



# **CPZ POLICIES TASK GROUP**

## **REVIEW OF THE POLICIES FOR WATFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES**

**FEBRUARY 2015**

## **CONTENTS**

<b>Committee Membership</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>Proposed Recommendations</b>	<b>Pages 4 to 5</b>
<b>Background Information</b>	<b>Page 6</b>
<b>Summary of Meetings</b>	<b>Pages 7 to 8</b>
<b>Recommendations and Comments</b>	<b>Pages 9 to 13</b>
<b>Bibliography and appendices</b>	<b>Page 14</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>Pages 15 to 49</b>
1 - Task Group scope	<b>Pages 15 to 23</b>
2 - Minutes 18 December 2014	<b>Pages 25 to 27</b>
3 - Minutes 20 January 2015	<b>Pages 29 to 36</b>
4 - Minutes 2 February 2015	<b>Pages 37 to 38</b>
5 - Report: Controlled Parking Zone Issues	<b>Pages 39 to 46</b>
6 - Document re Business Permits	<b>Pages 47 to 48</b>
7 - Document re Late Night Enforcement	<b>Page 49</b>

## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

### Watford Borough Council

#### Members - Task Group

Councillor Karen Collett

Councillor Kareen Hastrick

Councillor Peter Jeffree

Councillor Anne Joynes

Councillor Darren Walford

Chair of the Task Group and  
Councillor for Woodside Ward

Councillor for Meriden Ward

Councillor for Park Ward

Councillor for Leggatts Ward

Councillor for Tudor Ward

#### Officer Support

Andy Smith

Justin Bloomfield

Liam Hornsby

Sandra Hancock

Rosy Wassell

Transport and Infrastructure Section Head

Parking Services Manager

Deputy Parking Services Manager

Committee and Scrutiny Officer

Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer

# RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESENT TO CABINET AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

### **Vehicle Length Limits**

- 1 The 5.25m length limit to be retained for all residential permits.
- 2 To extend the length limit for business permits (in CPZs) to 6.0m.

### **Business Permits**

- 3 Criteria to be revisited
- 4 Vehicles should be registered to the company address (i.e. Head office) but not necessarily at the CPZ address – not to an individual at a residential address
- 5 Vehicles must realistically be usable for the stated operation
- 6 Vehicles to be used during the day rather than parked throughout entire business hours.

### **Blue Badge Drivers**

- 7 Free permits be retained for drivers who hold a Blue Badge.
- 8 Extend free permit issue to cover parents caring for disabled children under 16 years old who hold a Blue Badge

### **One Permit Per Person**

- 9 The current Rule should remain: up to two permits to be available to each household but only one permit per person.

### **Funerals**

- 10 The policy to remain unchanged

### **Visitor Voucher Abuse**

- 11 Amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to allow for the revocation of vouchers when they are abused and confirm that all minutes on Visitor Vouchers must be scratched, including zero.

### **Doctor and Health Visitor (DHV) Permits**

- 12 The price of DHV permits to be: £25 for the first five permits for any one organisation and subsequent permits to be priced at £55 each. Charges to be reflective of the residents' pricing structure. A formal criterion to be created and a clause inserted in the TRO to reflect this.
- 13 All current DHV permits to be revoked and reissued to applicants under the new criteria and pricing structure

### **Staff Permits**

- 14 A formal criteria for use to be created and a suitable clause inserted in the TRO to reflect this.

### **Late Night Enforcement (Residential Roads)**

- 15 To continue with the current arrangements and to be reactive to specific yellow line complaints in circumstances where safety or access concerns may exist.

### **Period of Residency (Vehicle Ownership)**

- 16 Proof of residency to be produced for each renewal of permit.  
17 The requirement for a V5 or insurance document to be produced each year should be removed if the renewal relates to the same vehicle.

### **Refunds**

- 18 That a standard administration fee of £10 is deducted from the refund due on each permit and a pro-rata refund for the remaining months is provided by BACS upon application. This rule to apply only to those permits with more than three months remaining.

### **Driveway CPZ Parking for Permit holders**

- 19 A suitable clause to be written into the TRO in order that persistent instances of abuse can be dealt with.

### **Residents' Permits – Minimum tenancy period**

- 20 To formalise a minimum six months tenancy period to qualify for a 12 month permit. All other residents remain entitled to visitor vouchers.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

At a meeting on 20 November 2014 the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were asked to review policies in relation to Controlled Parking Zones and to consider whether to establish a Task Group for this issue.

The meeting agreed that a task group on this subject would be wise.

It was suggested that the group should comprise councillors who did not represent a ward in which a CPZ was established. Councillors whose wards contained a CPZ were asked to attend as witnesses; enabling them to contribute the experience of residents in their wards.

In light of complaints received by the Parking Service the proposal had asked that the Task Group consider aspects of policies relating to the allocation of residents' and business permits and to test whether current policies were reasonable or whether a review would be justified.

It was proposed that evidence be gained through:

- Current policies
- Officers' views and comments from residents, the public and business users
- Member views
- Examination of other CPZ schemes

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee were advised that the Task Group must complete their work by the end of the current financial year.

It was agreed that the Task Group would comprise:

Councillor Karen Collett	–	Councillor for Woodside Ward
Councillor Kareen Hastrick	–	Councillor for Meriden Ward
Councillor Anne Joynes	–	Councillor for Leggatts Ward
Councillor Rabi Martins	–	Councillor for Central Ward
Councillor Darren Walford	–	Councillor for Tudor Ward

At the Task Group's first meeting it was agreed that Councillor Peter Jeffree, Park Ward, would replace Councillor Rabi Martins.

## SUMMARY OF MEETINGS

### First Meeting - 18 December 2014

Councillor Collett was elected Chair.

It was agreed that the Task Group would not review the entire parking scheme; the group would address those aspects specified in the scope.

Suggested areas for review included:

- Residence permits
- Visitor Vouchers
- Business Permits
- Exemptions
- Length of Vehicles
- Match day parking

It was recommended that transport and parking services officers prepare documents for the group listing comments and questions received from residents and members of the public. This could then be considered at the following meeting.

Members discussed the aims and contents of the report.

The following ACTIONS were AGREED:

1. That the Committee and Scrutiny Officer would research parking provision at other nearby local authorities and to then pass the information to the task group.
2. That the Transport and Infrastructure Section Head and the Parking Services Manager be asked to attend the following meeting of the Task Group
3. That the Committee and Scrutiny Officer would
  - email the task group members and the Head of Regeneration and Development for suggestions for questions in a survey to be sent to those Councillors whose wards had a CPZ: Callowland, Central, Holywell, Nascot, Park and Vicarage
  - look at questions posed by the consultant to residents and businesses in the CPZ areas and email these to the group
  - finalise the survey and send out to Councillors immediately after the Christmas break; the survey to be returned by 20 January.

