

ANNEX B - Riverside Road Area Permit Parking Area (Zone Z) – Statutory Consultation Responses

The Statutory Consultation was carried out between 23rd September and 14th October 2022 on proposals to introduce a Permit Parking Area (Zone Z) in the Riverside Road Area. This followed on from an informal consultation which was carried out between 11/02/2022 and 04/03/2022.

310 Letters were posted to properties in the affected area, notices placed on street and a legal notice placed in the Watford Observer.

There were **49 individual responses** received to the consultation. These have been summarised as **35 Objections, 12 in Support and 2 General comments**. In addition, **2 petitions** have been submitted in objection of the proposals. 1 signed by 28 residents of The Coppice and 1 signed by 17 residents of Blackwell Drive. These are summarised by street as follows.

Road	No of Letters posted to Properties	Representation of Objection	Representation of Support	Other
Blackwell Drive	45	9	9	Petition of objection signed by 17 residents. (2 of which also sent in their own individual comments of objections)
The Coppice	17	9	0	Petition of objection signed by 28 residents (7 of which also sent in their own individual comments of objections)
Riverside Road	71	6	3	
Colne Avenue	60	3	0	
Crossmead	63	4	0	1 General Comment
Waterman Close	36	1	0	
Address Not Disclosed	N/A	3	0	1 General Comment

The following table sets out the text of the petitions received

<p><i>“Petition against Riverside Road Area Watford, Controlled Parking Zone Z Order 2022 Parking Permits. Please see from the undersigned from the residents of the Coppice Watford WD19 4HR who are objecting to the The Coppice being part of the Controlled Parking Zone Z. We are all perfectly happy with the parking situation as it is currently and feel a controlled parking zone would be detrimental to the households and residents in The Coppice”</i></p>
<p><i>“We, residents of Blackwell Drive oppose this parking permit area as we see no reason for this measure to be implemented to our road. We do not see issues with street parking and we do not see people abusing parking spaces. We do not want to be subjected to extra cost when we have friends and family visiting us, especially with the economic conditions we are going through with rising costs and inflation. We would like to have Blackwell Drive excluded from your program effective immediate. The signatures below from the residents of Blackwell Drive feel the same way”</i></p>

The following table sets out resident’s comments on a street by street basis, verbatim (with addresses redacted), followed by officer response.

Blackwell Drive (9 Objections, 9 Support)

<p><i>“I live at (REDACTED) and would like to formally object to this proposal on the grounds that in my experience there is now parking issue or challenge faced on Blackwell Drive. I do not agree with introducing permit parking on Blackwell Drive as it will cause me and my visitors more inconvenience than the hoped for improvements. There is always parking available near my house throughout the whole day, every day (and that also includes the long stretch of paving where there are no house fronts at the end of the road I live at)”</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street. Inconvenience for visitors to obtain permits.</p>
<p><i>“I write to inform you of my formal objection to this proposal. The grounds on which my objection are based is that I do not believe there is a parking issue or challenge faced on Blackwell Drive. I live at (REDACTED) and believe any restrictions will cause me, my neighbours and my visitors more issues than good. I have not and nor to my knowledge have my neighbours had any parking issues on Blackwell Dr either outside and near my premises. I work from home and can comfortably voice there is plenty of parking during the day and in the evening with no struggle to park on the road, if required. For the reasons mentioned above I very strongly object”</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street. Inconvenience for visitors to obtain permits</p>

<p><i>"I write to inform you of my formal objection to this proposal. The grounds on which my objection are based is that I do not believe there are parking issues on Blackwell Drive. I live at (REDACTED) and have done for (REDACTED) and believe any restrictions will cause me, my family, my neighbours and my visitors more issues than good. I have not and nor to my knowledge have my neighbours had any parking issues on Blackwell Dr either outside and near my premises. My (REDACTED) both work from home and have never mentioned that they have had a problem in parking, there is always plenty of space evenings and weekends For the reasons mentioned above I very strongly object"</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street.</p>
<p><i>"We live at (REDACTED) There is no road access to the front of our house (including all the odd numbers from 1 to 17). Therefore our cars have to be parked in the garage court at the back of our house. This garage court which is the only location within the zone not subject to restrictions. This does mean that there is a real risk of displacement and unregulated parking to the rear of our properties by those seeking to avoid the parking restrictions (and charges), directly impacting on the ability of residents and visitors to our properties being able to park as they do now. We understand will lose the exclusive use of the lay-by which is currently marked as being for "residents of No.1-17 Blackwell Drive only". The lay-by will become part of the CPZ, which can be freely used by residents and their visitors from anywhere in the parking zone. This will further increase parking pressure in the garage court. We therefore object to the PPA due to the considerable impact on the garage Court outside our house"</i></p>	<p>Objection Concern of displacement of parking into private garage area.</p>
<p><i>"I am writing to you in protest at the proposition to put controlled parking in Blackwell Drive. We have never had a problem with parking and we do not need a controlled parking scheme. I feel the council are attempting this in order to make money. In my opinion as well as many others in the Road there is no need for this. It may cause difficulties for us residents if we want to park in the road during restricted times. We have been approached several times over the years and each time we say no"</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street.</p>
<p><i>"I write to inform you of my formal objection to this proposal. The grounds on which my objection are based is that I do not believe there is a parking issue or challenge faced on Blackwell Drive. I live at (REDACTED) and believe any restrictions will cause me, my neighbours and my visitors more issues than good. I have not and nor to my knowledge have my neighbours had any parking issues on Blackwell Dr either outside and near my premises. I work from home and can comfortably voice there is plenty of parking during the day and in the evening with no struggle to park on the road, if required. For the reasons mentioned above I very strongly object"</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street. Inconvenience for visitors to obtain permits</p>
<p><i>"We are the owner occupiers of (REDACTED) and have lived here for (REDACTED). We wish to express our strong objection to the proposed parking controls in this area"</i></p>	<p>Objection</p>

