

EXECUTIVE DECISION RECORD SHEET

Name of decision maker:	Councillor Julie Laws
Portfolio:	Environment Services & Sustainability
Date of Portfolio Holder Decision:	13 July 2012

Title of Decision:

To advertise and make the Borough of Dacorum (Wood Lane End, Hemel Hempstead) (Restriction of Waiting) Order 2012.

Decision made and reasons:

To advertise and make the Order to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the northwest side of Wood Lane End from a point approximately 8 metres northeast of the centre line of its junction with Whitmores Wood to the western kerb-line of its junction with the access lane to Kiln Cottage. The Order would discourage parking on this section of Wood Lane End which currently results in traffic congestion.

Reports considered: (here reference can be made to specific documents)

Initial consultation on: The Proposed Borough of Dacorum (Wood Lane End, Hemel Hempstead) (Restriction of Waiting) Order 2012.
Dated 6th January 2012.
Formal consultation on: The Proposed Borough of Dacorum (Wood Lane End, Hemel Hempstead) (Restriction of Waiting) Order 2012
Dated 8th June 2012
Reports available from The Parking Centre, contact S Barnes, Parking Policy Lead Officer

Officers/Councillors/Ward Councillors/Stakeholders Consulted:

- Local residents and businesses
- Councillor Andrew Williams - Leader of the council
- Councillor Julie Laws - Portfolio holder
- Councillor Allan Lawson - Ward councillor
- Councillor William Wyatt-Lowe - Ward councillor
- Hertfordshire Passenger Transport Unit
- Land Charges
- Hertfordshire Highways – Area Office
- Hertfordshire Highways – Traffic Order Manager
- Hertfordshire Police – Road Policing Strategy Unit
- Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service
- East of England Ambulance Service
- DBC Parking Operations Manager

EXECUTIVE DECISION RECORD SHEET

Monitoring Officer Comments:

No comments to add to the report.

Chief Financial Officer Comments:

The authorisation follows the completion of the required consultation process. All costs arising from the decision can be met from existing revenue budgets.

Implications:

Should making of the Order not be authorised, inappropriate parking in Wood Lane End will continue.

Risk:

The intention of advertising the Order is to comply with legislation and therefore avoid the risk of non-compliance.

Value for Money:

The on-street parking service is not designed to produce any income, but, in line with government guidelines, to be self financing.

Options Considered and reasons for rejection:

To advertise and make the Traffic Regulation Order.

Not to introduce the proposals and leave inappropriate parking issues unresolved

Portfolio Holders Signature:**Date:****Details of any interests declared and any dispensations given by the Standards Committee:****For Member Support Officer use only**

Date Decision Record Sheet received from portfolio holder: 12/07/12

Date Decision Published: 13/07/12 Decision No: PH/047/12

Date of Expiry of Call-In Period: 20/07/12

Date any Call-In received or decision implemented:

BACKGROUND

Wood Lane End is one of the roads leading into the Maylands Business Park area.

Much of Wood Lane End is subject to waiting restrictions during the day.

EXECUTIVE DECISION RECORD SHEET

A number of banks provide facilities in an area in which a limited number of parking spaces are available.

The road adjacent to this area is not currently subject to any waiting restrictions.

At times of peak demand for these facilities the requirement for parking spaces outstrips the availability and drivers inappropriately park in Wood Lane End which results in a build-up of traffic as the road is not wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic when cars are parked.

An informal consultation with the local residents and businesses was undertaken in December 2011 and early January 2012 to gauge their support for the proposal to introduce a no waiting at any time restriction in the 45.5 metre section of Wood Lane End adjacent to the banking area between Whitmores Wood and Kiln Cottages. There was a 41% response rate, 87% of respondents supported the proposal and 13% of respondents opposed the proposal.

A formal consultation on the proposals was undertaken in May 2012. There was a 33% response rate, 85% of respondents supported the proposal and 15% of respondents opposed the proposal.