

Part 1:

**Technical Summary Note of the all Member and Key Stakeholder
Workshop held on 8 August 2018**

Part 2:

**Summary of comments received at the all Member and Key Stakeholder
Briefing held on 26 November 2018 including further written comments
received to the Revised Parking Strategy working draft.**

Part 1: Technical Note

NHDC Parking Strategy Workshop – 8th August 2018



Project No. 16023

August 2018

Client **NHDC**

Author Joe Colclough (Markides Associates)

Authorised AN

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Markides Associates (MA) held a workshop on behalf of alongside North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC) to obtain feedback concerning a Phase 2 Parking Study draft document containing a review of the Council's parking strategy.
- 1.2 The following key topic areas were covered in the workshop: (Technical Notes summarising these topics were circulated prior to the workshop)
 1. Payment Methods
 2. On Street Parking
 3. Commuter Parking
 4. Employee Parking
- 1.3 Workshop attendees were split into three groups, each led by an MA representative. Discussion was generated around the topics, which were then fed back to the groups as a whole in a summary session. The attendee list is appended.

2. KEY TOPIC AREA SUMMARY

The following section contains the key points around each of the four topics collected during the discussion and at the summary session.

Payment Methods

- 2.1 The Phase 2 draft contains the following recommendations:
 - Retain existing technology
 - Encourage more use of pay by phone/app
 - Monitor development for next equipment refresh
- 2.2 Feedback surrounding these suggestions included:

Payment Method – Main points made in General Session
Pay as you go/Pay on foot is strongly supported as the direction to move towards
Paying on exit could be enforced by ANPR / barriers
The benefit of a reduction in enforcement required was a strong positive (This would enable enforcement officers to be redeployment to other areas)
Any new system was likely to vary a little across the council, as not all car parks are appropriate for the same technology
Support for moving away from cash towards contactless or other forms of payment, but some concerns were raised about implementing a cashless system for payment, particularly for older citizens
Any app or phone technology must be user friendly and be suitable for use for all ages. The technology should support those who park in town centre locations as well as on- street including within CPZ's.
The surcharges that alternative platforms such as RINGO make on top of the parking fee are not popular. The existing RINGO platform that is used by some car parks in NHDC was described as not user friendly by some, others supported and found the platform easy to use. This platform is also used in adjacent districts
Certain car parks e.g. Multi Storey would still require some form of human interaction to increase sense of safety and awareness.
Concerns were raised about DVLA records that couldn't be used to enforce car parking that wasn't on-street

In addition, the following points were also made in individual group discussions.

Payment Method – Other points made in individual groups
Pay on foot principle should be tested on certain car parks, concerns were raised about its impact on turnover. Locations recommended for testing included edge of town centre car parks (Lairage in Hitchin, Garden Square in Letchworth and Royston Town Hall). Through testing, monitoring of occupancy should be collected to give more detail on numbers of free spaces.
Pay and Display doesn't have a future within the NHDC car parks
Frequent and casual car park users must be catered for
Pre-loaded payment cards could be used and topped up

On Street Parking

2.3 The Phase 2 draft contains the following recommendations:

- Recommendations is to trial payment for 'premium' on-street spaces using pay by phone/app
- Suggested locations for trials include core shopping streets with the lowest duration of stay and highest turnover

On Street Parking -Main points made in General Session
Mixed views – some support for charging in 'premium' areas, but 2 of 3 groups didn't want any charging because of the likely impact on the local economy. (Latter would like retention of existing free bays with continued enforcement).
If implemented should be trialled in a variety of areas not just the town centre locations before blanket implementation
Points raised concerning the timing before charging, some support for retaining hour limit with others preferring a shorter 30-minute period
Incentives could be introduced for residents who allow for commuters to use CPZ parking spaces
Payment for on street parking needs to be quick and easy, certain apps seem complex
Fish Hill/Market Place in Royston is confirmed as having some paid on street bay implementation already

In addition, the following points were also made in individual group discussions.