The minutes for this meeting can be found in Appendix 2 to this report

### **Second Meeting - 20 January 2015**

The Task Group had received a report of the Parking Services Manager addressing issues raised by residents and members of the public in respect of a number of rules and policies relating to the administration of the scheme. The Task Group had also received the results of a survey sent to Councillors whose wards had a CPZ.

The Parking Services Manager asked for guidance on whether any changes should be introduced to the current policies.

The Task Group considered each of the items outlined by the Parking Services Manager and then made its recommendations.

The recommendations are detailed on pages 4 and 5 of this report

The minutes for this meeting can be found in Appendix 3 to this report

### **Third Meeting - 2 February 2015**

The Task Group had received the draft report to be sent to Cabinet in addition to an example of parking details in the vicinity of places of worship and two documents from the Parking Service regarding Business Permits.

The Task Group considered the documents and recommended that they be presented to the Cabinet at their next meeting on 16 February 2015.

The minutes for this meeting can be found in Appendix 4 to this report



## RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

### VEHICLE LENGTH LIMITS

#### Recommendation 1

*The 5.25m length limit to be retained for all residential permits.*

#### Recommendation 2

*To extend the length limit for business permits (in CPZs) to 6.0m.*

The Parking Services Manager advised that 5.25m was a standard length for cars and a maximum length of 6.0m was standard for vehicles in business use. He advised that applicants make a declaration stating the length of their vehicles when applying for a permit.

### BUSINESS PERMITS

#### Recommendation 3

*Criteria to be revisited*

It was felt that the rules were not sufficiently stringent to prevent abuse of the scheme.

The meeting agreed that where criteria were changed permit holders be fully informed of all aspects of the new regulations. It was also agreed that it would be wise to inform residents and businesses that parking staff would monitor CPZs to ensure that the regulations were complied with.

#### Recommendation 4

*Vehicles should be registered to the company address (i.e. Head office) but not necessarily at the CPZ address – not to an individual at a residential address*

#### Recommendation 5

*Vehicles must realistically be usable for the stated operation*

It was noted that in some cases vehicles were not such as would generally be used for business purposes e.g. luxury cars where normally it would be expected that a 'trades' van would be used. It was agreed that the type of vehicle to be used for a business permit should be specified if this were possible.

#### Recommendation 6

*Vehicles to be used during the day rather than parked throughout entire business hours*

The meeting noted that business vehicles were occasionally parked in the CPZ and then were not moved for the whole day; i.e. the parking permit was being used for parking rather than for business use. It was agreed that rules specify that vehicles be used rather than parked and then left in situ throughout the working day.

Parking Services officers produced a revised set of criteria which was approved by the Task Group at the meeting on 2 February 2015. The document is attached to this report at Appendix 6.

## **BLUE BADGE DRIVERS**

### Recommendation 7

*Retain free permits for drivers who hold a Blue Badge.*

### Recommendation 8

*Extend free permit issue to cover parents caring for disabled children under 16 years old who hold a Blue Badge.*

The meeting noted that requests for free permits had been received from applicants who had caring responsibilities for members of the family in the same household. It was agreed that only Blue Badge drivers and parents caring for children under 16 years of age should be granted free permits.

## **ONE PERMIT PER PERSON**

### Recommendation 9

*The current rule should remain: up to two permits to be available to each household but only one permit per person.*

Increasing numbers of residents were requesting two permits where they had two vehicles registered in their name. It was agreed that to introduce a change in this rule could potentially result in an increase of vehicles parking on the highway.

## **FUNERALS**

### Recommendation 10

*The policy to remain unchanged*

Under the current regulations only hearses and limousines for mourners were exempt from parking restrictions in CPZ areas. The meeting noted that changes to the current policy could significantly impact on residents and businesses in some areas of the town.

Officers agreed to produce leaflets indicating available parking near to places of worship and to distribute these to churches etc and to funeral directors for use by guests on these occasions. At the Task Group's final meeting the Transport and Infrastructure Section Head produced a map which Members felt would be very helpful.

## **VISITOR VOUCHER ABUSE**

### Recommendation 11

*Amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to allow for the revocation of vouchers when they are abused and confirm that all minutes on Visitor Vouchers must be scratched, including zero*

Under the current regulations the parking service had no power to act on abuse of the voucher scheme. The meeting agreed that an amendment to the TRO would be wise; this would then allow residents who had abused the system to be penalised through the loss of vouchers.

## **DOCTOR AND HEALTH VISITOR (DHV) PERMITS**

### Recommendation 12

*The price of DHV permits to be: £25 for the first five permits for any one organisation and subsequent permits to be priced at £55 each. Charges to be reflective of the residents' pricing structure. A formal criterion to be created and a clause inserted in the TRO to reflect this.*

### Recommendation 13

*All current DHV permits to be revoked and reissued to applicants under the new criteria and pricing structure.*

The Task Group was advised that there were no formal criteria for applications for DHV permits, that the cost of DHV permits were cheaper than those for residents and that a number of problems were associated with their use, for example drivers use them for personal and social reason.

The meeting discussed charges and it was agreed that a tiered pricing system be introduced at a cost equal to those of residents.

## **STAFF PERMITS**

### Recommendation 14

*A formal criteria for use to be created and a suitable clause inserted in the TRO to reflect this.*

For a number of Council staff, their role required them to visit sites within CPZs for which they were issued with parking permits. The permits were used on a 'pool' basis.

The meeting noted that no formal criteria for application for these permits existed and agreed that a criterion should be created and then inserted into the TRO.

## **LATE NIGHT ENFORCEMENT (RESIDENTIAL ROADS)**

### Recommendation 15

*To continue with the current arrangements and to be reactive to specific yellow line complaints in circumstances where safety or access concerns may exist.*

The meeting noted that problems occurred in roads which included a 'turning point' at the closed end of the street. Yellow lines had been installed to facilitate turning but this had raised complaints from residents who stated that this had minimised parking spaces. It was agreed that whilst officers would not monitor residential roads after 6.30 p.m. they would act in cases of specific complaints.

Parking Services produced a sample letter to send to residents in roads which had turning points at the ends of the street (Euston Avenue and St Mary's Road). The proposed letter is attached to this report at Appendix 7.