<p><i>We feel the issue of parking in Riverside Road is due to the number of work personnel currently working on the hospital and Riverwell sites who park there during the working day and once this building work is finished there should not be such a problem. We have not had any issues in Blackwell Drive but can foresee issues if parking restrictions are introduced”</i></p>	<p>No issues with parking on street</p> <p>Demand for parking temporary due to construction in surrounding area</p>
<p><i>“As residents of (REDACTED), we, together with our neighbours at 1-19 Blackwell Drive, enjoy exclusive, lawful, and unregulated use of the garage court and access road which is located to the rear of our properties for the purposes of access and parking. The garage court area and access road are owned by Watford Borough Council and consequently the direct responsibility of the Council for cleaning, lighting, repair and maintenance. Each of our properties have legal rights to pass and repass on foot and by car over the access road. We have also enjoyed use of the layby on Blackwell Drive since the houses were constructed in 1963 for use by those visiting us due to the pedestrian only access to the front of our homes. A plan is attached identifying both the extent of the garage court, layby and pedestrian access. The garage court and access road also provide some additional parking spaces for us and our visitors. If the PPA is introduced, our garage court and access road is the only location within the whole parking zone that would not be subject to parking restrictions. It will effectively be an island marooned in the centre of the PPA, impacted by the zone but not getting any of its proposed benefits. This therefore raises significant risk of increased displacement and unregulated parking to the rear of our properties by those avoiding the on-street parking restrictions. This is exacerbated by the inclusion of the lay-by within the CPZ, which as we highlighted above, has traditionally provided additional resident and visitor parking and short-term waiting for deliveries to the front of Nos 1-19. In future, this will not even benefit from the existing signage which is proposed to be removed. As a pre-requisite of any parking controls being introduced, there needs to be signage at the entrance to our access road to make it absolutely clear that the garage court is private and for access and parking for the residents of Nos 1-19 Blackwell Drive only. This is imperative and falls on the Council as the landowner to ensure that such a sign or signs are erected in advance of any controls being introduced. There is a legal requirement to have clear signage on entering the PPA, so this should equally apply to where the PPA ends, and our garage court and access road begins. Residents are only faced with this problem as a consequence of the Council proposing to introduce the PPA. Our position is</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Concern of displacement of parking into private garage area.</p>

<p><i>that we can only support the introduction of the PPA if appropriate signage is erected at the entrance to our access and garage court in advance of the PPA being introduced. Such signage should be agreed with the residents. If agreed signage is not in place, then this letter should be treated as an objection to the PPA”</i></p>	
<p><i>I am writing regarding the above consultation. I have two objections to this proposal as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. I understand that the layby at the bottom of Blackwell Drive is to be included in the parking zone. Currently this layby is reserved for the residents of 1 - 17 Blackwell Drive and the council have erected a sign to this effect. These houses are set back from the road and have a separate parking lot at the back but there is pressure on parking within that parking lot so the layby is often needed for overspill parking. I live at (REDACTED) and although I understand we would qualify for a free permit as a blue badge holder, I need to be able to park our car close to the house for him. Without the layby being reserved for these houses only, there is a concern that other people with parking permits will take those spaces instead.</i> <i>2. Furthermore, I have concerns that the parking zone restrictions will tempt more drivers to park their cars within the parking lot at the back of the house (which will not be included in the zone) which will put even more pressure on the parking area</i> <p><i>Overall I would not therefore support the proposal as it currently stands. If the restrictions do go ahead I would request that :</i></p> <p><i>(a) the layby is not included in the parking zone and the current sign is kept where it is, and</i></p> <p><i>(b) a new sign is erected at the entrance to the parking lot similar to the one in the layby to discourage people from entering the lot to park.If in the worst case scenario (definitely not my preferred outcome!) that you still decide to include the layby in the parking zone then it would seem to make sense to move the current sign to the entrance of the parking lot instead.</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Concern of loss of dedicated parking near home. (Resident may apply for a Disabled if they meet criteria)</p> <p>Concern of displacement of parking into private garage area.</p>
<p><i>“I am in Total Agreement that Permit Parking should be Introduced in Blackwell Drive as the Road has now become a Car Park for NON Residence using Bushey Station and Walking into Watford to work. I do hope the proposal for P P A in Blackwell Drive is successful”</i></p>	<p>Support</p> <p>Issues with commuter parking</p>
<p><i>“I wish to show my support and agreement that Permit Parking should be introduced in Blackwell Drive. The road is currently being used for non-residents commuting from Bushey Station and walking into Watford town centre</i></p>	<p>Support</p>