On Street Parking -Other points made in individual groups
General parking behaviour causes conflict and blocks accesses/driveways
Points raised concerning the timing before charging, some support for retaining hour limit with others preferring a shorter 30-minute period
The use of CPZ's across the District is not consistent, with some well used and others with empty streets, there were some views that where streets are empty, sensitive application of paid for parking could be appropriate.
New CPZ's must have clearly defined bays and road markings
Payment for on street parking needs to be quick and easy, certain apps seem complex
Concerns in Hitchin about retailers 'close to the edge' and the negative aspects of paid parking

Commuter Parking

2.4 The Phase 2 draft contains the following recommendations:

- Encourage sustainable modes/liaise with train operators

- Knebworth – needs larger CPZ, but will be costly, burden on residents – suggest some paid on street commuter use to off-set costs
- Encourage commuter use of Woodside in Hitchin, Garden Square in Letchworth Garden City and Town Hall in Royston.

Commuter Parking – Main points made in General Session
Station car park overspill leads to parking conflict More spaces are needed at station car park locations
Land availability to develop new parking areas serving commuters is lacking Network Rail is viewed as in control in terms of station car parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hitchin – discussions were underway with Network Rail, and a new access on the southbound side had potential • Baldock – some opportunities with new development • Letchworth – no potential for new spaces, CPZ expansion may be only solution • It was noted that discussions with NWR on these issues had been ongoing for many years
Need for a survey concerning commuter travel demand to be conducted
Bus companies could introduce more demand led services to stations through key commuter areas
The costs of station car parking is going to rise in the future, impacts on surrounding streets is unknown Some commuters have reached their limit and actively travel further to reduce parking costs
Some potential for a shift to cycling as an access mode.
General support for schemes that would encourage commuter use of underused car parks Concerns raised about the requirement for enough spaces be kept free for such a use

In addition, the following points were also made in individual group discussions.

Commuter Parking – Other points made in individual groups
The design of certain car parks could be improved to increase the number of spaces and ease of access – (case of Royston, with barriers around trees leading to spaces being underused was mentioned)
Baldock has an opportunity for new commuter parking sites due to large future planned development
Park and Ride services were raised as an idea, but concerns were voiced about patronage and economic viability The idea of smaller shuttle type services from certain car parks was raised

Employee Parking

2.5 The Phase 2 draft contains the following recommendations:

- Report recommends permitting BID funding schemes
- BID allocates permits to town centre employees with certain priorities
- Shouldn't undermine sustainable travel choices

Employee Parking - Main points made in General Session
The cost and availability of parking is poor for workers
General support for schemes led and funded by BIDS in appropriate locations
Commuters compete with local employees' and take available spaces early on
Any subsidised system would require bays to be available for staff use Some questioning of subsidy due to the feeling that any subsidy is effectively subsidising the (larger) employers and keeping wages low; however, it was also noted that the BID's were funded by businesses
Car parks could implement opening time restrictions to serve workers rather than commuters
Support raised for discounted season worker season tickets Carnet car park tickets for zero hour and part time workers also raised as an idea
Recruitment issues from lack of parking for workers unknown
Developers need to provide enough parking with new residential and commercial schemes
BID managers in favour, with money from businesses helping their own staff But some BID staff suggesting unlikely cooperation from businesses
Schemes would need to be consistent across the District to avoid complexity, although there were other views that different schemes were needed in different towns, and technology could make these available.
Town centre resident parking should not be forced out by worker schemes
Uniformity in charges raised as an issue and emotive topic that could cause problems Parking is already cheaper than bus travel in all towns other than Hitchin, need to keep balance right so as not to encourage more car travel

In addition, the following points were also made in individual group discussions.

Employee Parking - Other points made in individual groups
GDPR raised as issue for employee parking schemes and any income criterion test

Other general points made

2.6 General points from the discussion around the draft Phase 2 documents also included the following:

- Is the overall strategy revenue or local- economy led?
- Future mode shift is key
- Each town must have unique elements to the strategy and the parking strategy should be integral to the local town centre plans/strategies as they are reviewed
- Electric vehicles and future proofing need to be considered
- Developers need to provide better access to sustainable links and or subsidise improvements to public transport
- S106 contributions should be required and used effectively

Part 2: NHDC Parking Strategy Review – Comments on November 2018 Working Draft.

