

**TITLE OF REPORT: BALDOCK PARKING MANAGEMENT - PROPOSED SCHEMES**

REPORT OF STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, HOUSING AND ENTERPRISE

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report summarises the findings of survey work undertaken at the end of 2010 and seeks the Committee's support for taking forward parking management proposals to draft Traffic Regulation Order stage.

**2. FORWARD PLAN**

- 2.1 This Report contains a key recommendation that was first notified to the public on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2009 for the NHDC Car Parking Strategy Review.

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 At its November 2010 meeting the Committee supported parking management options consultation in several areas of Baldock (see Appendix A). Survey work was completed before Christmas and consisted of a questionnaire posted to each property in each Zone. Each property was asked to provide their first and second choices for the options offered along with additional comments.
- 3.2 The options survey has been analysed and schemes to take forward to implementation are now set out in this report.

**4. ISSUES**

- 4.1 The parking strategy seeks to undertake reviews of parking management in each town on an area wide basis. This is reflected in the zones identified and surveyed in Baldock. The Committee will no doubt be aware that some areas have had parking problems for some time whilst others surveyed have been included on the basis that they have emerging problems or are likely to be affected by displacement if parking management schemes are implemented nearby.
- 4.2 The parking strategy confirms the Council's commitment to prioritising residents' parking needs over non-residents. Policy 19 seeks to secure 50% support for any proposed parking management from those who have responded to consultation.

- 4.3 With regard to the survey work taken at the end of 2010, each zone's responses have been analysed to give the following results:

**Zone 1a – Brewery Lane, Church Street, Farriers Close, Football Close, Icknield Way, Jackson Street, Meetinghouse Lane, Norton Road, Orchard Road and Pond Lane**

- Total responses received 118, total estimated number of properties 200
- Estimated no. of properties with no off street parking 55

- 4.4 Across the whole zone, of the first choices there was 57% support for a permit scheme of some sort with 23% of responses preferring double yellow lines only at junctions/narrow sections of roads and 20% support for do nothing.
- 4.5 For second choices 75% supported a permit scheme, 16% double yellow lines at junctions etc and 9% do nothing. It should be noted that anyone voting for do nothing as first choice is less likely to have a second choice. Numbers of second choices were lower.
- 4.6 The first conclusion to be drawn from the options consultation is that there is majority support for a permit scheme in this zone. The summer survey identified that there is a significant amount of pressure in most streets in the zone from non-residents' parking, especially in those streets where residents have limited off-street parking.
- 4.7 The summer survey suggested that, across the whole zone, the number of long stay non-residents' cars could be as high as 50 spread across the zone and split between rail commuters and town centre employees. Precise non-residential parking numbers are very hard to define given the arrival/departure times of long stay, fluid nature of short stay and residents moving cars within and between streets to park.
- 4.8 Several streets in the zone do not have majority support for permits in line with the overall figures set out in 4.4. Brewery Lane, Farriers Close, Jackson Street, Norton Road and Orchard Road all responded with do nothing and/or double yellow lines only as equal to or slightly higher than the support for a permit scheme.
- 4.9 Jackson Street, Orchard Road and Farriers Close would be in the middle of a permit parking zone so it would not make sense to exclude these streets. To do so would result in non-residents parking in these streets in greater numbers than present and also residents/visitors from adjoining streets parking to avoid the need for permits.
- 4.10 Brewery Lane and Norton Road do not currently have a significant non-resident parking problem. They are on the edges of the zone so could more logically be excluded. Experience suggests that there would almost certainly be displacement of non-residential parking to these streets so their inclusion is recommended.
- 4.11 The options consultation offered several permit parking options, reflecting different times and days of operation and the potential to include some short stay parking across the whole zone or just in Church Street (where there are existing businesses).
- 4.12 Analysis of the support for permits shows that, as a first choice, 42% of respondents preferred a scheme that runs from Monday to Saturday, 8am-6pm, 28% support Monday to Friday 8am-6pm, 20% either of the permit days/hours but with 2 hours limited waiting in whole zone and 9% either of the permit days\hours but with 2 hours limited waiting only in Church Street. As a second choice the figures were 21.5%, 40%, 21.5% and 16% respectively.