<p><i>as well as users of the new skate park and residents of the new build flats in Eastbury Road. It is becoming more and more hazardous for residents to navigate safely off our driveways as a lot of the parking is inconsiderate and dangerous. I believe that any household who has 2 or more vehicles and therefore unable to park off road would not be affected by the PPA as the majority are at work during the operating times of 1pm-3pm”</i></p>	<p>Issues with ‘commuter’ parking within street, This “set text” email was sent in by 8 individuals from 4 separate properties of Blackwell Drive</p>
---	---

The Coppice (9 Objections)

<p><i>“I am perplexed by the notification that appeared in the close as during the consultation residents of The Coppice voted against the proposal. Why is this moving forward without further canvassing of the resident’s views? To move forward to a situation where formal objections will need to be made is not consultative as the original correspondence suggested”</i></p> <p><i>“We are writing to lodge our objections to the proposed controlled parking zone ‘Riverside Zone Z’ primarily as in our experience we do not have any issues with either commuters or football traffic parking in The Coppice. There are further reasons for our objections which I will outline below.</i></p> <p><i>As a family both sets of parents/grandparents do not live in the local vicinity residing in both (REDACTED) Consequently, visits are for an extended period and under the proposed scheme would necessitate the use of the visitor voucher scheme at a rate of two a day (parking scheme 1pm-3pm) with a cap of one hundred and twenty vouchers which equates to sixty days allowance for visitors per annum.</i></p> <p><i>We are one of the few remaining households that have not turned our front garden into driveway and have maintained an area of lawn space. An element of this has been due to environmental concerns of increased flooding in parts of London where a vast majority of driveways have been transformed into driveways without adequate soak aways. Furthermore, as a household we believe that in a period of economic concerns through the cost of living crisis this is not an expense we have budgeted as I assume will apply to many other households as well.</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>No support during informal consultation from residents</p> <p>Visitor vouchers would be inconvenience</p>
--	---

<p><i>We would like to also draw your attention to the results of the informal consultation of the controlled parking zone in which residents of The Coppice provided the highest response rate (47%) and the majority (62%) objected"</i></p>	<p>(not enough) for visitors</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary.</p>
<p><i>"This is my formal objection the parking restrictions in the coppice I and the whole street are against this proposal I have family that only visit occasionally because they live far away and it would be detrimental to them I also have a daughter who is autistic and quite regularly has therapy visits which also would be a nuisance as does my next door neighbour and my neighbour across the road (who have special needs children) We currently do not have any issues with the parking arrangements it all works very well in our street We Do Not need parking restrictions now or in the future Everyone including myself have also signed a petition against this proposal which will be sent in due course</i></p> <p><i>This is an objection to any controlled parking in this street I have lives here for (REDACTED) and many of the other residents have also been here a long time and we are all in agreement that we DO NOT want controlled parking we have signed a petition and have sent it in and we also have emailed in separately Please take all our considerations seriously because we as a small community have the parking situation under control and don't need any assistance."</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>Visitor vouchers would be inconvenience</p>
<p><i>"I wish to clearly state my strong objection to the proposal that The Coppice should have permit parking restrictions brought in.</i></p> <p><i>I and my husband have lived here (REDACTED) and have never had any problems in parking in the road.</i></p> <p><i>Our family live in (REDACTED) and when visiting for any length of time it is hard to see how they might avoid the restriction between 1pm -3pm.</i></p> <p><i>With all extra costs already in the pipeline for heating (my husband has health issues and cannot be cold) I do not want any further expenditure added unnecessarily"</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>Visitor vouchers would be inconvenience</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary</p>
<p><i>"We have recently been advised that we are going to have permit parking in our road after all the people in the street have been against the idea.</i></p>	<p>Objection</p>

