

**NOTE OF THE PARKING PROVISION AND MANAGEMENT DISCUSSION FORUM
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY 2013 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
THE CIVIC CENTRE, 161 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED**

Attendees

1. Those attending were:

Cllr Ian Reay (Chair)
David Carter (Resident representative)
Kerry Bangle(Resident representative)
Clive Birch(Resident representative)
Ian Stephenson (Resident representative)
Allen Green (Resident representative)
Ivor Eisenstadt (MGP Ltd)
Peter Nicholls (Berkhamsted School)
Cllr Laurence Handy
Cllr Tom Ritchie

Gary Cox (Town Clerk)

Apologies

2. Apologies had been received from Jerry Wright and Cllrs Laws and D Collins.

Minutes

3. Minutes of the meeting on 28 November 2012 were considered for points of accuracy only and would be agreed at the next,, rather than this additional meeting. Cllr Handy asked that the minutes (para 18, last bullet) clarify who was responsible for parking enforcement.

Commuter Ban Zone – Revised Proposals

4. Cllr Reay summarised the Town Council decision to abandon the Residents Parking Zones proposals, but to re-examine the extent of any possible Commuter Ban to address concerns about the impact of displaced cars.
5. In discussion, it was recognised that the aims of the proposed ban would be for commuters to park in the railway station car park and to reduce parking inconvenience to local residents.
6. Further work and comparison of work to assess the amount of displacement suggested that there were approximately 70 commuter cars likely to be displaced. Based on a survey by Clive Birch, the numbers were itemised approximately as follows:

New Road	30
Murray Road	10
Bridgwater Road	20
Delahay Rise	6
Trevelyan Way	0
Gaveston Drive	0
Total	66

7. Revised proposals to remove Delahay Rise and New Road from the commuter ban would reduce by half the number of displaced cars to around 30.

8. A presentation on parking patterns in the area suggested that the main problems caused by commuter parking were because of bad and inconsiderate parking. This was mainly affecting the lower end of Murray Road.
9. There were also some fundamental road safety issues caused by cars parking too close to and directly opposite to junctions – where existing double yellow lines were inadequate, and across resident driveways, where single white lines would prevent inconsiderate parking. By the same token, it was also recognised that most residents had driveways; but residents were more likely to park on the street than use their driveway, reducing parking available for others.
10. In looking at ways of reducing further the number of displaced commuter cars, a revised proposal was to also remove Bridgewater Road from the commuter ban proposals: some consultation responses suggested that parking in Bridgewater Road served to reduce speeding along the road; .
11. A further proposal, which needed clarification on whether part roads could be removed from a scheme without re-consultation, would be to remove part of Gaveston Drive from proposals.
12. In discussion, the potential effects of the commuter ban were considered. It was recognised that the reasons for commuter parking in the area were based on avoiding the cost of parking in station and other car parks. The location of commuter parking was mostly determined by finding the nearest possible location to the station. It was suggested that there would be a maximum distance a commuter would walk from a parked car to the station, beyond which they would look to park elsewhere, but there was no agreement as to what this distance was.
13. Some expressed concern that there was no detailed evidence available to indicate the journeys made by commuters to park in the area or how the proposed ban would change that journey or where they would then park when the ban was introduced
14. It might be that some commuters opt to drive to other stations to start their train journey; they might chose to pay to park in the railway station. Depending on maximum distance, it was recognised that a possible effect might be for displaced cars to look to park nearer Bridgewater School. This was soon to become a primary school and have younger pupils, more likely to arrive by car. Against that, the catchment area for the primary school was likely to be smaller and that may reduce the number of school car journeys.
15. Commuters may also look to park in other parts of the town, which were already overcrowded with parked cars and they would add to what was already and overcrowded parking environment, well in excess of the current parking problems faced in the proposed commuter ban area.
16. If the revised proposals were to be introduced, it was suggested that they might either be introduced for a trial period, to understand better the impact of the ban and where displaced cars would then seek to park. This pilot would determine the viability, of the commuter ban and the effect on other parts of the town.
17. In discussion, it was also suggested that the commuter ban proposals be deferred and introduced when the Parking Forum had agreed other measures to be introduced that would address parking issues in other parts of the town and help alleviate the impact of any displaced cars from the commuter ban then parking in those areas.
18. The revised commuter ban proposal – to remove Delahay Rise, New Road and Bridgewater Road from the commuter ban, and subject to advice, also to remove part of Gaveston Drive, would be proposed at the Town Council's Transport and Environment and Full Council committee meetings on 21 January 2013.

Way Forward on an integrated parking plan

19. It was agreed that the next Discussion Forum Meeting would be held at 7.45pm on Monday 11 February 2013. The intention would be to use the meeting to develop a parking action plan.
20. A draft agenda for that meeting was considered. An amended version is below. The following points were raised in discussion.
21. The meeting would consider whether to respond to the Berkhamsted and Northchurch Urban Transport Plan which will be consulted on between the 21st January and the 1st March. It will be available on the Herts County Council website.
22. The Town Clerk was asked to provide an update of **available s106 funding for transport and parking improvements**.
23. **David and Kerry would provide Gary with the list of proposals** they have developed so far, to add to a collated list ready for the meeting.
24. The draft agenda is:
 - Apologies
 - Minutes of last meetings
 - Urban Transport Plan Consultation – developing a response
 - Feedback on Commuter Ban proposals from T&E and Full Council
 - Developing an integrated parking plan
 - Proposals made so far, including to create additional spaces in other areas of the town
 - Suggestions from consultation feedback
 - Stocktake on Progress
 - Next Steps discussion on arrangements needed to develop and deliver a parking action plan
 - Evidence gathering requirements
 - Developing the plan
 - Approach to delivery
 - Roles and responsibilities
 - Governance and Membership
 - Funding and available S106 funding
 - Any other Business
 - Date of Next Meeting

Any Other Business

25. There was no other business.