- 4.13 More weight should be attached to first choices so a Monday to Saturday scheme is recommended. Some areas of the zone are affected by town centre related parking (employees, shoppers) that may be significant on Saturdays.
- 4.14 As far as short stay limited waiting is concerned, the survey results do not support its inclusion so it is not recommended. If a permit scheme is implemented visitors to the zone will have to use visitor permits and/or visitor ticket books.
- 4.15 Several requests were received for 24 hour permit controls. In particular some residents of Church Street have raised this issue in relation to weekend and night time activities in the town and the potential impact of a re-opened 'George and Dragon' Public House.
- 4.16 The main concern regarding 24 hour operation is that residents in more peripheral streets will be required to display permits through the night even though they are unlikely to have a problem with non-residential parking.
- 4.17 Whilst the concerns of residents is understood re: evenings, it is more likely that residents will be at home and have taken the majority of available parking spaces before evening visitors arrive. This is different to the daytime situation where residents vacate spaces and employees/commuters move in and haven't left before residents return.
- 4.18 There is also all of the on street space in the town centre for evening visitors (i.e. unlike for daytime employees/commuters) which should help keep non-resident numbers relatively low during evenings. It is not recommended that permit controls operate for 24 hours on all days.
- 4.19 With regard to permit eligibility it is recommended that all properties within the zone are eligible for permits. It is also recommended that the handful of residential properties in Sun Street are also eligible for permits.
- 4.20 There are businesses (notably at the north end of Church Street) that almost certainly require short stay parking for customers and maybe longer stay parking for staff (although no consultation responses request on street parking for staff).
- 4.21 Businesses are normally only eligible for a single permit for operational vehicles. In this zone it is recommended that businesses are eligible for one permit for operational vehicles as well as eligible to purchase one visitor permit and visitor ticket books in the same way as residents. This will allow customers of businesses to park on-street if necessary. It is not recommended that businesses' staff are eligible for permits.
- 4.22 Throughout the zone there are locations where yellow line protection will be required, especially at junctions. This is confirmed by the level of support for yellow line restrictions. A permit scheme will include yellow line restrictions alongside permit holder parking space but the precise details will need to be agreed via site visits with Herts Highways and Police. As a general rule those streets that have parking on one side of the road will be retained as parking areas with yellow lines added/extended at junctions/narrow roads. Those streets with parking on both sides will be similarly retained unless widths dictate that parking both sides will be a problem.

- 4.23 **It is recommended that all of the streets included in the Zone 1a consultation have permit parking controls introduced, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm** to remove long stay, non residential parking and prioritise residents parking. Subject to detailed discussion with Herts Highways and the Police, yellow line restrictions at junctions and narrow sections of road should also be introduced.

**Zone 1b – Icknield Way East and Bramley Close**

- Total responses received 33, total estimated number of properties 62
- No. of properties without off street parking – 0 (NB 32 properties with garages in shared area at rear of properties)