<p><i>I am sure we received notification some time ago which said that the percentage in favour was very low. How can you justify putting permit parking in our road. We do not want it here!!</i></p> <p><i>My family visit regularly and would incur costs to park at a time when the majority of this country are being severely squeezed with the rising food, energy and cost of living. I and all my neighbours request this be stopped immediately!!”</i></p>	<p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>No support during informal consultation from residents</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary</p>
<p><i>“The Coppice is a very small road and is not usually affected by non-residents parking there. If it was to become a parking permit area, we the residents and family members would incur an unnecessary charge, particularly with the rising cost of living.</i></p> <p><i>We have family members who visit from time to time and need to travel by car, in particular someone who is recently bereaved and needs support. Also when family with young children and babies visit, they need to drive and be able to park as close to the house as possible. Please take this into consideration when making your decision about making The Coppice a parking permit area”.</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>Visitor vouchers would be inconvenience</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary</p>
<p><i>“We are residents of (REDACTED). My wife and I are in objection of allowing resident permit holders to be placed on our street. There are several reasons why we would like to object:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) By default there is limited parking for visitors and residents</i> <i>2) We have young children under (REDACTED) making it difficult to push the buggy down the pavement if cars are half parked</i> <i>3) As the cost of living is increasing, this would be an additional burden on visitors and residents alike.</i> <i>4) Outside our house, the curb in front of the lamp post is half cut, and therefore those parking will block our drive</i> <i>5) the street is very narrow, and only single car can pass through if cars are double parked.</i> 	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>Visitor vouchers would be inconvenience</p>

	<p>Cost of permits not necessary</p> <p>The proposed PPA does not endorse or encourage parking on footway or blocking of driveways. These issues are present regardless of PPA.</p>
<p><i>“We are writing to express our concern regarding the proposed Parking Permit Area (Zone Z), in particularly for The Coppice and for Blackwell Drive. We are against this proposal and feel very uncomfortable to have to pay for a parking permit (an extra expense on top of everything else) every time family or friends come to visit us at home. We do not wish for parking regulation to change at The Coppice or at Blackwell Drive”</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary</p>
<p><i>“My partner and myself are writing to object against the parking permit for The Coppice, Watford”</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No reasons stated.</p>
<p><i>“We have recently been notified of the proposal to introduce permit parking in our area, in particular, The Coppice. We have always objected to the introduction of permit parking and would again object. We have family and friends visit regularly and stay with us due to the distance they travel. Permit parking would add an additional cost to their visit and this is especially difficult under the current cost of living crisis”</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>.</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary</p>

Riverside Road (6 Objections, 3 Support)

<p><i>"I'm a resident of (REDACTED) and was the person who brought the parking problem to the attention of Peter our Mayor. As I pointed out many many times the problem of the all day parking was not commuters using Bushey Station or people using the new park facilities but was the workmen from the Riverwell building works having no on site parking and so were using Riverside Road all day long from 7am onwards. Now that the works are winding up in Colnebank Drive the workers are no longer parking here at all as I predicted. I have just walked down the road today 07.00- 07.15 and not a single works van is parked up or any cars that are not residents. Normally by now you would not be able to park anywhere. I like many residents feel this parking permit zone is not required and will be a waste of time and money in it's implementation and administrative costs in the years to come. May I suggest a visit to riverside road during the week to see how much parking we now have in relation to what I said about the riverwell construction workers no longer parking here"</i></p>	<p>Objection No issues with parking on street</p> <p>Demand for parking temporary due to construction in surrounding areas</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary.</p>
<p><i>"We are sending this e-mail to strongly object to the proposed permit parking in the riverside road area. We have lived here since (REDACTED) and that we have been here the parking has been the same. when the consultation was done it was at a time when the new riverwell housing project was at the start of its development with an abundance of tradesmen needed these tradesmen all had vans or cars but no or little parking was provided on site which meant our road was used for</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Demand for parking</p>