Organisation, Councillor and Key Stakeholder Comments	NHDC Officer response
Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation	
General	
I think that the Strategy does lack some substance in many areas. It relies on many instances to the Parking Operational Guidelines document, which is not yet in existence. As such it is difficult to understand the implications of the strategy and there is in places there is little to comment on.	The details of how the Council proposes to implement the policy framework on certain policies will be set out the NHDC Parking Operational Guidelines which will also be discussed with Members and key stakeholders. It is the officers view that these guidelines should remain as a separate document which needs to be more flexible and amended more frequently than the existing Strategy in order to reflect and address future parking initiatives and challenges.
There are an awful lot of the use of ‘may’ and ‘will consider’ and no real certainty in places. This makes a clear understanding of the implications of the strategy challenging, but also for an organisation such as the BID and ourselves, difficult to make future plans. We would therefore like to see more substance to this strategy, which can then be tested through consultation.	Experience has been that some flexibility in wording is needed; the Council does not have the resources to deal with all matters reported to it. If there are particular issues where more certainty is required these can be discussed with relevant stakeholders and incorporated, if appropriate, into future action plans
There is a need to encourage alternative modes of transport, which will reduce the need for car parking provision. We are therefore of the view that a separate policy should identify measures to encourage and support public transport, cycling and pedestrians, by ensuring that this is an attractive option for local communities and visitors.	A new objective has been added at paragraph 4.1 (1). relating to the need to balance parking with sustainable travel objectives.
Background section	
In this text we welcome the reference to the economic downturn and the role that parking plays in support of town centres. We would however like to see greater emphasis on the impact that out of town centres have on town centres. This is particularly in Letchworth, where out of town centres gain popularity with retailers, investors and subsequently customers due in part to their provision of free convenient car	Some text added to this section at paragraph 2.4, which acknowledges competition from free parking in out of town retail centres.

parking. We are now faced with the town centres having a poorer retail offer than for example Stevenage and Biggleswade retail parks, which also have better and free car parking facilities.	
Policies	
Policy 1 – Management and resources	
In addition to the policy text, it would be good to see something along the lines of: <i>The Council will help support the vibrancy and viability of town centres by a proactive approach to car parking provision and charging regimes, to ensure that town centres remain competitive.</i>	Noted, Text added to Objective 1 in para 4.1 to reference helping to support the vitality of town centres. Reference to town centres is also covered under paragraph 2.2 and 6.9 in the draft Strategy.
Policy 3 – Physical Improvements & Maintenance of Car Parks	
We request that a programme of improvements is linked to this policy.	Reference to investigating physical improvements to the council multi-story car parks is included as a key project in the Strategic Action Plan within the short term (i.e. in 1 to 3 years following adoption of the Strategy). More detail would be provided in due course following the initial investigation which would be subject to available funding (including third party funding) and discussion with town centre management and relevant stakeholders.
Policy 6 – Charging for Evenings, Sundays & Bank Holidays	
We would strongly object to any charging during these periods. We have invested a significant amount in trying to create and support an economy and activity during the evenings and weekends in the leisure sector, such as in the cinema, theatre, studio & gallery and by encouraging food and drink facilities by way of a proactive approach to lettings. This part of the local economy is still establishing itself, would be harmed by the imposition of further charges and be counter-productive at a number of levels. We would therefore object to this being introduced in Letchworth town centre.	Noted; officers are of the view that the policy remains appropriate given the life of the Strategy, in that it proposes to review these issues in consultation with relevant Members and key stakeholders.
Policy 9 – Charging for on-street parking	
One of the strengths of Letchworth Town Centre is its provision of local services, such as banks and building societies. This relies on free short term parking and again the imposition of charging for on street parking would be harmful to the	Noted; Officers are of the view that the policy is appropriate in that it refers to careful consideration on a case by case basis and in consultation with relevant Members and key stakeholders