- 4.24 In Zone 1b there is no majority support for any single option. As a first choice 31% of responses supported doing nothing, 13% supported a single yellow line commuter ban, 19% supported double yellow lines only at junctions/narrow roads and 38% supported a permit scheme of some type. Second choices were 11%, 22%, 11% and 55% respectively although this was from only 18 responses.
- 4.25 A number (8) of those voting for non-permit options are residents of properties on the south side of Icknield Way East who have considerable off-street parking and probably do not rely on on-street parking or garages elsewhere for themselves or for their visitors.
- 4.26 The width of Icknield Way East is such that most on street parking occurs in laybys or in relatively wider sections leaving a passing width of approximately 3 metres in the very widest parts (i.e. the approximate width, excluding wing mirrors, of a waste disposal vehicle). In Bramley Close parking occurs on bends and in the turning space at the top of the close. The summer survey showed vehicles parked on the footway and too close to the junction with Bramley Close, all on the north side of Icknield Way.
- 4.27 Up to 15 vehicles were observed parked on street in the summer survey. This exceeds the available capacity in laybys and underlines the pressure on narrow sections, the junction with Bramley Close and turning areas.
- 4.28 If parking management was introduced into Zone 1a, directly opposite Icknield Way East, it is inevitable that some displacement of commuter parking will take place. The above information suggests that Icknield Way East and Bramley Close has very limited parking capacity and due to the narrow widths of roads, is very sensitive to the addition of even small numbers of additional long stay parked cars.
- 4.29 The responses received to the options consultation suggest that the majority of views are based on what exists at the moment as opposed to what may happen if parking is displaced from elsewhere.
- 4.30 The Council has, in the past, found it difficult to promote parking management in areas where there is currently not a large parking problem but displaced parking is likely to occur. It is the view of officers that Icknield Way and Bramley Close are extremely vulnerable to displaced long stay commuter parking. There is also concern that any displacement will give rise to safety problems as well as residents' amenity issues due to the narrow widths of roads in this zone.
- 4.31 **It is recommended that the streets included in the Zone 1b consultation have permit parking controls introduced, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm** to remove and protect against displaced long stay, non-residential parking and prioritise residents parking. Subject to detailed site visits with Herts Highways and the Police, yellow line restrictions at junctions and narrow sections of road may also be introduced.

- 4.32 Eligibility for permits should be restricted to residents within the zone although consideration should be given to excluding residents of Laurel Mews (who have residents' only parking on Station Approach as well as garages at the rear) and properties on the south side of Icknield Way (who all have at least 2 off road parking spaces and at least 1 garage).

**Zone 2 – Simpsons Drive, The Twitchell and Thurnall Close**

- Total responses received 36, total estimated number of properties 76
- No. of properties without off street parking – 17 (NB 17 properties with garages in shared area at rear)

- 4.33 The Committee will be aware of the pressures for parking space in this area of Baldock, especially since the implementation of the Town Centre Enhancements. Options consultation was undertaken of this whole zone although comments received in the summer indicated that the requirements of residents of Simpsons Court were different to those of The Twitchell and Thurnall Close.
- 4.34 In Simpsons Drive permit controls were not offered. Instead parking on the south side for disabled badge holders and some short stay 2 hour limited waiting was proposed along with yellow line restrictions. Of the 7 responses received, 0% supported do nothing, 14% supported double yellow lines only at junctions/narrow widths, 86% supported disabled + short stay bays and 0% supported permits. Second choice (4) figures were 25%, 50%, 0% and 25% respectively.
- 4.35 Clear support has been received for the disabled badge holder & 2 hour limited waiting parking along with yellow lines at junctions/narrow sections of road on the south side of Simpsons Drive.
- 4.36 On the north side of Simpsons Drive there is space for up to 8 cars in the unrestricted layby and kerb alongside the Community Centre. The options consultation suggested that these spaces be permit controlled but permits be sold to local businesses. This was suggested as a way to allow some employee on-street parking in Simpsons Drive and to help reduce the amount of displacement.
- 4.37 No clear support was received for this proposal from the options consultation. Perhaps of greater significance was the fact that no significant objections were received either. It is recommended that this proposal is progressed as suggested (i.e. up to 8 permits would be sold for up to 8 spaces only) and local businesses be contacted to establish their interest.
- 4.38 In the Twitchell and Thurnall Close the options consultation results for first choices were 5% do nothing, 38% double yellow lines only at junctions/narrow roads, 57% permit scheme of some type. Second choice (12) results were 8%, 25% and 67% respectively.
- 4.39 Majority support has been received for a permit scheme of some sort although not in such large numbers as may have been anticipated. This is perhaps because of the availability of garages at the rear of properties plus much of the support focussed on inconsiderate parking at junctions/narrow roads (hence support for yellow lines only).
- 4.40 Two permit options were offered in the consultation, Monday to Friday 8am-6pm and Monday to Friday 10am-11am/4pm-5pm. First choice support was 79% for 8am-6pm and 21% for 10am-11am/4pm-5pm. Second choice support was 56% and 44% respectively. There is clear support for the Monday to Friday 8am-6pm permit option.