## **PERIOD OF RESIDENCE (VEHICLE OWNERSHIP)**

### Recommendation 16

*Proof of residency to be produced for each renewal of permit.*

### Recommendation 17

*The requirement for a V5 or insurance document to be produced each year should be removed if the renewal relates to the same vehicle.*

The Parking Services Manager advised that proof of residency was required for each renewal as this acted as a safe-guard to ensure that permits were not issued to individuals who were no longer residents. It was not, however, necessary to update details of vehicles unless they had been changed since the previous permit had been issued.

## **REFUNDS**

### Recommendation 18

*That a standard administration fee of £10 is deducted from the refund due on each permit and a pro-rata refund for the remaining months is provided by BACS upon application. This rule to apply only to those permits with more than three months remaining.*

Significant numbers of requests for refunds were received which equated to considerable staff time spent in administration. There was no formal rule on the sums concerned.

The meeting considered the refund tables in the agenda and agreed that the structures indicated in the second table be introduced. The figures in this table included an administration fee of £10 having been deducted from the pro-rata refund for those months of the permit where more than three months remained.

## **DRIVEWAY CPZ PARKING FOR PERMIT HOLDERS**

### Recommendation 19

*A suitable clause to be written into the TRO in order that persistent instances of abuse can be dealt with.*

This issue had been referred to the Task Group as officers had received complaints of permit holders parking in front of vehicular access points and driveways. Residents signed a declaration agreeing not to park across driveways but there was no formal provision in the TRO allowing the Council to withdraw the permit in these circumstances. The group agreed with the Parking Services Manager's recommendation as detailed in his report.

## **RESIDENTS' PERMITS MINIMUM TENANCY PERIOD**

### Recommendation 20

*To formalise a minimum six months tenancy period to qualify for a 12 month permit. All other residents remain entitled to visitor vouchers.*

The Parking Services Manager advised that applications for permits were occasionally received from individuals who had short lets on properties in CPZ areas. The Task Group agreed that proven residency of at least six months should be a requirement for a parking permit and that residents for shorter terms should remain entitled to visitor vouchers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY AND APPENDICES

### Bibliography

The following documents were found to be useful:

1. Minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee meeting – 20 January 1997:
2. Minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee meeting – 26 February 1997
3. Minutes of Special Planning and Highways Committee – 10 July 1997
4. Minutes of Cabinet meeting – 3 September 2007  
<http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=121&MeetingId=164&DF=03%2f09%2f2007&Ver=2>
5. Report of the Head of Planning and Development on Controlled Parking Zone Consultation – Outcomes and Recommendations  
<http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/Data/Cabinet/200709031930/Agenda/att764.pdf>
6. 'Your Parking Your Choice' consultation  
<http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/Data/Cabinet/200709031930/Agenda/att765.pdf>
7. Minutes of Cabinet meeting – 2 December 2013  
<http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=121&MIId=1199&Ver=4>
8. Watford High Level Parking Review  
<http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s6157/Appendix%20Ai.pdf>
9. Comparator information on parking permits (meeting on 20 January 2015)
10. Additional Comparator information on parking permits (meeting on 20 Jan 2015)
11. Map for parking near to places of worship

### Appendices:

- Appendix 1: Task Group scope
- Appendix 2: Minutes 18 December 2014
- Appendix 3: Minutes 20 January 2015
- Appendix 4: *Minutes 2 February 2015*
- Appendix 5: Report: Controlled Parking Zone Issues
- Appendix 6: Business Permits
- Appendix 7: Late Night Enforcement

**Selection of topics and issues for scrutiny by councillors, officers or members of the public**

Anyone wishing to suggest a topic for scrutiny must complete Section 1 of this form.

**1. Sources**

The following are sources of ideas for the work programme:

- Performance indicators, both national and internal.
- Views of Cabinet and Leadership Team especially in relation to policy subjects.
- The Council's surveys, such as the annual residents' survey.
- The Complaints Report which is compiled annually by the Customer Service Centre.
- Service complaints more widely; although individual cases will not be taken up if a large volume of complaints is received about a single issue then it may be appropriate to pursue the topic.
- Reports of external inspections of services.
- The views of the Council's partners.
- Issues picked up by ward councillors in their locality.
- The Council's Forward Plan

**2. Outcomes**

Success indicators could include:

- Having identified local needs;
- Having evaluated alternative ways of working/how a service could improve and making recommendations to the Executive or the Council's partners;
- Having developed an awareness of any contractual, economic, legal or structural constraints on Council's or its partners approach.

### 3. Criteria

To qualify for consideration the topic must meet the following criteria:

- Affect a group or community of people. Scrutiny will not normally look at individual service complaints.
- Relate to a service, event or issue in which Watford Borough Council has a significant stake.
- Not be an issue that Scrutiny has covered during the last year.
- Not be a planning or licensing issue, or any other matter dealt with by another council committee.
- To match one or more of the Council's current priorities.
- To be feasible and able to be completed within the timescale projected for the work.
- There must be availability within the relevant department/service to support the review.
- Be a topic that members wish to scrutinise.

On completion please return to Sandra Hancock, Committee and Scrutiny Officer

By email – [sandra.hancock@watford.gov.uk](mailto:sandra.hancock@watford.gov.uk)

By post – Democracy and Governance, Watford Borough Council, Town Hall, Watford, WD17 3EX



## Suggestions for topics to be scrutinised – evaluation table

A Member, Officer or member of the public suggesting a topic for scrutiny must complete Section1 as fully as possible. Completed tables will be presented to Overview & Scrutiny for consideration.

<b>Section 1 – Scrutiny Suggestion</b>	
<b>Proposer: Councillor/Officer/Member of public</b>	
<p><b>Topic recommended for scrutiny:</b></p> <p><i>Please include as much detail as is available about the specific such as;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>areas which should be <u>included</u> in the review.</i></li> <li>• <i>areas which should be <u>excluded</u> from the review.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether the focus should be on past performance, future policy or both.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Review of operational aspects of policies relating to the Controlled Parking Zone, for example, allocation of residents' permits, business permits etc.</i></p>
<p><b>Why have you recommended this topic for scrutiny?</b></p>	<p><i>To address frequent issues arising from comments to the Parking Service relating to the above issues, and queries raised by members in dealing with their casework.</i></p>

**What are the specific outcomes you wish to see from the review?**

*Examples might include:*

- *To identify what is being done and what the potential barriers are;*
- *To review relevant performance indicators;*
- *To compare our policies with those of a similar authority;*
- *To assess the environmental/social impacts;*
- *To Benchmark current service provision;*
- *To find out community perceptions and experience;*
- *To identify the gap between provision and need*

*To test whether the current policies are reasonable, or whether a review is justified. If the policies are to be reviewed this would require wider public consultation and some amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order associated with the CPZ.*