<p><i>parking their vans sometimes being left for the whole week. If you were to visit the road now that most of the construction has been completed, you will see that there is no issue with parking now."</i></p>	<p>temporary due to construction in surrounding areas</p>
<p><i>"We are against this planned proposal as our work and life situation will not fit into the outlined proposal for the following reasons.</i></p> <p><i>We currently have 3 vehicles currently in use by household members as we all have to commute to separate jobs that are not within walking distance, one of them being a company car essential for work use.</i></p> <p><i>While the proposed time is only set for 2 hours during work hours we have different days off, due to our vehicle use for essential work travel, we would need 3 permits to cover this.</i></p> <p><i>We also believe that due to the current uncertainty in the economy with the cost of living increasing, adding on further costs for this PPA would not help the situation."</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Opposes 2 cars per household</p> <p>Cost of permits not necessary.</p>
<p><i>"I object to the parking restriction that is being recommended as the parking issues has been drastically reduced as the building work is near complete and we are seeing a heavy reduction in cars and vans on our road from early September 2022. For this reason, I believe it's not in in the local community interest to have parking restrictions imposed and to pay for permits, I as a vulnerable person have my kids coming to see me every day and can't imagine me having to sort their car permits in order to avoid them being issued with parking fines and the allocation wouldn't be sufficient as I have 4 different cars coming to help me each week. It is for this reason I object to the restriction on riverside road.</i></p> <p><i>I would also recommend if you could build a two way road on riverside, by going into the park area from 1 riverside road to 27 riverside road. This would make better use of the area and keep people safe as at moment there are a lot of fighting with bus drivers and other cars too regarding right of way from 1 riverside road to 27 riverside road. It would be great if they could use the park as a parking area for the local community."</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street</p> <p>Demand for parking temporary due to construction in surrounding areas and issues has passed.</p>

	<p>Visitor vouchers would be inconvenience</p> <p>The road is two way on Riverside but resident would want to see this widened which would be a HCC issue. The loss of recreational ground for car parking and roads is unlikely to be supported by the Council principles to promote sustainability.</p>
<p><i>"I am writing this email to express our concern on the parking permit on Riverside Road. As a household we believe that having parking permits on our road will not benefit anyone as it's only 1pm- 3pm. Additionally as a house hold we have 5 cars and you have limited us to two permits per house. This causes us concerns as we do not know what to do with the 3 cars that are not able to have a resident permit. Furthermore, all the vehicles are used for work purposes and it's unfair for a household to only have 2 permits when we require 5, and it is not fair on us to have to pay for visitor parking permit when we are living here and you only give us 120 hours worth of visitor parking. I think it is reasonable for us to have 5 household permits as we owned the cars before the implementation of this scheme.</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No benefit to residents</p> <p>Opposes 2 cars per household</p>

<p><i>In order to benefit the residents the parking permit should be enforced all day especially on football matches as that's when there is no parking available on our road."</i></p>	
<p><i>"I am placing my objections on record as to how the consultation to the above scheme was conducted. I have received various and differing advice on the possibility of the objections raised below being sustained on legal grounds. I have also been advised that it would be a good idea to organise a petition and publicise the objections through the local press etc. I have to state that it is not my intention to follow the above actions at this stage. My hope is that the objections are considered and responded to in a complete and inclusive manner so that this contentious issue can be resolved.</i></p> <p><i>I have stated that my objections concern the manner in which the consultation was conducted:</i></p> <p><i>Lack of timely information.</i> <i>The initial consultation material contained no information on the cost to the residents to administer this scheme. This is a serious omission. Many residents had started to form their views and opinions on the scheme based on the initial information made available to them. To correct this error with a follow up note was not adequate and the consultation should have been terminated and restarted at a later date. This omission is particularly difficult to understand in a Borough such as Watford, which has completed several PPA consultations previously.</i></p> <p><i>Lack of community consultation</i> <i>To my knowledge there was no attempt to organise a community meeting to answer any questions that may have arisen from the written circulars. This constitutes a serious democratic deficit especially when dealing with such a serious and contested change of residential services. There was door to door political canvassing during this period, but a complete lack of any disinterested Local Government Officer input which should have occurred.</i></p> <p><i>Lack of Impact Assessment on Equality and Equal Access to Services.</i> <i>To my knowledge there has been absolutely no mention or sight of an Impact Assessment relating to Equal Opportunities on this scheme or any similar scheme to the one proposed. There is a reduction in fees and a greater number of permits available to older residents and that is the sum total. But:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No mention of the impact on the increased cost of the second vehicle which national figures indicate are owned and paid for by the females in the households.</i> ▪ <i>No mention on the impact of households occupied by multi generations.</i> 	<p>Objection</p> <p>Information was supplied to residents during the informal consultation and the costs of permits set out within the FAQs.</p> <p>Informal consultations both councillor and officer led were carried out prior to any statutory consultation, this ensured all properties in the area were informed of proposals and not just those willing to attend a meeting.</p>

- *No mention of the impact on households where multi vehicles are required for their occupations.*

If there has been an impact assessment completed on the above, then residents should have sight of the outcome. If there has not been an impact assessment, then that should have been completed prior to the consultation exercise.

Timing of the consultation

The timing of the consultation failed to supply a true account of the feelings of the residents living in the area. The consultation was conducted over a period when there was a large building programme being carried out nearby, and this area was the only area where the contractors were able to park. No doubt this problem was raised to the Councillors, (I know in a number of cases this occurred), and the local Councillors supported the Permit Parking scheme as an answer to the temporary problem. This temporary issue seriously distorted the outcome of the consultation. I know this was raised on a number of occasions but not acted upon. Consequently a large proportion of the residents feel that they have been the victims of political expediency. Even if these feeling are ill founded, it is not a good basis to promote a change such as the one proposed.