strength of the town centre.	
Furthermore, having invested in excess of £9 million into the public realm of the town centre, which included a de-cluttering of the street, we would be concerned about physical additions to the street scene that would be required for charging to take place.	Noted; careful consideration would be taken into consideration in terms of impacting on the street scene, however any signage would need to be provided in accordance with the DfT regulations.
Members and Key Stakeholder Meeting 26th November 2018	
Objectives 2 and 3 refer to on- and off-street parking separately, suggest amendment to reflect the interaction between the two and potentially with a general transport policy objective.	Agreed at meeting on 26 November; a new objective has been added at paragraph 4.1 (1) reflecting the need to manage both on- and off-street parking to meet policy objectives.
Add objective relating to sustainable transport/mode shift and balance between this and other objectives	Agreed at meeting on 26 November; a new objective has been added at paragraph 4.1 (1) reflecting the need to manage both on- and off-street parking to meet policy objectives whilst recognising sustainable travel modes and the vitality of town centres as well.
Too much hinges on the operational guidelines	Noted; the adoption of operational guidelines means that it is possible to react quickly to changes in circumstances, this is considered important given the proposed 12 year life of the strategy. The guidelines are intended to set out clear processes by which Members can raise local issues with officers.
Commuter parking should also consider town centre employees parking in residential streets	Clarification text added at paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2. The controlled parking measures relate also to town centre employee parking issues. However, the commuter parking policy, Policy 18, deals specifically with railway station parking.
It is important for the strategy to manage expectations as in some neighbourhoods satisfactory solutions may not be met.	Clarification text to manage expectations has been added in the 'Introduction' at paragraph 1.4 and also under the section on 'Controlled Parking' at paragraph 7.13.
The strategy needs to state explicitly that NHDC will seek to work with external parties (Heritage Foundation, Network Rail)	Clarification text added as a footnote in introduction at paragraph 1.7 and also at paragraph 6.5 in terms of the strategy reviewing parking capacity.
Strategy not clear on what is meant by making provision for more off-street parking. Does this mean new parking areas? This relates to reviewing the use of existing car parks and their capacity. Text to explain this intention more clearly.	Clarification text added at paragraph 6.3.

Definition of “under-utilised” not clear in policy text.	Noted; new footnote number (11) added to paragraph 6.8 for clarity.
If introducing charged parking bays on street, these shouldn’t remove cycle lanes	Clarification text added at end of paragraph 7.24 about not conflicting with other objectives.
Point raised about being ‘fair and equitable amongst towns’ whilst recognising each town is different	Noted; the existing introductory text at paragraph 6.17 sets the rationale for differential pricing between and within town centres.
HCC should also be consulted on the Strategy	HCC have been consulted on the draft Strategy see comments below.
Action plan Need to be clear about length of reviews for towns. It would be helpful to add dates to action plan for everything, which should be realistic and linked to available resources.	Specific action plans for the towns will be prepared in due course, which will include more detail on the dates and durations of parking reviews for the towns.
Action Plan - • Need clear objectives for pay on foot trial.	Clarification text has been added to this action at PS3.
Consideration of town centre uses and their location should be taken into account.	Noted
Need consistency of regulation, don’t mix parking restrictions in same street	The Strategy acknowledges the general principle of making on-street parking as easy to understand as possible. Officers are currently reviewing existing provisions of on street parking restrictions within the town centres
Have some permit areas been ‘over-sold? May want to consider the number of permits issued at the outset.	Noted; the Operational Guidelines will cover the topic of the number of permits issued.
Not clear how the high level action plan will relate to the towns and other areas like Knebworth.	Specific action plans for the towns will be prepared in due course. This forms part of Action PS2 in the Strategic Action Plan.
Royston Town Council	
Against bringing in a parking fee for evenings, Sundays and Bank Holidays, as it is felt that this would have an adverse effect on the restaurant trade of the town, and would stop people from outside the town using the TC facilities. It is felt that this would affect the businesses, and their trade, as a result some may well close down.	Noted; officers are of the view that given the life of the strategy the policy remains appropriate, in that it proposes to review these issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders.
NHDC should, with the County Council, look at Melbourn Street. • There are road improvements in the	Noted; these are specific non strategic issues that will be picked up at a later stage.