<p><b>How do you think evidence might be obtained?</b></p> <p><i>Examples might include</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires/Surveys</li> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• Interviewing witnesses</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Performance data</li> <li>• Public hearings</li> <li>• Comparisons with other local authorities</li> </ul>	<p><i>Current polices available</i></p> <p><i>Comments received from the public, businesses and others</i></p> <p><i>Officer views</i></p> <p><i>Member views</i></p> <p><i>Vinci views</i></p> <p><i>Examination of other CPZ schemes</i></p> <p><i>Your Parking Your Say survey</i></p> <p><i>The Parking Study</i></p>
<p><b>Does the proposed item meet the following criteria?</b></p>	
<p>It must affect a group or community of people</p>	<p><i>Residents and businesses within the CPZ</i></p>
<p>It must relate to a service, event or issue in which the council has a significant stake</p>	<p><i>The Parking Service</i></p>

<p>It must not have been a topic of scrutiny within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>There will be exceptions to this arising from notified changing circumstances. Scrutiny will also maintain an interest in the progress of recommendations and issues arising from past reports.</i></p>	<p><i>No it hasn't</i></p>
<p>It must not be an issue, such as planning or licensing, which is dealt with by another council committee</p>	<p><i>No it isn't</i></p>
<p><b>Does the topic meet the council's priorities?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Making Watford a better place to live in ✓</li> <li>2. To provide the lead for Watford's sustainable economic growth ✓</li> <li>3. Promoting an active, cohesive and well informed Town ✓</li> <li>4. To operate the Council efficiently and effectively ✓</li> </ol>

<p><b>Are you aware of any limitations of time, other constraints or risks which need to be taken into account?</b></p> <p><i>Factors to consider are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>forthcoming milestones, demands on the relevant service area and member availability:</i></li> <li>• <i>imminent policy changes either locally, regionally or nationally within the area under review.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Task Group needs to have completed their work by end of this financial year.</i></p>
<p><b>Does the topic involve a Council partner or other outside body?</b></p>	<p><i>Vinci</i></p>

<p>Are there likely to be any Equality implications which will need to be considered?</p> <p><i>Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Disability</li> <li>• Gender reassignment</li> <li>• Pregnancy or maternity</li> <li>• Race</li> <li>• Religion or belief</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Sexual orientation</li> <li>• Marriage or civil partnership (only in respect of the requirement to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination)</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Parking Service already has an EqIA – this could be reviewed as part of the process to test whether any proposed changes would require a revised assessment.</i></p>
---	--

<p><b>Sign off</b> <i>(It is expected that any Councillor proposing a topic agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee will participate in the Task Group)</i></p>	
<p><b>Councillor/Officer</b>  <b>Jane Custance, Head of Regeneration and Development</b></p>	<p><b>Date</b>  <b>12-11-14</b></p>

**The following sections to be completed by Democratic Services in consultation with the relevant Head of Service and Overview and Scrutiny Committee as necessary**

<b>Section 2</b>	
<b>Consultation with relevant Heads of Service</b>	
Has the relevant Head of Service been consulted?	Yes
Is there any current or proposed review of service which would affect this suggestion?	No
Is this a topic which the service department(s) is able to support	Yes, we intended to review the CPZ policies and some external review of this work would be beneficial.
When was the last time this service was the subject of a scrutiny review?	Include date if known – have not been reviewed since the scheme was brought introduced in the mid-1990s.
Is the issue something which will be of significant interest to the public and if so, how should this be managed?	Potentially – if significant changes were proposed public consultation may be required. This should be considered as part of the review as it would have resource implications.
Head of Service consulted and when	November 2014





**CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE POLICIES SCRUTINY TASK GROUP**

**18 December 2014**

Present: Councillor Collett (Chair)  
Councillors Hastrick, Jeffree and Joynes

Officers: Committee and Scrutiny Officer  
Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer (RW)

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIR / COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Apologies were received from Councillor Walford.

It was noted that Councillor Jeffree would take Councillor Martins' place on the Task Group on a permanent basis.

The Task Group was asked to elect a Chair for the Task Group.

AGREED

that Councillor Collett be elected Chair of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Policies Task Group.

**2. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

**3. SCOPE AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The Task Group received, from the Committee and Scrutiny Officer, documents relevant to the review.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that scrutiny of the CPZ policies had been requested by the Head of Regeneration and Development. This would not be a review of the entire parking scheme; the task group's views were sought on aspects detailed in the scope.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer explained that there had been no review of CPZ policies since 1997. She noted the specific areas which it had been suggested the group should look at and then decide whether these needed alteration in any form. Suggested areas to review included:

Resident Permits:

Currently two permits per household / one per person – was this ideal?

Visitor Vouchers:

Was the allocation sufficient?; too many?; too few?

Business Permits:

At present one permit was allocated per business. Was this sufficient?

Exemptions:

The Task Group might like to look at this aspect of the scheme

Length of Vehicles:

An assessment of vehicle lengths and provision for differing types of vehicles could be considered by the group.

Match day parking and extent of each individual zone:

The group was not asked to look at these sections of the CPZ policies.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer stressed that the work required of the group would need to be accomplished in a very short time frame: it was intended that the report should be presented at Cabinet at the February meeting.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that Council officers had, over time, received a considerable degree of feedback and questions from residents and members of the public. She recommended that, before the next meeting, transport and parking services officers would be asked to prepare documents listing comments and questions received along with officers' observations and suggestions. At the meeting the task group could consider options available and decide on recommendations for possible changes to policies.

The meeting discussed the aims and contents of the report.

It was decided that there would be no meeting to gather residents' views as there was too little time before the report needed to be finalised.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer agreed to research parking provision and policies at Harrow, Three Rivers, Dacorum, St Albans, Hertsmere and Stevenage Councils and then pass this information to the task group.

The Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer advised that the Transport and Infrastructure Section Head and the Parking Services Manager would attend the next meeting on 20 January 2015.

It was decided that a survey would be sent to Councillors of those wards with a CPZ (Callowland, Central, Holywell, Nascot, Park and Vicarage) to be mailed back by 20 January. The Committee and Scrutiny Officer agreed to email the task group and also the Head of Regeneration and Development for suggestions for questions. She would also look at questions posed by the consultant to residents and businesses in the CPZ areas and email these to the group.

The survey would be finalised and sent out immediately after the Christmas Break.

4. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

- Tuesday 20 January 2015
- Monday 2 February 2015

Task Group  
The meeting started at 6.00 p.m.  
and finished at 6.30 p.m.

