

**Report to:** Justin Bloomfield - Parking Lead Officer

**Date:** 18<sup>th</sup> January 2023

**Report of:** Norma Adjepong –Traffic Engineer

---

**THE BOROUGH OF WATFORD (WATFORD) (CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES)  
(CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2018  
(AMENDMENT) (NO. 19) ORDER 2022**

**1.0 SUMMARY**

**1.1 The purpose of this report is:**

- 1.1.1 To inform the Parking Lead Officer of comments and objections received following the statutory consultation process which was carried out between the 11<sup>th</sup> November and 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2022 and;
- 1.1.2 To seek authorisation from the Parking Lead Officer to implement the above titled traffic order, by publishing the “Notice of Making”, procuring the sign and line works associated with the proposals, and sealing the Traffic Regulation Order.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Parking Lead Officer authorises all the actions as described in paragraphs 1.1.2 above.

**Contact Officer:**

For further information on this report please contact:

Norma Adjepong

Telephone:

Email:

Traffic Engineer

01923 278150

norma.adjepong@watford.gov.uk

### 3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Residents of the Watford Fields Area (Zone F) have raised concerns about the parking capacity within the zone to elected members and officers, citing that there wasn't enough spaces for them to park and requested a review into increasing the capacity.
- 3.2 Officers walked the area to assess the existing issues being experienced by residents and devised a plan to increase parking capacity, ensuring both pedestrian and vehicle safety. They then completed the desk top study by proposing to reduce sections of the no waiting restrictions around the existing parking bays to increase the parking bays where feasible. The review showed that an additional 10-11 spaces in the area could be found.
- 3.3 Whilst on site, the Officers were fortunate enough to witness Veolia vehicles navigate the streets in question and it was apparent that the yellow line restrictions were working as intended as it is very tight to manoeuvre around some of the junctions within the Neal Street/Roberts Road/Tucker Street Area. It was also apparent that whilst bays were busy in some areas, some adjacent streets such as Muriel Avenue & Watford Field Road, had spare capacity for parking.
- 3.4 Initial plans were shared with Ward Councillors who were supportive of the proposals to increase provision for permit holder parking in the area.
- 3.5 A vehicle swept path analysis was then carried out to determine if the proposals are feasible. That is, if the proposals can accommodate the turning movements of large vehicles without any hindrance or cause any safety issues during operation. The route was tracked using a Fire Engine and a refuse vehicle with similar dimensions to the Veolia refuse vehicles that are used in the Borough. The vehicle swept path analysis identified 3 locations where, due the carriageway layout, the proposals would cause obstruction to large vehicles. These locations were therefore dropped.

### 3.6 Site Location

The Watford Fields Area is mainly residential in nature, with terraced housing with no off street parking facilities. A school, church and recreation ground are also within the study area.

To provide residents with an ability to park on street, a controlled permit zone covers the area. This is Zone F and operates Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm, with additional restrictions on Watford FC Match days. For the majority of the area the bays are permit holders only with junctions protected with no waiting at any time.

### 3.7 Statutory Consultation

The statutory consultation was carried out between the 11<sup>th</sup> November and 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2022 This involved a letter and plan (see **Annex A**) being posted to all properties in the areas within close proximity to the proposals. On street notices were erected, and the notice was published in the Watford Observer and on the Watford

Borough Council website. Statutory consultees were also informed of the proposals. Feedback from the statutory consultation was shared with Ward Councillors, for their consideration, along with officer comments and recommendations.

3.8 A total of 7 responses were received to the Statutory Consultation out of the 75 addresses that were sent the consultation material. Of these, 5 objected the proposals and 2 supported: Refer to Table 1 below

Table 1: Summary of responses from the Statutory Consultation

Street	No. of responses	Support	Objection
Hamilton Road	1	-	1
Lammas Road	2	-	2
Elfrida Road South	1	-	1
Cannon Road	1	-	1
York Road	0		
Lammas Rd by York Rd		Same as Lammas Rd	Same as Lammas Rd
Tucker Street	1	1	-
Roberts Road	1	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>

The full responses can be seen in **Annex B**.