- 4.41 **It is recommended that in Simpsons Court, on the south side, some parking for disabled badge holders and 2 hour waiting be provided alongside yellow line restrictions at junctions and narrow sections. In Simpsons Drive, on the north side, permit parking for up to 8 spaces be provided and permits sold to businesses along with yellow line restrictions at junctions and narrow sections.**
- 4.42 **In The Twitchell and Thurnall Close it is recommended that a permit scheme is introduced on Monday-Friday between the hours of 8am and 6pm.** Yellow line restrictions should also be introduced at junctions and narrow roads. Consideration could be given to extending the permit days to Saturdays but there was little feedback requesting this from residents.
- 4.43 With regard to permit eligibility in The Twitchell and Thurnall Close, it is recommended that this be limited, initially, to residents of both streets.
- 4.44 There will be displacement of long stay non-residential cars from this area if the above proposals are implemented. It is likely that some long stay parking will be retained in the Twitchell Car Park when charges are introduced (NB 50p up to 3 hours, £1 all day).
- 4.45 There is some residual capacity in the unrestricted parking bays on either side of the south end of High Street. Informal observations of parking in the High Street over the last few months suggests that the 2 hour limited waiting on the east side in front of the Cock pub is often underused plus there is normally spare 2 hour limited waiting capacity elsewhere in High Street.
- 4.46 **It is recommended that the 2 hour limited waiting bay in front of the Cock public house is returned to unrestricted use** to help accommodate some of the displaced long stay parking.
- 4.47 Officers are aware of existing concerns regarding parking at the western end of Mansfield Road. This problem is likely to become more acute if displaced parking uses this area.
- 4.48 **It is recommended that additional yellow line restrictions are implemented at the western end of Mansfield Road in the area between Park Street and High Street.**

### **Zone 3 – The Gardens**

- Total responses received 13, total estimated number of properties 32
- No. of properties without off street parking – 25 (properties with garages in shared area at rear)

- 4.49 In The Gardens the options consultation results for first choices were 15% do nothing, 23% double yellow lines at junctions/narrow roads and 61% permit scheme of some sort. Second choices were 22%, 0% and 78% respectively.
- 4.50 Two permit options were offered, Monday to Friday 8am-6pm and Monday to Friday 10am-11am and 4pm-5pm. Of the first choice respondents 87% supported the Monday to Friday 8am-6pm option, 13% the Monday to Friday 10am-11am and 4pm-5pm option.
- 4.51 **It is recommended that a permit scheme is introduced in The Gardens on Monday-Friday between 8am and 6pm.** In addition yellow line restrictions at junctions should be considered where necessary (i.e. the junction with Hitchin Street).

- 4.52 Access to Cambridge House and Cambridge Mews is achieved via The Gardens. This may also mean that residents of both also park in The Gardens. A resident of Cambridge Mews has confirmed that this is the case for one property. Some residents of The Gardens are also believed to park on land between the Gardens and Cambridge House on land that is not highway.
- 4.53 With regard to permit eligibility for a proposed permit scheme in The Gardens it is recommended that this is limited to those properties whose address is The Gardens. With regard to the property in Cambridge Mews it is recommended that this property is made eligible for one permit in The Gardens. Alternatively this property could be made eligible for the existing permit scheme on Hitchin Street (NB at time of writing two properties in Hitchin Street have purchased permits for this scheme).