In conclusion.

Bearing in mind the above points and also that the majority for the scheme was a simple majority and a slender one of 52%, I think that it is reasonable to request that the consultation should be re-run. I know that the response to this request could well be that “a majority is a majority”, but I believe that the Councillors must understand that it is important to have faith in the decision-making process and in this case that can only be achieved by addressing the above issues.

Note. A number of residents have concurred with the above points and I have been requested particularly to note that residents living at numbers (REDACTED) support the above points but felt that they did not have the resources to respond in the form stipulated by the Statutory Consultation requirements.”

An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared and this has not flagged any major issues. This considers the 9 groups with protected characteristics, disabled and age (elderly) benefit from reductions in permit costs. The specific points raised by the resident can be considered going forward, but these don't fall into the EQIA and would require borough wide permit rules to be rewritten.

The request for PPA from

	<p>residents is not new and parking surveys were carried out prior to any construction work on Riverwell. The informal and statutory consultation took place at times which were considered neutral months.</p> <p>We cannot accept comments on behalf of other residents if they do not sign the response themselves</p>
<p><i>“Hello, This is a short note to express my support for the proposed parking permit area in Riverside Road where I have lived for (REDACTED)”</i></p>	<p>Support No reasons given.</p>
<p><i>“In response to your email regarding parking, this email served to confirm our full support of the scheme. There are 2 vehicles in this household and should the scheme be approved; you may be assured that the permit fees will be paid in full in a timely manner”</i></p>	<p>Support No reasons given.</p>

<i>"Email to confirm I am in support of the proposed permit parking mon - sat Zone Z"</i>	Support No reasons given

Colne Avenue (3 Objections)

<p><i>"I have just received a letter regarding Riverside Road Permit Parking and appreciate the update.</i></p> <p><i>I must reiterate the objections I made some months ago to this proposal for Colne Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>I have lived this the street for (REDACTED) and we have never had an issue with parking. There is adequate parking down both sides of the street with many residence having off street parking.</i></p> <p><i>I work from home Monday to Friday and the street is always empty in the middle of the day. I looked at the figures of those who were in support of this restriction in Colne Avenue and it does not nearly represent the majority of the street, in fact it is the opposite.</i></p> <p><i>The restriction in my opinion isn't necessary here especially during the proposed times of 1-3pm and especially not required on a Saturday when most people will be at home. It would only be a nuisance to people without a drive that are at home during the day.</i></p> <p><i>It seems completely unfair that due to parking issues on Riverside Road that we will now have an additional cost to factor in for a problem that isn't ours. In times of a cost of living crisis I am sure this proposal will not go down well in our street especially as we already pay road tax and council tax.</i></p> <p><i>I urge you to reconsider the proposal to NOT include Colne Avenue. I appreciate it may be needed in other streets."</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>Cost of Permits</p>
--	--

<p><i>"I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed PPA in relation to Colne Avenue. I have been a resident of Colne Avenue for (REDACTED) years and our household has owned at least a single car, usually two, for the entire time we have lived here.</i></p> <p><i>The reasons for my opposition are as follows.</i></p> <p><i>Firstly, I strongly believe that the neighbourhood's concerns over a lack of road parking provision is unwarranted. Our household has two cars, both of which are parked on-street, and we have always been able to park our car(s) within 15 metres of our house. This is the maximum distance we must park from our house and this is only experienced sporadically during match days. On non-match days, this is normally a maximum of 5 metres from the centre point of the road parking space parallel to our property. During our (REDACTED) tenure as residents, we have not noticed a deterioration of parking provision on Colne Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly, the majority of households on Colne Avenue have social housing tenancies with WCHT. The socio-economic demographic of Colne Avenue is lower than that of the other proposed streets under this PPA scheme and it would be immoral to further increase the cost of living for households during this time. This would be an unnecessary expense considering the more than sufficient parking provisions currently available to residents. This is exacerbated by the regressive nature of these schemes whereby the financial impact of such schemes is only a detriment to the poorest households. We, as a household, are fortunate enough that if the scheme was implemented, we would be able to afford it but I have sincerely grave concerns for my fellow residents.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, there is a significant and material impact on households deemed vulnerable due to age, disability or other protected characteristic. These households, of which there are many on Colne Avenue, rely heavily on their support networks for daily living. The imposition of an unnecessary PPA would prevent these households from getting the support they require due to the additional expense of visitors parking on Colne Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, the proposed parking restrictions are, in my opinion, ineffective and overzealous. The primary issue for parking on Colne Avenue is only during match days. It would be far more effective to simply impose a PPA for match days only. However, this would still not ameliorate the concerns outlined above regarding the cost of living crisis. Therefore, I am unequivocal in my opposition to this PPA scheme".</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street.</p> <p>Cost of Permits</p> <p>Inconvenience and cost of visitor permits,</p>
<p><i>"I strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions in Colne Avenue and surrounding roads for several reasons.</i></p>	<p>Objection</p>