3.9 Both proposals on Lammas Road (the southern end and northern end by York Road) received objections as residents were concerned that the proposal would reduce the stopping area the current arrangement offers to permit vehicles to stop and allow other vehicles to drive past. The current layout of the existing parking bays creates a pinch point in the carriageway width at those locations. The issue highlighted with the proposals can be envisaged with the proposal at the southern end which when implemented, would reduce the current stopping area to 4 metre and may encourage vehicles waiting for other vehicles to pass, to block vehicles turning right out of the northern section Elfrida Road. It is therefore recommended that this proposal should not proceed to implementation in the interest of road safety and to prevent causing obstruction.

With the proposal at the northern end of Lammas Road (on the eastern side), the issue highlighted by the residents will not affect traffic flow as the proposed area for extension is in front of the existing bay and just north of the junction with York Road. As southbound vehicles go past the bay (the pinch point), they will not stop to give way to passing vehicles as they can either continue straight ahead or immediately turn left into York Road.

Another scheme that was objected to and is recommended to be dropped is the proposal on Hamilton Street where the resident believes the proposals to extend the parking bay will cause further obstruction and blockage with the safe passage of emergency vehicles and delivery service who already experience issues outside the restriction hours, in the evening and on Sundays.

With Elfrida Road (south), the resident is concerned that extending the bay will affect

accessibility into and out of their private drive as it is directly opposite the proposed bay extension area. Based on this objection, It is therefore recommended that this proposal should not proceed to implementation in the interest of road safety and to prevent causing obstruction.

Concerning the response for Cannon Road, the resident is convinced the issue with the area as a whole is not due to the lack of parking bays but due to the number of non-permit drivers that park outside the parking restriction period. The aim of the proposals however, is to benefit permit holders by increasing the parking spaces in the whole area.

Even though majority of the responses were objections, it is deemed prudent to implement the reduction of sections of the waiting restriction where safety is not compromised, to facilitate the extension of adjacent parking bays as advertised in the interests increasing parking capacity for residents in the area.

## **PROPOSALS**

### **4.0**

It is therefore proposed that the TRO as shown in draft format in **Annex C** be implemented as advertised, and objectors advised of the decision by letter.

### **5.0 IMPLICATIONS**

#### **5.1 Financial**

The cost of the schemes is estimated at £850 for the legal advertising. Cost to implement the lining changes is £2,000.

It has been confirmed there is a sufficient budget in BEA004 B0908 to undertake the works associated with this project.

#### **5.2 Legal Issues (Monitoring Officer)**

Watford Borough Council has been given delegated authority to make traffic regulation orders and implement proposals to manage parking on public highways and other roads, pursuant to arrangements made under Section 19 of the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government (Arrangement for discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012 with Hertfordshire County Council, and is exercising the powers conferred on it under Section 1, 2 ,3 and 4 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (which said Act of 1984 is hereinafter referred to as “the 1984 Act”) and of all other enabling powers.

#### **5.3 Equalities**

This scheme aims seeks to improve resident amenity through the provision of additional on street parking spaces, thus paying regard to the council’s

duty according to the Equality Act 2010 as set out below.

Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the 'general duty' on public authorities is set out as follows:

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

Consideration has been given to any impact on certain parties, and it is considered there would be no negative impact on specific groups, as the proposals are being promoted to increase on street parking spaces for permit holders, where it is safe to do so. The council has not been made aware during statutory consultation process, of any specific groups that have raised concern.

## 6.0 Potential Risks

Potential Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Overall score
Some members of the public will perceive on-street parking controls as an unnecessary imposition by the Council.	2	1	3
Failure to implement new parking controls will lead to continued complaints from the public and residents in regard to on street parking provision.	1	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>

### Background Papers

Annex A: Statutory consultation letter and plan

Annex B: Resident responses and officer comments to statutory consultation

Annex C: Draft TRO