**Zone 4 – North Road, Bygrave Road, Salisbury Road and Larkins Close**

- Total responses received 91, total estimated number of properties 180
- No. of properties without off street parking – 20 (Bygrave Road and Salisbury Road), 40 (Larkins Close but properties have shared resident only parking space), 0 (North Road)

- 4.54 This zone was included in the consultation because of concerns about displaced parking from adjoining areas. There was also some concern about existing/emerging non-residential parking problems that the options consultation would help understand.
- 4.55 Across the whole zone first choice support for options was 27% do nothing, 26% double yellow lines at junctions/narrow roads, 6.5% single yellow line/commuter ban and 39.5% for a permit scheme of some sort. Second choice figures were 13%, 19%, 6% and 62% respectively albeit with just over half the numbers of the first choice.
- 4.56 These figures are similar to zone 1b and reflect many respondents views that there isn't currently a significant parking problem. As this is a larger zone there are variations between streets, however.
- 4.57 In Bygrave Road, first choice responses are 6% do nothing, 25% double yellow lines at junctions/narrow roads, 0% single yellow line/commuter ban and 69% for a permit scheme of some sort. This reflects both the limited on street parking space, relative lack of off street parking and views of residents that there is commuter parking.
- 4.58 In Salisbury Road first choice responses are 3.5% do nothing, 50% double yellow lines at junctions/narrow roads, 3.5% single yellow line/commuter ban and 43% for a permit scheme of some sort. These results reflect the fact that many residents have off street parking and that there is limited conflict with non-residents other than at junctions with North Road and Bygrave Road. There is significant minority support for a permit scheme, again reflecting the pressure that is occurring at either end of Salisbury Road.
- 4.59 In North Road respondent numbers are very small (6) and voted equally for do nothing, single yellow line/commuter ban and a permit scheme of some sort. This reflects the fact that all properties on North road have off-street parking but are affected by commuter parking in some way.

- 4.60 In Larkins Close first choice responses are 52% do nothing, 11% double yellow lines at junctions/narrow roads, 5% single yellow line/commuter ban and 33% for a permit scheme of some sort. These results clearly reflect the fact that, currently, there is little or no conflict with regard to parking. As with Salisbury Road there is a slight difference between choices depending on which part of the road residents live in – the end of Larkins Close furthest from North Road is more likely to favour ‘do nothing’.
- 4.61 There are, therefore, localised parking problems in this zone but there is not currently enough of a problem to result in overall majority support for any specific solution across the whole zone.
- 4.62 In Bygrave Road there is support for a permit scheme and it would be the best solution for residents as many do not have off street parking. If a single yellow line commuter ban was implemented (i.e. No Waiting Monday to Saturday 10am-11am and 4pm-5pm) then residents without off-street parking would need to move to adjoining streets.
- 4.63 In Salisbury Road there is majority support for junction protection. This, however, does not assist those residents at the eastern end of Salisbury Road who are competing for road space with others, possibly commuters, possibly residents of Bygrave Road displaced by commuters.
- 4.64 In Larkins Close there is clear support for doing nothing, based on the view (supported by officers’ observations) that there is currently no parking problem in Larkins Close.
- 4.65 Turning to consider a future scenario where commuters have been removed from Zones 1a and 1b, this is likely to displace approximately 30 vehicles (this figure was established before the Baldock Town Centre Enhancements were started and is in line with the overall estimated figure of non-residential long stay parking in both 1a and 1b). Officers consider that Zone 4 is vulnerable to commuter parking displacing due mainly to its close proximity to the Station.
- 4.66 ***It is recommended that, if parking management is introduced to Zones 1a and 1b, a solution should be proposed for Zone 4. The consistent, area wide approach would be to define the whole area as permit parking only. A limited permit scheme could be defined as permit holders only Monday to Friday for one hour per day (11 – 12 midday).***
- 4.67 This means that residents with off street space could park cars off-street without having to buy permits. This would leave the area vulnerable to some non residential parking but will prevent all day rail commuters from parking in this area and would also prevent all day and any morning part time employee parking.
- 4.68 In addition to concerns about displaced commuter parking relocating to this area, experience suggests that any roads left out of a permit parking scheme are also likely to attract parking from residents and visitors in adjoining streets.
- 4.69 Eligibility for permits in this zone should be restricted initially to all residents within the zone. In addition to junctions, yellow line restrictions should be provided on the west side of North Road and just beyond the junction of Salisbury Road with Bygrave Road towards the town boundary.
- 4.70 An alternative to the recommendation at 4.66 would be to go solely with the majority consultation responses for each street. This will mean a different solution in each street and would leave Salisbury Road and Larkins Close vulnerable to displacement.