<p><i>I have been a Watford resident for (REDACTED) and will now have to pay to park outside the same house /road that I have lived in all this time!</i></p> <p><i>I feel that it is incredibly unfair to introduce additional charges for families in such difficult times.</i></p> <p><i>Have you even considered pensioners who may not even own a car but rely on friends, family or friends visiting, who will now have to purchase parking vouchers. This is an un-necessary and unaffordable extra cost.</i></p> <p><i>Does the cost of living crisis not affect you ?</i></p> <p><i>Any parking issues have arisen due to poor planning / decision making of the council -</i></p> <p><i>Putting in pay and display bays in Eastbury Road; pushing station users into residential roads as there is no adequate station car park.</i></p> <p><i>Building a lovely skate park with an inadequate car park, again pushing visitors into parking in residential roads.</i></p> <p><i>Building a huge housing estate in Thomas Sawyer way - which is an absolute eyesore by the way - with no provision for contractors to park so yet again they are parking in the nearby roads and walking up to the site”</i></p>	<p>Cost of Permits</p>
--	------------------------

Crossmead (4 Objections 1 General Comment)

<p><i>“I object to the introduction of parking permits in Crossmead, as I have lived here for (REDACTED) and parking is not an issue, I believe this is a revenue making exercise, and as such I will never vote for the liberal party again”</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Costs of Permit</p>
<p><i>“I wished to email in to express my objections and concerns for the proposed Riverside road parking restrictions.</i></p> <p><i>When this was first put forward in the summer myself and other residents on my road expressed our dislike for these plans but it seems those opinions are out weighed or not valued.</i></p> <p><i>We do not see how the proposed restrictions or any restrictions would benefit the residents, they seem to only benefit the council in getting a little more income.</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street</p> <p>Cost of Permits</p> <p>Resident has had email responses to their specific questions.</p>

The issue with the parking in this area is the lack of it, by expanding Riverside road to offer parking on both sides and expanding the car park in Oxhey park you would ease the load on the residential roads. Additionally if the parking at the hospital was not so extortionate people would begin to park there rather than on our roads and walk down.

With regards to Crossmead specifically most houses do not have a drive so require to park on the road most houses now also have more than 1 even more than 2 cars due to the size of the families living in them and some having vans for work and then personal cars. The proposed hours of the parking resections are at a time when parking is plentiful so the permits would hold no benefit. The cost of annual parking permits may seem minute but for those struggling with current costs if living these are an unwelcome additional expense.

We have already come to the conclusion that you will be putting this plan into place, as historically, Watford and other Hearts councils have very little interest in the opinions of its citizens. We therefore have the following questions;

How will the permits be enforced?

Will the permits have car REG numbers on them?

What of houses that need more than 2 permits?

What can be done for visits more than 1 hour, or for essential car visits where visitors permits would be used at great speed?

Will there be marked bays to park?

Will a permit be needed to park on OR over your own drive or a drive of your relatives?

Thanks in advance"

How will the permits be enforced? During the hours of the Permit Parking Area, Civil Enforcement Officers will patrol the area and check vehicles parked in the designated permit parking area hold a valid permit. Those that do not hold a valid permit will be served a Penalty Charge Notice.

Will the permits have car REG numbers on them? The Parking Service issue virtual permits. A virtual resident permit is designated to a specific vehicle. However, as they are virtual these details will only be visible to the Civil Enforcement Officer when they check the vehicle using a hand held device. Further information on resident permits can be found on www.watford.gov.uk/parking.

What of houses that need more than 2 permits? Households that have more than two vehicles will need to seek alternative legal parking for their additional vehicles, during the hours of the scheme.

What can be done for visits more than 1 hour, or for essential car visits where visitors permits would be used at great speed? Visitor voucher can be booked in advanced online or through the app or alternatively through the dedicated phone line. They can also be booked for longer than 1 hour. Further information on visitor vouchers can be found on www.watford.gov.uk/parking Once a resident visitor voucher account has been set up is a very quick process, especially if it is for a vehicle that the household has booked time for before as the system can store the vehicle details and payment details to ease the process.'

Will there be marked bays to park? As this is a Permit Parking Area there are no marked bays, the permit parking is within an area, bounded by entry/exit signs. A similar situation can be seen in Cedar Road/Kingsfield Road Area Y.