<p>pipeline for Kneesworth Street, but what is the point if the traffic speeds up in one road, only to hit congestion when it gets 100 yards round the corner in Melbourn Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bay should be installed outside the Manor House where the footpath is wider again for HGV use only. The rest of the road should then have double yellow lines that are enforced. • With the current problems on Melbourn Street, bus routes get held up, and so too emergency vehicles. In the rush hours, traffic has been backed up to Priory Lane, and even back on the A10 up London Road, as a direct result of HGVs doing deliveries in Melbourn Street. 	
<p>It is felt that at the Cross the parking spaces on the bend joining the High Street to Upper King Street should be removed, the footpath pushed back, and a parking bay installed for HGVs to deliver. The flower shop and Domino's Pizza are the two main companies that come to mind in this connection.</p>	<p>Noted; these are specific non strategic issues that will be picked up at a later stage.</p>
<p>It is felt that the new estates planned for Royston will add to congestion, as will the vast amount of building being planned for South Cambridgeshire, and currently taking place. One must not forget the expansion of Cambourn, the development planned for Bourne Airfield, Northstow and Waterbeach which alone adds up to 1 new town.</p>	<p>Noted; the Council's Transport Strategy prepared to support the submission Local Plan and the Vehicle Parking Standards SPD will provide the necessary policy guidance for development and management of on-street parking issues.</p>
<p>Modern technology should be installed at The Town Hall and Warren car Parks, where it is possible to use a contactless card to be used for payment, but also allow people who wish to pay by cash to do so. The use of top-up cards could be used for people without contactless cards.</p>	<p>Noted; Policy 4 – 'Off Street Parking Management System' refers to the introduction of parking management systems and payment mechanisms on a case by case basis. An additional paragraph has been included at 6.16 which refer to the potential for cashless payments in the Council off-street car parks.</p>
<p>Smaller car parks in the town centre should remain the same as they are now, unless it is possible to pay in advance by card. It was also felt that a new half hour spot should be introduced for say 40p as against the 70p currently charged for one hour's parking. Our thinking on this is people may only wish to pop into one or two shops, or their bank, yet have to pay for an hour, when they may only need half that time.</p>	<p>Policy 5: 'Off –Street Car Park Tariff Reviews' – recognises that the patterns of parking demand vary between the towns and between car parks. The operational guidelines will provide the criteria for undertaking tariff reviews, which will include monitoring the usage of its car parks and undertake discussions with the town centre managers and relevant organisations to understand the impact of proposed tariff changes, including those put forward by other organisations .</p>

Councillor Responses	
Joint Response from County Cllr Hill and Cllr Hunter and endorsement as Chairman Royston and District Committee.	
<p>The Draft Parking Strategy looks positive, but just to reinforce a few points below It is vital that the points in 6.3 remain in the Strategy, in order to recognise the differences that exist between and in various towns.</p> <p>Fully support the principles of 6.8, particularly bullet point 1.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – this is now Paragraph 6.4 in the final draft</p> <p>Noted – this is now paragraph 6.9 in the final draft.</p>
<p><u>Policy 6 - Charging for Evenings, Sundays and Bank Holidays.</u></p> <p>This could be counter productive and cause further On Street parking issues, particularly in residential areas. It is unlikely to raise significant revenue. In Royston, it is likely that more vehicles will park on the residential roads, causing an even greater problem than already exists. Baldock only has one Council car park and in Letchworth vehicles are likely to park on the streets, or in one of the many cheaper car parks.</p>	<p>Noted; officers are of the view that given the life of the strategy the policy remains appropriate, in that it proposes to review these issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p>There are references in the Strategy, specifically in <u>Policies 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19 and 21</u> to "relevant stakeholders". This needs clarifying to state the stakeholders (for example, Hertfordshire County Council, Area Committees, the Police, Royston Town Council, Town Managers, Royston First, the BIDS, Chambers of Commerce and others).</p>	<p>Noted; reference to 'relevant stakeholders' has been set out at paragraph 1.6 in the Strategy, which includes the examples as suggested.</p>
<p>The Royston and Letchworth Parking Reviews need to be completed imminently. However, it should be recognised that, as future development takes place across the district, there will be ongoing and new parking issues and these should be addressed as the needs arise.</p> <p>It is important to liaise with Hertfordshire County Council, Highways England and the Police, together with other councils, including cross border.</p>	<p>Noted. The Strategic Action Plan lists the completion of the Letchworth and Royston Parking reviews as key projects (Action PS7) within the short-term, i.e. 1 to 3 years following adoption of the Strategy.</p> <p>Policy 24: 'Parking at New Development and Existing Controlled Parking Zones' recognises the need to review the current Parking Standards at New Development SPD to reflect changing development pressures and demand for parking in new developments and surrounding streets. It is also acknowledged that the parking strategy and its action plans should be kept under review during the 12 year period as technological and transport patterns change over time and development pressures</p>