- 4.71 Should the Committee agree to progress a TRO for a permit scheme for the whole zone and if substantial objections are received to the TRO from a particular street(s) , the TRO could be made 'in part' and implemented only in streets where there is support. The situation could then be monitored for 6 months to see if the excluded street(s) are experiencing significant displacement. If so, the remaining part of the TRO could then be made to add excluded street(s) to the overall management. If displacement hasn't occurred then the remaining part of the 'unmade' TRO will be left to lapse.

#### **Zone 5 – Grosvenor Road and Grosvenor Road West**

- Total responses received 19, total estimated number of properties 43
- No. of properties without off street parking – 0

- 4.72 This zone was also included in the consultation because of concerns about displaced parking that may result from adjoining areas' parking management. The summer survey underlined that there is not currently a significant parking problem.
- 4.73 With regard to the options consultation and first choices, 47% support do nothing, 21% support a single yellow line commuter ban, 5% double yellow lines only at junctions/narrow roads and 26% a permit scheme of some type. For second choices (6) the figures are 17%, 17%, 17% and 50% respectively.
- 4.74 Unlike Zone 4 all properties have off-street parking and there is less pressure from current parking problems. This is reflected in the 47% support for doing nothing.
- 4.75 Similar to Zone 4, however, there is significant *potential for* displacement of rail commuter and possibly town centre employee parking. There is the opportunity to consider a solution that would protect residents' amenity, convenience and safety.
- 4.76 Given the amount of off-street parking **it is recommended that a single yellow line 'commuter ban' restriction (No Waiting Monday to Friday 10am-11am and 4pm-5pm) is introduced to this zone.**
- 4.77 Officers consider that it is very likely that a permit scheme for this area is unlikely to be supported and, if implemented, will result in very low permit take up.
- 4.78 In addition to all of the above zones **it is recommended that a single yellow line Monday to Friday 10am-11am and 4pm-5pm waiting restriction is introduced on both sides of Clothall Road nearest to the traffic signals junction.** This would be to discourage rail commuters from displacing to this section of road.

#### **Other issues**

- 4.79 There was a considerable amount of comment received from each zone. Issues raised and responses to them are set out in the background papers to this report. Some of the issues are considered below.
- 4.80 Related issues were unwillingness to pay for permits, permit price and the potential for NHDC to sell permits to non-residents. Current permit prices are £58 per annum for resident or visitor permits and £7.50 for a book of 10 visitor tickets. These prices are planned to increase to £76 and £10 respectively in 2011.

- 4.81 In terms of value, assuming a permit scheme applies five days a week on every week of the year this means the planned £76 permit price equates to 29p per day. When considered against town centre and station parking charges and that permits will remove long stay non-residential parking, this is considered to be good value.
- 4.82 Several comments received referred to permits being provided free of charge or that they should be provided as part of the Council Tax. The Council has never provided permits free of charge and given that a permit scheme is an optional extra service for certain areas only plus that the Council's finances are increasingly constrained it is not considered appropriate to issue permits free of charge.
- 4.83 With regard to selling permits to non-residents, the Council will give consideration to selling, on a strictly limited basis, permits to non residents where this is not considered to undermine residents' parking needs. Where circumstances do allow sale of permits to non residents it is anticipated that permit prices will be competitive with rail or town centre prices and income would help cover the cost of the permit schemes.
- 4.84 The Committee will recall that there are development proposals in Baldock that may deliver additional parking for town centre employees/users and rail commuters. Tesco have committed to providing an extra 30 spaces for the town centre as part of their plan to extend the store. The status of this scheme is not known re: delivery date.
- 4.85 At the station there is a development proposal that will deliver 30 or so additional parking spaces. The Council is currently considering the detailed design plans for this scheme.
- 4.86 Some consultation comments referred to the need for more station parking and that it should be free. It is possible that additional station parking will be delivered around the same time on street parking management is implemented. The price of station parking is out of the Council's controls but this issue will be raised with the train operator.
- 4.87 Several residents have asked for disabled badge spaces in locations where permit schemes are proposed. Each case will be considered on its merits but it will be possible to provide spaces. Disabled badge holders are able to park anywhere in permit controlled areas without the need to display a permit.
- 4.88 There have been some requests to limit the numbers of permits sold to each property. The *existing* Baldock scheme does limit permits but it is not recommended that the same policy is adopted for the above proposals. All areas being considered are residential and are not intended to share space with town centre uses as per the existing scheme.
- 4.89 Experience from elsewhere suggests that there will be displacement of parking to other unrestricted streets. The above recommendations seek to strike a balance between residents' amenity and offering some alternatives to non-residents, albeit not always within the Council's control. In doing so it is hoped that any displacement that will occur may be less intense than in some existing locations.

