>
Date: <b>Redacted</b>	Date: <b>Redacted</b>
Signature: <b>Redacted</b>	Signature: <b>Redacted</b>
<b><u>Cross out below as appropriate;</u></b>	<b><u>Cross out below as appropriate;</u></b>
<i>Agree to Make Traffic Regulation Order/s</i>	<i>Agree to Make Traffic Regulation Order/s</i>
<i>Agree to Abandoned Scheme</i>	<i>Agree to Abandoned Scheme</i>

Please note, for data protection the signatures details have/will be redacted.