Chair  
CPZ Policies Scrutiny



**CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE POLICES SCRUTINY TASK GROUP**

**20 January 2015**

Present: Councillor Collett (Chair)  
Councillors Hastrick (for Minute numbers 7 and 8),  
Jeffrey, Joynes and Walford

Officers: Transport and Infrastructure Section Head  
Parking Services Manager  
Deputy Parking Services Manager  
Committee and Scrutiny Officer  
Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer (RW)

**5. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies were received.

**6. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

**7. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2014 were submitted and agreed.

**8. CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE ISSUES FOR TASK GROUP**

The Parking Services Manager explained that consultations on the parking schemes had been conducted in 2007 and also 2013 and that residents' views were taken into account. He noted that in numerous instances residents felt that they qualified for a parking permit but that reference to individual circumstances and to existing policies demonstrated that they were excluded. He considered that the policies relating to CPZ issues required further clarity to ensure they remained fit for purpose or required amendment.

The Parking Services Manager drew attention to the issues outlined in the agenda and asked for guidance on whether changes should be introduced to the current policies.

The Chair referred to the survey sent by the Committee and Scrutiny Officer to all Members whose wards had a CPZ and explained that

six replies had been received from: Central (1), Holywell (1), Nascot (1) and Park (3).

The Committee then discussed the issues as outlined in the report.

### 1 - Vehicle Length Limit

Councillor Jeffree expressed surprise that the current length limit was 5.25m as the standard parking bay length was 4.8m and 2.4m width.

The Parking Services Manager noted that 5.25m was a standard length and comparable to the standards applied in other authorities.

The Transport and Infrastructure Section Head advised that a maximum of 6m was the standard length for vehicles in business use.

It was noted that officers had no powers of enforcement with regard to vans in CPZs unless complaints were made. The Parking Services Manager pointed out that in the case of a complaint, officers would need to first measure the vehicle in order to establish that the length exceeded the permitted length. He advised that applicants were required to declare the length of their vehicle when applying for a permit.

The Transport and Infrastructure Section Head asked Members to consider how business vans could be accommodated in CPZs during the day.

The Parking Services Manager suggested that:

- vehicle length for business use should be 6.0m
- residents' permits remain at 5.25m

The meeting agreed that:

- the height limit of 2.3m should be unchanged.

### Recommendation:

The 5.25m length limit to be retained for all residential permits. To extend the length limit for business permits (in CPZs) to 6.0m.

### 2 - Business Permits

The Parking Services Manager explained the difficulties inherent in determining which businesses were entitled to permits. He felt that the rules were not sufficiently stringent to prevent abuse of the scheme.

The meeting then discussed the differing needs of individuals and companies in order to carry out their businesses; it was noted that in some cases vehicles were not such as would generally be used for

business purposes.

The Parking Services Manager noted that business vehicles should not usually be present in the CPZs for long periods of time. He advised that officers had monitored the zones and vehicles' lengths of stay; this information would enable officers to determine where rules were being breached.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer asked whether it would be possible to ask businesses for examples of their daily delivery schedules.

Councillor Hastrick suggested that the rules specify that vehicles be used during the day rather than simply parked in the zones and then left in situ. Councillor Joynes agreed that it would then be possible to state that the vehicle did not meet the criteria.

The Transport Infrastructure Section Head suggested that officers produce a draft criteria which would then be emailed to Members for their views.

The meeting considered that:

- It would be wise to continue to monitor CPZs and to inform residents and businesses of this fact.
- That the criteria for permits be considered and changed where necessary; where criteria were changed, permit holders be fully informed of all aspects of the new regulations
- Vehicles for which a business permit was granted should be used throughout the day and not left in situ
- That the type of vehicle to be used for a business permit should be specific if this were possible

Recommendation:

Criteria to be revisited

Vehicles should be registered to the company (but not necessarily at the CPZ address, e.g. Head Office) – not to an individual at a residential address

Vehicles must realistically be usable for the stated operation

Vehicles to be used during the day rather than parked throughout entire business hours

**ACTION:** Officers to prepare and email draft revised criteria to Members

3 - Blue Badge Drivers

The Parking Services Manager reminded the task group that free permits were only available for those Blue Badge holders who were drivers. Requests for free permits had been received from

applicants who had caring responsibilities for members of the family in the same household.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that other authorities used a variety of methods of charging; these were itemised on the comparator tables in the agenda.

The meeting discussed:

- the issue of free parking permits for carers of disabled children who were under 16 years of age
- areas in which Blue Badge holders could / could not park for free

Recommendation:

Retain free permits for drivers who hold a Blue Badge.  
Extend free permit issue to cover parents caring for disabled children under 16 years old who holds a Blue Badge

4 - One Permit per Person

Currently each Council Tax property would be entitled to up to two permits but only one permit per person.

The Parking Services Manager advised that an increasing number of residents were applying for two permits where two vehicles were registered under one name. It was considered that to introduce this change would result in an increase in vehicles on the highway.

Recommendation:

The current Rule should remain: up to two permits to be available to each household but only one permit per person.

5 - Funerals

The Parking Services Manager spoke to the meeting on the subject of funerals and advised that a suspension of parking rules near places of worship was frequently requested by individuals and Members. It was agreed that sensitivity was required when addressing these requests. He noted that only hearses and limousines for mourners were exempt from parking restrictions in CPZ areas. It was also noted that sites of places of worship varied greatly across the borough and that changes to the current policy would, in some areas, significantly impact on residents and businesses.

Members pointed out that if precedents were set for funerals, then requests would inevitably be received for other religious service attendance: weddings, christenings etc.



Officers suggested that:

- maps be produced indicating where parking was available near to places of worship. These could then be passed to churches etc for distribution to guests / participants
- officers consult with funeral directors on suitable measures to facilitate parking in CPZ areas.

Recommendation:

The policy to remain unchanged

Officers to produce leaflets indicating parking places near places of worship which can be given to churches and funeral directors.

6 - Visitor Voucher Abuse

The Parking Services Manager advised on abuse of the visitor voucher scheme and explained that the parking service had no power to act in this regard.

The meeting agreed that it would be wise to amend the traffic regulation order: where abuse is identified residents would be penalised through the loss of their vouchers.

Recommendation:

Amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to allow for the revocation of vouchers when they are abused and confirm that all minutes on Visitor Vouchers must be scratched, including zero.

7 - Doctor and Health Visitor (DHV) Permits

The Deputy Parking Services Manager explained that there were no formal criteria for the application for DHV permits. He added that the cost (£20) was cheaper than for residents.

The Parking Services Manager outlined problems associated with use of these permits and said that criteria were needed which were suited to individual organisations.