## **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The District Council's agreement with Hertfordshire County Council gives the Council powers to create Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) for on-street parking management. All of the recommended proposals in this report will require TROs to be made to introduce parking management.

- 5.2 NHDC will be required to follow regulations on creating TROs including consulting all statutory consultees and considering any objections received. NHDC's approach to the TRO process was recently considered by the Highways Joint Member Panel.

## **6. FINANCIAL AND RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Preparing draft TROs, plans and supporting documents will be prepared in-house. All costs of preparation work and consideration of representations and objections then implementing any subsequent signing and lining will be met from existing revenue budget for the Baldock Area Wide parking review.
- 6.2 There are some potential S106 contributions in Baldock that could be used for some of the proposals and a limited amount of Growth Area Funding if necessary.
- 6.3 A key risk associated with this report is that the proposals are not approved and the process is delayed. Draft TROs are planned to be prepared in March and published in April. Depending on objections received schemes could be implemented in May/June.
- 6.4 The suggestion at para. 4.71 will increase costs for advertising a final TRO in two parts so more detailed consideration of these costs will be needed once TROs have been advertised and comments/objections received.
- 6.5 The main risks associated with the proposals are significant objections to draft TROs which extends the time required to implement them or may result in them being abandoned.
- 6.6 No income from permits or enforcement has been assumed from the above zones in the Council's Corporate Business Planning process.

## **7. HUMAN RESOURCE AND EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The ongoing work on this project will be undertaken from existing staff resources.
- 7.2 The Traffic Regulation Order process requires Notices to be published in the local press. Notices will also be posted on site in the areas affected and draft TROs will be made available to the public in Baldock Library, NHDC Council Offices and NHDC website.
- 7.3 The Council will need to consider the resource implications of administration and enforcement. At this stage it is anticipated that additional enforcement resource will be required depending on the outcome of any TRO process.

## **8. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND MEMBERS**

- 8.1 Informal consultation will be undertaken with Herts Highways and the Police prior to the Committee date. Any changes to the report following this meeting will be reported orally.
- 8.2 The Cabinet Member for Transport has been consulted throughout the process to date. Ward Members will be briefed in detail on the proposals.

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1 The Area Committee endorses the Parking Management recommendations highlighted in this report and instructs the Transport Policy Officer to prepare and publish draft Traffic Regulation Orders at the earliest opportunity.
- 9.2 The Area Committee receives regular updates on progress with the Parking Management proposals from the Transport Policy Officer.

## **10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 10.1 In order to progress the Baldock Parking Management project towards implementation following the significant consultation work undertaken in 2010.

## **11. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 11.1 Several options for each zone were provided in the consultation undertaken in late 2010. This report sets out levels of support for each option in each zone.

## **12. APPENDICES**

- 12.1 Appendix A – Baldock Parking Management Zones and Parking Management Options

## **13. CONTACT OFFICERS**

- 13.1 Simon Young  
Transport Policy Officer  
01462 474846  
[simon.young@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:simon.young@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 13.2 Louise Symes  
Projects Manager  
01462 474359  
[louise.symes@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:louise.symes@north-herts.gov.uk)

## **14. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 14.1 Baldock Parking Management Options consultation results summaries.