	need to addressed.
Cllr Brown and Cllr Nash	
I am concerned that para 6.32 Charging for on-street parking does not reflect the general consensus of members' discussions during the Parking Strategy workshop held in November. Although I understand the logic for charging a premium for parking which has the highest demand, in practice charging for very short stay on street parking will prevent people from popping in to use local shops and facilities at a time when we need to do all we can to encourage town centre shopping.	Noted; (now paragraph 6.34 in final draft) - officers are of the view that Policy 9: 'Charging for On-street Parking' remains appropriate, in that it proposes to review these issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders. The operational guidelines will provide the criteria for considering and introducing on-street charging.
Hertfordshire County Council Comments	
General	
Hertfordshire County Council draw attention to the fact that we have recently adopted Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4). This document sets out the long-term transport strategy for the County to accommodate the levels of housing and employment growth being identified by the District Councils in their emerging Local Plans. LTP4 provides a framework to guide all our future transport planning and investment. It highlights both existing and future transport problems and issues and identifies ways we can deal with them. LTP4 accelerates the transition from a previous transport strategy that was largely car based to a more balanced approach which caters for all forms of transport and seeks to encourage a switch from the private car to sustainable transport (e.g. walking, cycling and passenger transport) wherever possible. The principles of this document should be considered in the strategy.	Noted; LTP 4 is referenced in the 'Policy context' section of the Strategy at Section 3 and also under the 'Policy Framework' where considered relevant. .
HCC welcomes the Strategy and its overall vision and objective and is encouraged that there is a commitment to cycling and walking in the major town which is set out in the Strategy's principles in section 6.8	Noted.

Background to the Strategy	
Para 2.1 - Querying wording choice - not sure how parking availability contributes towards the attractiveness of an area.	Noted; text at paragraph 2.1 amended for clarity, and refers to how the design and layout of parking can affect the quality of place of residential areas.
Para 2.2 - The key aspects of parking management are not well represented in the policies – this needs to be better incorporated.	No examples were given by HCC with regard this comment, officers and the executive member have reviewed the strategy and are of the view that the three key elements described are appropriate and are reflected in the Strategy 'Objectives' and through the 'Policy framework'.
Policy context	
Para 3.4 - Hertfordshire County Council are developing the North Central Growth and Transport Plan which will replace the Urban Transport Plan	Noted; text amended for clarity – now refers to the emerging North Central Hertfordshire Growth Transport Plan.
Objectives to the Strategy	
Parking Strategy Objectives – these need further work Objective 1 refers to striking a balance between different demands for parking, but it is also about balancing demand with a need to enable more active travel as per Section 2.2 Objective 3 requires similar context as above and balanced against section 2.2	A new objective has been added at paragraph 4.1 (1) relating to the need to balance parking with sustainable travel objectives. Officers believe this is now covered in objective 1.
Policies	
Para 6.25 - Does commuter parking fall under Long stay	Yes, added to 4 th bullet for clarity (now paragraph 6.27 in final draft)
Para 6.26 - Need further understanding into what the demand is. There should be an approach similar to Policy 1 of LTP4 which seeks to satisfy demand through a hierarchical approach focussed on enabling more sustainable travel with creation of car parking spaces being the last resort.	(Para 6.25 is now paragraph 6.28 in final draft) Noted; it is important to ensure the vitality of the town centres and therefore a careful balance needs to be struck between making provision for on-street parking together with encouraging more sustainable modes of travel over time. Policy 8 – 'On Street Parking Provision' and paragraph 6.29 have been amended to include reference to sustainable travel.

<p><u>Policy 2 – off-street car park capacity in town centres</u> Should not undermine efforts to promote sustainable transport. This can be managed through supply and pricing mechanisms.</p>	<p>Noted, the policy already contains text referring to the need to consider the needs of sustainable transport. Reference to LTP 4 is added to the 2nd bullet point at paragraph 6.9 which lists a set of principles that the Council will consider when making provision for town centre parking.</p>
<p><u>Policy 8 – on-street parking provision</u> Should be managed in a way which does not undermine use of sustainable modes. Management and enforcement should be targeted to ensure that efficient operation of bus services can be achieved and can be used as a tool to support bus priority.</p>	<p>Noted; text added to Policy 8 reflecting the objectives in Policy 2 including sustainable travel Text also added within Policy 8 relating to the needs of bus operations.</p>
<p><u>Policy 9 – Charging for On-Street Parking</u> Para 6.28 is correct but the paragraphs following this seem to create some ambiguity about how the issue will be addressed. The Policy and supporting text does not commit to how, when and where changes will be applied. Retaining any free bays in town centre will continue to encourage people to drive into the centre to look for a free space. However, agree that there should be charging for on street parking close to town centres.</p>	<p>Noted. (Paragraph 6.28 is now paragraph 6.30 in the final draft) The detail of how this is proposed to be achieved will be set out in the Parking Operational Guidelines. Officers are of the view that that an incremental process is required to ensure stakeholder support on this issue.</p>
<p><u>Policy 13 – powered two-wheeler and bicycle parking</u> Generous provision should be made for secure, short and long-term cycle and powered two-wheeler parking to promote sustainable modes of travel.</p>	<p>Noted; text added to the end of paragraph 6.40 making reference to the need for additional cycle parking. Reference also made within Policy 13 to ‘..and/or new development proposals..’ as also being an appropriate mechanism for making provision for cycle parking. For consistency text has also been added to paragraph 8.1 under Policy 24 which refers to Parking at New development SPD..</p>
<p><u>Policy 15 – bus, coach, HGV and caravan /trailer parking</u> Bus and coach operators should be consulted in the preparation of plans for bus and coach parking.</p>	<p>Noted; added to paragraph 6.44 for clarity.</p>
<p><u>Policy 16- electric vehicle charging in town centres,</u> Charging in town centres needs further</p>	<p>Noted, text added to Policy 16 and to paragraph 6.46</p>