The meeting then discussed charges; the following points were raised:

- a tiered pricing system to be introduced eg. The first five permits per organisation to be £25 but additional ones to be more expensive
- DHV and residents' permits costs to be equal
- Permit cost to be vehicle specific rather than shared use

Recommendation:

The price of DHV permits to be: £25 for the first five permits for any one organisation and subsequent permits to be priced at £55 each. Charges to be reflective of the residents' permit pricing structure. A formal criteria to be created and a clause inserted in the TRO to reflect this.  
All current DHV permits to be revoked and reissued to applicants under the new criteria and pricing structure

8 - Staff Permits

For a number of Council staff their roles required them to visit sites within CPZs. Staff were issued with parking permits for this work at a charge of £100 per permit; these were used on a 'pool' basis and charged to the relevant service.

The meeting noted that there was no formal criteria for the application of these permits. The Transport Infrastructure Section Head suggested that fees and charges could be reviewed during the following year.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer noted that officers other than those from the Council were also issued with Staff Permits. These included: Watford Community Housing Trust, Herts County Council, Herts Highways.

Recommendation:

A formal criteria for use to be created and a suitable clause inserted in the TRO to reflect this.

9 - Late Night Enforcement (Residential Roads)

The Parking Services Manager explained that enforcement officers did not generally patrol residential roads after 6.30 p.m. He noted that problems occurred in Euston Avenue and St Mary's Road both of which included a 'turning head' at the closed ends of the streets. Double yellow lines had been installed in these roads to facilitate turning; residents had complained, however, that this action had minimised parking spaces.

In response to a suggestion by Councillor Jeffree that additional signs could be installed, the Parking Service Manager said that such signs could only be advisory. He added that officers could write to residents in these roads to advise that the part of the road painted with yellow lines must remain clear.

The meeting discussed issues concerning yellow lines and agreed that whilst officers would not monitor residential roads after 6.30 p.m. they would act in cases of specific complaints in these areas.

Recommendation:

To continue with the current arrangements and to be reactive to specific yellow line complaints in circumstances where safety or access concerns may exist.

10 - Period of Residency (Vehicle Ownership)

The Parking Services Manager advised that permits could be renewed on line. It was not necessary to update details of vehicles unless they had been changed since the previous permit although proof of residency was required for each renewal since this was an important safe-guard to ensure that permits were not issued to individuals who were no longer residents.

Recommendation:

Proof of residency to be produced for each renewal of permit. The requirement for the a V5 or insurance document to be produced each year should be removed if the renewal relates to the same vehicle.

11 - Refunds

The Deputy Parking Services Manager advised that refunds were given but that there was no formal ruling.

The Parking Services Manager confirmed that a significant number of requests for refunds were received and a considerable amount of staff time was utilised in dealing with this issue. It was debatable whether the amount refunded was worth the work required.

The meeting looked at the refund tables in the agenda and noted that the figures showed the amount refunded after the administration fee had been taken into account.

The task group agreed that the new structures as indicated in the second table be introduced.

Recommendation:

That a standard administration fee of £10 is deducted from the refund due on each permit and a pro-rata refund for the remaining months is provided by BACS upon application. This rule to apply only to those permits with more than three months remaining.

12 - Driveway CPZ parking for permit holders

Complaints had occasionally been received where permit holders parked in front of vehicular access points and driveways. It was

noted that residents signed a declaration agreeing not to park across driveways.

The task group agreed with the officers' recommendation.

Recommendation:

A suitable clause to be written into the TRO in order that persistent instances of abuse can be dealt with.

13 - Residents permits minimum tenancy period

The Parking Services Manager advised that applications were occasionally received from individuals who had short lets on properties in CPZs e.g. holiday agreements or for temporary tenants. He considered that proven residency for a minimum of six months should be a requirement for a parking permit.

Recommendation:

To formalise the minimum six months tenancy period to qualify for a 12 month permit. All other residents remain entitled to visitor vouchers.

14 - Other issues

In reply to a query from Councillor Joynes the Parking Services Manager confirmed that non-residents landlords would not be entitled to a parking permit.

The Chair thanked officers for their input and for the detailed report.

9. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

- Monday 2 February 2015

Chair  
CPZ Policies Scrutiny

Task Group  
The meeting started at 6.00 p.m.  
and finished at 7.30 p.m.

## CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE POLICES SCRUTINY TASK GROUP

2 February 2015

Present: Councillor Collett (Chair)  
Councillors Hastrick, Jeffree and Joynes

Officers: Transport and Infrastructure Section Head  
Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer (RW)

### 10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Walford.

### 11. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

### 12. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2015 were submitted and signed.

### 13. REPORT TO CABINET

Members considered the draft report to be submitted to Cabinet on 16 February 2015.

The following points were noted:

*Business Permits:*

At the meeting of the Task Group on 20 January 2015 it had been suggested that Parking Services officers prepare and present revised criteria for Business Permits to Members. This action had been completed and the criteria were approved by Members.

The criteria are attached to the Task group's report at appendix 6.

*Funerals:*

The Transport and Infrastructure Section Head had agreed to produce leaflets and maps to indicate available parking near to places of worship; this information to then be given out by the churches to assist their visitors.

One example of such a leaflet (for Holy Rood Church in Market Street) had been passed to members of the Task Group. It was agreed that this would prove very useful for both visitors and nearby

residents.

*Late Night Enforcement (Residential Roads):*

At the previous meeting Members had discussed problems at the turning points at the ends of certain closed ends of streets, specifically Euston Avenue and St Mary's Road.

Officers had agreed that the roads would be monitored and had also produced a letter for all residents of these roads detailing problems encountered by residents, information on restrictions and enforcement actions.

The task group approved the letter and agreed that distribution to residents would be wise.

The letter is attached to the report at appendix 7.

RESOLVED

that the report be submitted to Cabinet at the meeting on 16 February 2015.

Task Group  
The meeting started at 6.00 p.m.  
and finished at 6.15 p.m.

Chair  
CPZ Policies Scrutiny

**APPENDIX 5**

**CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE ISSUES FOR TASK GROUP**

The Controlled Parking Zone scheme has been in operation within Watford since 1997. Residents and businesses of the scheme have been consulted upon the rules and arrangements in both 2007 and 2013, which has resulted in a change to some zones adopting full time hours, further to changes the denomination of the annual allocation of visitor vouchers available. Residents and businesses did not indicate that they wished to see any significant changes made to the operational hours or zone boundaries of the scheme and the vast majority of rules remained unchanged.

However, a number of fundamental rules and policies relating to the administration of the scheme did not form part of the consultations but continue to be raised and challenged by both residents and members. As a result, the Parking Service determined that it would be beneficial to all if those issues were considered and clarified by members to determine if they remain fit for purpose or require amendment. The specific points in question are outlined below:

**1. Vehicle Length Limit**

**Current:** length limit 5.25m (height limit 2.3m).

The length limit is equal to the size of a standard Ford Transit van and the restriction applies to residential and business permits.