Will a permit be needed to park on OR over your own drive or a drive of your relatives? During the hours of the scheme, members of the household will need a valid permit

	<p>to park across their own driveway. This also applies if a visitor to the household wishes to park across the household's driveway during the controlled hours. Outside of the controlled hours members of the household can park across their own driveway without a permit and equally their visitors to the household can park across the householders driveway if a member of the household has provided them with consent.</p>
<p><i>"I like the Liberal Democrats but I DO NOT want to PAY To park outside my house. Parkin is OK No Need for permits Thank you and have a good day"</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Costs of Permit</p>
<p><i>"I am writing to yourself with regards to parking proposal. I believe that parking restrictions are not necessary in this area as this doesn't affect residents ability to park their cars.I would like to keep Crossmead as free parking zone. I don't think that residents should be paying for any parking around this area"</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street</p> <p>Cost of Permit</p>
<p><i>"Just a quick note regarding the proposed permit parking (Zone Z). On consulting residents earlier in the year we were seeing contractors/builders parking their cars in the local area. As the development near the hospital has now been completed we are not seeing anywhere the same number of vehicles parking during the day.</i></p> <p><i>In light of the cost of living crisis and the potential cost of parking permits to local residents and in due course the cost to the council it would be a shame to over react."</i></p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>Demand for parking temporary due to construction in surrounding areas and issues has passed.</p> <p>Costs of Permit</p>

Waterman Close (1 Objection)

<p><i>"I am writing to object to any parking restrictions near my property on Waterman. This seems an unnecessary restriction that will infringe on my daily life. As Waterman close is nowhere near a train station, education setting and at present there are no issues with parking outside my home, it seems very unnecessary. I object to all planned parking restrictions in the area"</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No issues with parking on street</p>
---	--

Unknown Address (3 Objections, 1 General Comment)

<p><i>"After receiving your letter regarding the Riverside Road Permit Parking. I would just like to point out a few reasons why I disagree with this.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>1. We do not see a parking warden around this area from one week to the next, and I cannot see this changing.</i><i>2. Parking on corners on yellow lines is common practice and totally ignored by traffic wardens if they do come past, with the excuse "I know who owns it and he lives around here"</i><i>3. Lutreola Close, a new road off Riverside has vehicles parked at the riverside end due to vans and cars from the 5 new houses opposite parking there as well as over the pavement in front of their houses as there is not enough parking in front of their own houses to do so.</i><i>4. The zig zag lines are a joke and nobody takes any notice of them as there is always cars parked on them even with the works no parking in yellow written across them.</i><i>5. There has never been any visibility issues with the Riverside Works as they have been here for years and never caused any problems to the residents or motorists on Riverside .</i> <p><i>I hope these objections will be considered as the cost of parking permits on top of the rise in every aspect of living at the moment is also a consideration that should be taken into account"</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Enforcement would be carried out as part of CEO rounds and PCNs would be issued to vehicles on No Waiting At Any Time. The proposals seek to formalise the 'zig zag' lines as these are unenforceable and cause</p>
--	---

	<p>confusion to road users.</p> <p>Cost of Permit</p>
<p><i>“Further to your notification dated 22nd September 2022, we are writing to object to the proposal to turn existing street parking to a controlled parking zone. Our objection stems from the fact that the majority of the daytime parking in 2021 and 2022 stemmed from the abuse of residential parking by contractors who were hired to build Watford General car park and the adjacent residential units.</i></p> <p><i>Now that this is completed the instances of car parking abuse have gone down. Given the state of personal circumstances due to high inflation and energy costs we object to any paid parking scheme.</i></p> <p><i>If you proceed with the permit parking area - this should <u>NOT be at the expense of residents of the area and any permits should be supplied free of charge to all residents.</u>”</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Demand for parking temporary due to construction in surrounding areas and issues has passed.</p> <p>Cost of Permit</p>
<p><i>“Dear sir few months ago I send you a email I mentioned there is the parking problem only because Watford building work is going on and when work finish there wouldn't be any problem.</i></p> <p><i>We received latter for parking restrictions. Hospital building work has finished there is no parking problem at all because all the builders and labour used to park on these roads has gone. If you do survey again you will see no problem.</i></p> <p><i>Putting the restrictions now would be only another burden on people who already facing living crisis. Thanks”</i></p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Demand for parking temporary due to construction in surrounding areas and issues has passed.</p> <p>Cost of Permit</p>
<p>SilkmIII Road</p> <p>Is there a reason why Silk Mill Rd is not included in this proposal as now all non permit holders are going to try and park on this rd which already is a problem entering/exiting Eastbury Rd.</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>Resident advised</p>

The proposals for a permit parking area are with the boundary of Watford Council and terminate at the borough boundary at Riverside Road/Silk Mill Road.

Silk Mill Road falls under Three Rivers District Council. As the adjoining authority Three Rivers have been made aware of the proposals.