<p>work/understanding as this cannot be delivered without HCC agreement.</p>	<p>referencing HCC.</p>
<p><u>Policy 17 – employee parking schemes</u> Should support and not undermine delivery of sustainable travel. This needs to be considered and be in line with HCC travel plan guidance.</p>	<p>Noted; paragraph 6.48 refers to the Parking Operational Guidelines which will set out the criteria for consideration of this issue including comparison with local bus fares.</p>
<p><u>Policy 18 – commuter parking</u> Agree with the majority of the principle outlined but this will need to be reviewed on a case by case basis. Para 7.3 – the last point contradicts encouraging sustainable journeys to the station, it should not undermine delivery of sustainable travel.</p>	<p>Noted. (paragraph 7.3 is now paragraph 7.4 in the final draft). New text has been added to the beginning of paragraph 7.4 to remove perceived ambiguity taking into consideration the needs for sustainable transport. .</p>
<p><u>Policy 19 – identifying on-street parking problem areas and potential solutions</u> <u>Policy 20 – small-scale parking improvements</u> Opportunities should be taken to tackle problem parking which would alleviate the flow of bus services, in support of the emerging Intalink Bus Strategy</p>	<p>Noted; added ‘or public transport operations’ to policy 20 and ‘.. bus operations..’ in the supporting text at paragraph 7.8 under Policy 19.</p>
<p><u>Policy 23 – Sale of Permits to Non-residents in Controlled Parking Zones</u> Further discussions need to be had with HCC to understand these proposals as the information within this policy is too vague to determine if acceptable or not. This policy undermines the efforts to promote sustainable transport as per LTP4.</p>	<p>Noted, reference to HCC is added to Policy 23 to ensure HCC views are taken into account.</p>
<p><u>Policy 24 – parking at new developments and existing controlled parking zones</u> Should support and not undermine delivery of sustainable travel through travel plans, in line with county council travel plan guidance. HCC agrees that in a vast majority of cases new development should not lead to additional demand to park in surrounding roads. However, in certain circumstances smaller development proposals, such as house extensions and in fill</p>	<p>Noted; sustainable transport will be considered as part of any review of the Parking SPD. Text added to the end of paragraph 8.3 setting out how the Council may address parking at new developments in residential areas outside town centres where there is a high dependency of on-street parking, taking into consideration sustainable modes of travel.</p>

<p>arrangements, may not be in a position to provide sufficient off-street parking. In theory this will lead to additional pressure to park on-street. In some situations, this may be acceptable. Where availability of on-street parking is limited we support a policy that resists further development or effectively removes the option to park by preventing future residents from applying for CPZ permits. Insufficient on-street parking often leads to obstructive or nuisance parking. HCC's emerging parking design guidance includes industry standard methods of establishing on-street parking capacity which in some cases may help by providing an objective assessment of parking pressure.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 25 – electric vehicle charging in new development and on-street</u> Hertfordshire County Council supports the principle of electric charging points, however our advice on type/purpose of infrastructure and suitability of locations needs to be reviewed in line with HCC's current position.</p> <p>In addition, the strategy would benefit from reference to electric bikes. Electric bikes are growing in popularity. The project http://cycleboom.org may have some useful information. The strategy should consider and set a basis for planning infrastructure to support use of electric bikes (including in new developments, workplaces, and public facilities/hubs). Charging facilities should also be available for the electric bikes.</p>	<p>Noted; reference to HCC is added to Policy 25 to ensure HCC views are taken into account.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 amended to include reference to other forms of sustainable transport such as electric bikes.</p>