2007 and 2013 consultations showed that residents continued to support the length limit.

**Issue:** Some members call for enforcement of the rule, which is done reactively, and others complain about enforcement of the rule. A number of business vehicles belonging to commercial premises or individuals exceed the current limit but we have not received complaints.

**Recommendation:**

The 5.25m length limit is retained for all residential permits.

Extend the length limit for business permits (CPZ businesses) to 6.0m

---

**2. Business Permits**

**Current rules:**

1 permit per business (Up to two registration marks)

No off street parking available on premises

Registered for business rates

Vehicle must be registered to the business and at the business address

“Vehicle must be used on an intermittent daily basis”

Permits not issued for commuting

**Issue:** rules are too vague and do not appear to have been consistently applied in the past.

A number of existing permits do not meet the current criteria and some have had them for a number of years. Attempts to withdraw or refuse issue have resulted in complaints and this is difficult due to the number of permits in operation that do not meet the criteria.

**Recommendation:**

Criteria needs to be revisited.

Vehicle should be registered to company but not necessarily at CPZ address (Head Office address etc) – not to an individual at a residential address Vehicles must realistically be used for the stated operation

---

**3. Blue Badge Drivers**

**Current:** permits are issued free to residents whose vehicle is registered to them at their CPZ address and prove their residency in the usual manner but provide a valid blue badge in their name.

**Issue:** There are an increasing number of applicants who are seeking free permits because their wife or mother or relative within the household is a blue badge holder and they have caring responsibilities.

**Recommendation:** Extend free permit issue to cover parents looking after children under 16 years old. Currently 256 residential permits issued free to BB holders/drivers (Loss of income to Council £5,632) Figure likely to increase if extended to carers/partners/relatives (for those over 16 years old). We do not see the correlation between charging for a permit and hindering the individual's ability to continue to care for the adult blue badge holder but this may need to be checked with Legal.

---

**4. One permit per person**

**Current:** Each Council tax property entitled to up to 2 permits but only 1 permit per person

**Issue:** Increasing number of residents are seeking two permits in their name and state this does not increase the overall numbers of vehicles on the highway or the maximum number of permits in the household beyond two. We are seeing increased member support of these requests and questioning of the rule.



**Recommendation:** Rule should remain. Up to 2 permits are available to each household but the 1 permit person appears to have attempted to curb each household having 2 permits where it can be avoided. Where these requests are refused, there will be one less vehicle on the public highway and this is significantly important in central CPZ zones where the availability of space is at a premium such as St Marys Road, where a specific contested request was made.

---

**5. Funerals (Policy)**

**Current:** Exemption only for official vehicles (limo's/hearse)

**Issue:** Requests from individuals and members for non-enforcement of whole roads during specific dates/hours when guests attending CPZ address for funerals. Generally accepted when informed of policy but some members less so.

**Recommendation:** Do not change policy – will impact significantly on residents and businesses in some areas

---

**6. Visitor Voucher Abuse (TRO Revocation) + not scratched zero PCN's**  
**Current:** Rules relating to eligibility of vouchers outlined in TRO and instructions for use on face and reverse of vouchers

**Issue:** Vouchers are abused by a small number of residents, who pass them to businesses and commuters (potentially sell them) or use a variety of methods to re-use a single voucher. A small number of motorists do not scratch the zero when they claim to have arrived on the hour and seek cancellation of any PCN issued, which has often been supported by members.

**Recommendation:** Amendment required to TRO to allow for the revocation of vouchers when they are abused and confirm that all minutes on Visitor Vouchers must be scratched, including zero. (Visitor Vouchers have been amended to make this even clearer and recent Traffic Penalty Tribunal (TPT) decision supports Council has done all it can)

---

**7. Doctor and Health Visitor (DHV) Permits (TRO Criteria & Charges)**  
**Current:** a number of "all zone" permits are issued to various health and caring organisations, which are known as Doctor, Health Visitor (DHV) permits. These are charged at £20 each and allow the holder to visit patients living within the controlled parking zone during restricted hours.

**Issue:** there is no formal criteria for the application of either of these permits. This can make the assessment of new applications or requests for additional permits difficult. Furthermore, the use of DHV permits is not included in the governing CPZ TRO.

**Recommendation:** the price of DHV permits is reviewed with consideration given to a tiered pricing structure. A formal criteria should also be created and a suitable clause is inserted in the TRO to reflect this. All DHV permits are revoked and re-issued to applicants under the new criteria and pricing structure.

---

8. **Staff Permits (TRO Criteria & Charges)**

**Current:** there are a number of Council staff whose roles require them to carry out visits within the controlled zones and are also issued with “all zone” permits. These are charged at £100 and are intended to be used on a ‘pool’ basis rather than issued to individuals. A number of external organisations have also historically been using these permits, including those which used to form a department of the council. This includes Watford Community Housing Trust, Hertfordshire County Council Highways Department and West Watford Community Association.

**Issue:** there is no formal criteria for the application of either of these permits. This can make the assessment of new applications or requests for additional permits difficult. Furthermore, the use of staff permits is not included in the governing CPZ TRO. Whether external organisations should receive ‘staff’ permits has also to be questioned.

**Recommendation:** a formal criteria is created and a suitable clause is inserted in the TRO to reflect this

---

9. **Late Night Enforcement (Residential Roads)**

**Current:** Evening enforcement takes place of Zone E (Met Quarter) to 10pm weekdays/Saturdays with some enforcement on Sundays. The general approach to evening enforcement across the town is 1-2 evenings per week until 10pm which includes one evening until 11pm for the overnight lorry ban. This is the only time that CEO's go into residential roads but do not issue to residential vehicles. All other evening enforcement only relates to the town centre and roads with bus routes. This is all further to weekday matchday enforcement in specific zones. Any enforcement in residential roads, which are primarily Euston Avenue and St Marys Road, is reactive to enforcement requests due to

obstruction and access concerns for larger vehicles in need of using the turning heads governed by double yellow lines.

**Issue:** whilst some residents and members call for enforcement of the double yellow lines in the turning head of residential roads, some residents on the receiving end of such enforcement do not wish this to take place and criticise the service.

**Recommendation:** allowing residents to use the yellow lines in the evenings does not appear to have caused any specific issues, further to those raised by the emergency services in Zone J area, and this creates additional space where and when it is often at a premium. Continue current arrangements and be reactive to specific yellow line complaints in circumstances where safety or access concerns may exist.

---

#### 10. **Proof of Residency (Vehicle Ownership)**

**Current:** All applicants seeking a residents parking permit must provide a proof of residency (dated within the last 3 months) or their name must appear on the electoral register. Further, residents must supply a proof of vehicle ownership (V5 log book or insurance) each year.

**Issue:** the proof of residency and vehicle ownership is viewed as onerous by some residents who are unhappy at providing the same documents each year.

**Recommendation:** the need to prove residency is an important safeguard to ensure that permits are not issued to individuals who are no longer resident. The requirement for a V5 or insurance document each year should be removed if the renewal relates to the same vehicle.

---

**11. Refunds (Not formalised – Admin fee)**

**Current:** Permit holders who no longer require their permits and have more than 3 full months remaining can return their permit to the Parking Shop and apply for a pro-rata refund for the number of full months remaining (as shown on the chart below).

PERMIT COST £	FULL MONTHS REMAINING									
	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2 1
6 + 12	NO REFUNDS GIVEN									
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
22 RES	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	NONE
52 RES	44	40	36	32	28	24	20	16	12	NONE
60 BUS	44	40	36	32	28	24	20	16	12	NONE
150 BUS	132	120	108	96	84	72	60	48	36	NONE
300 BUS	264	240	216	192	168	144	120	96	72	NONE

**Issue:** the permit refund pricing structure is not standardised and leaves the Council open to challenge

**Recommendation:** that a standard administration fee of £10 is deducted from the refund due on each permit and a pro-rata refund for the remaining months, for permits with more than three months remaining, is provided by BACS upon application. This would also allow for refunds to be given for permits with the full 12 months remaining. The new structure would look as below:-

PERMIT COST £	FULL MONTHS REMAINING									
	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2 1
6 + 12	NO REFUNDS GIVEN									
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
22 RES	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	0
52 RES	38.50	35	31.50	28	24.50	21	17.50	14	10.50	0
60 BUS	44	40	36	32	28	24	20	16	12	0
150 BUS	126.50	115	103.50	92	80.50	69	57.50	46	34.50	0
300 BUS	264	240	216	192	168	144	120	96	72	0

**12. Driveway CPZ parking by permit holders (Change TRO to allow revocation)**

**Current:** All residents sign a declaration agreeing not to park in front of vehicular access points and driveways and acknowledge that this could result in the withdrawal of their permits.

**Issue:** On occasion we receive complaints of this behaviour and it is usually dealt with by writing to the permit holding resident and reminding them of the declaration. However, there is no formal provision in the TRO that would allow the Council to withdraw the permit in this circumstance.

**Recommendation:** A suitable clause needs to be written into the TRO so that persistent instances of abuse can be dealt with.

**13. Residents Permits minimum tenancy period**

**Current:** Residents must only prove residency by way of electoral roll, tenancy agreement, Council Tax or utility bill etc. We do not issue annual

permits to applicants who will be resident for periods of less than 6 months.

**Issue:** This is not a formalised process and we are frequently presented with applications from tenants in temporary housing etc seeking annual permits, although they will only be resident for short term periods.

**Recommendation:** Formalise the minimum 6 months tenancy period to qualify for a 12 month permit. All other residents remain entitled to visitor vouchers.

## APPENDIX 6

Business permits are intended for businesses whose primary function is the delivery or the provision of a service at a customer's home or external address. One permit can be issued to qualifying businesses for use on a vehicle essential to the delivery of those services on a frequent basis throughout each day. All business permits will be subject to on-street monitoring to confirm that this is taking place.

Applicants should note that business permits **are not** issued for:-

- Commuting to or from a place of work
- Vehicles needing to load or unload from a business premises
- The purposes of banking
- Occasional visits when pay and display facilities are present in the nearby vicinity

With every application and permit renewal businesses must:-

- Not have any off-street parking within the curtilage of their premises
- Use the vehicle on a frequent basis throughout each day
- Provide a copy of their most recent business rates bill
- Provide a copy of their vehicle registration document confirming that the vehicle is registered in the name of the business either at the business address within the Controlled Parking Zone or at the company's main Head Office
- Provide a full covering letter or supporting statement outlining why they believe the vehicle is essential to the daily operation of the business and meets the criteria for business permit allocation
- Confirm that their vehicle does not exceed 6m in length and 2.3m in height

---

Declaration to be signed by all business permit applications

I understand that any business permit issued to me must be returned to the Council immediately if:-

- 1) I cease to own or use the vehicle in relation to the business
- 2) I cease to own or be the authorised user of any vehicle specified on this form
- 3) Any vehicle specified on the form is adapted or no longer used as an operational vehicle, as defined by the Traffic Regulation Order
- 4) On-street Council monitoring confirms that the vehicle has not been used for the purposes it was issued or has remained parked for extended periods in contravention of the terms of use
- 5) I am issued with a duplicate or replacement permit
- 6) Payment made for the purchase of the permit is dishonoured
- 7) Information relating to the issue of the business permit transpires to be false
- 8) The Council notify me in writing that the business permit has been cancelled because of the events specified above has occurred.

Business permits do not:-

- Guarantee a parking space
- Allow parking on single or double yellow lines
- Allow obstruction of a vehicular/pedestrian access points and/or driveways
- Allow parking within signed suspended areas

I agree that the use of this business permit will be subject to regular on-street monitoring by Council Officers and Civil Enforcement Officers. I declare that all the information I have given in this application is correct and understand that a false statement or any breach of the above may result in the withdrawal of the business permit and render me liable for prosecution.



All Residents  
**Euston Avenue**

CPZ/01/1/JB

Dear Resident,

**Re: Double Yellow Lines – Turning Head**

Over a period of time, the Parking Service has received a number of complaints from local residents seeking enforcement of the double yellow lines found at the turning head of ***Euston Avenue***.

As you will be aware, double yellow line restrictions apply 24 hours, 7 days a week, every day of the year, with the intention of ensuring that a specific area of public highway remains free from vehicles. It is clearly not possible for enforcement to be carried out at all times that the restriction is in force but this does not diminish the motorist's responsibility to observe it.

The introduction of these double yellow lines followed a statutory process, which involved consultation with the emergency services, and there was an identified need to ensure that larger vehicles would be provided with sufficient room to manoeuvre safely in order to avoid the danger of reversing the length of the road to gain exit.

It is acknowledged that the availability of spaces can often be at a premium, particularly in the evenings, but I am sure that you can appreciate that the Parking Service cannot consider extending the use of permits to allow parking on these yellow lines under the circumstances.

As a result, all residents should be aware that the double yellow lines governing the turning head remain subject to enforcement at all times and all contravening vehicles observed will be liable for the issue of a Penalty Charge Notice.

Thank you for your understanding and co-operation.

Yours Sincerely,

Watford Council Parking Service