

## Town Centres On Street Order Response summary

The below summaries the responses associated with the Town Centres On Street Order consultation which took place between 10<sup>th</sup> July 2024 & 31<sup>st</sup> July 2024.

A total of 372 responses to the proposals were received. Of these responses, two stated no objection to the proposals.

The number of objections received at each location are summarised below:

| Location                     | Number of Objections |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Apsley                       | 8                    |
| Berkhamsted                  | 35                   |
| High Street, Hemel Hempstead | 48                   |
| Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead    | 1                    |
| Kings Langley                | 232                  |
| Tring                        | 26                   |
| Not Specified                | 22                   |
| Total                        | 372                  |

### Apsley:

A total of 8 objections to the proposals were made in Apsley. The objections stated that the proposed changes will have an impact on businesses. The objections centered around the proposed restrictions not giving shoppers sufficient time to shop in the businesses adjacent to the restrictions which will cause businesses to close, as a result of lower footfall. Several of these representations also stated objections to introducing charging to these locations, which is not proposed and therefore is incorrect and these elements of the objections can be considered invalid.

### Berkhamsted:

A total of 35 objections to the proposals were raised in Berkhamsted. The themes of the objections are summarised below:

| Key Theme                    | Number of Objections |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Changes will impact business | 16                   |
| Cost                         | 7                    |
| Inconvenience                | 7                    |
| Parking Migration            | 5                    |

16 objections were received which stated that the proposed changes will have an impact on businesses. The objections centered around costs already being too high and that further increasing costs will drive people away from shopping in the town to out of town/online locations, as the price rises are unaffordable. Responses also referred to the proposed restrictions not giving shoppers sufficient time to shop in the businesses. It is stated that these proposals will cause businesses to close as a result of lower footfall.

Seven objections were received regarding cost, stating that the price rises were unacceptable, unaffordable and not in line with inflation. Objectors also stated that the council had forgotten there is a cost-of-living crisis and that it should be doing more to help people, rather than hinder them further.

Seven objections were received regarding the inconvenience caused by the proposals. The objections centered around the spaces opposite the bottom of Highfield Road. The objectors stated that these are a considerable distance on foot from the town centre and, if the time allowed for parking is reduced to 30 minutes (from 1 hour as currently), very little time will be available to shop once the time for walking to and from the shops is taken into account. They state the proposal will make these bays virtually useless for anybody actually using the shops. Objections were also received regarding the inclusion of Sunday into the restricted hours for these bays, as it will prevent churchgoers from attending services at the nearby Baptist Church which last longer than the permitted time allows for. They request that Sunday be removed from the restricted hours here. Comments were also made regarding disruption caused to traffic flow from vehicles turnover within the bays and the inconvenience this causes.

Five objections were raised regarding the potential for parking migration into nearby unrestricted/less restricted roads. Objectors stated that the proposals would cause vehicles to migrate into nearby roads to find longer stay parking and cause further issues for residents of these streets to find parking near to their home. Some comments stated these changes could not be introduced without a permit parking scheme in parallel to combat parking migration.

### **High Street, Hemel Hempstead:**

A total of 47 objections to the proposals were made to the proposal on High Street, Hemel Hempstead. The themes of the objections are summarised below:

| <b>Key Theme</b>             | <b>Number of Objections</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Changes will impact business | 46                          |
| Should be pedestrianised     | 1                           |

46 objections were received which stated that the proposed changes will have an impact on businesses operating from the High Street. The objections centered around the proposed restrictions not giving shoppers sufficient time to shop in the businesses adjacent to the restrictions which will cause businesses to close, as a result of lower footfall. Several of these representations also stated objections to introducing charging to these locations, which is not proposed and therefore is incorrect and these elements of the objections can be considered invalid.

One objection was received stating that instead of changing parking restrictions, the High Street should be pedestrianised so that it is safer and more attractive for all users.

### **Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead:**

One objection to the proposals on Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead was raised. The objection was from a resident of Marlowes who stated an objection to the restricted hours being introduced on a Sunday. They request that the Sunday hours are removed so that they can continue to park there on a Sunday, as it has a significant impact on the care they give family members. They requested permits for them to park in this bay.

### Kings Langley:

A total of 232 objections to the proposals were raised to the proposal at Kings Langley. The themes of the objections are summarised below:

| Key Theme                    | Number of Objections |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Changes will impact business | 223                  |
| Cost                         | 3                    |
| Inconvenience                | 5                    |
| Parking Migration            | 1                    |

223 objections were received which stated that the proposed changes will have an impact on businesses. The objections centered around introducing charging which would drive people away from shopping in the town to out of town/online locations, as the prices are unaffordable and too high. Responses also referred to the proposed limited waiting restrictions not giving shoppers sufficient time to shop in the businesses, as they do not allow for longer stay parking. It is stated that these proposals will cause businesses to close as a result of lower footfall.

Three objections were received regarding the costs of the restrictions, stating that the price rises were unacceptable, unaffordable and not in line with inflation. Objectors also stated that the council had forgotten there is a cost-of-living crisis and that it should be doing more to help people than hinder them further. They stated Kings Langley was unique and should be treated differently to other locations within the borough given it is full of independent shops.

Five objections were received regarding the inconvenience the restrictions would cause for visitors to Kings Langley and residents. Residents questioned where they would be able to park given the introduction of restrictions on Sunday. Comments were also made regarding disruption caused to traffic flow from vehicles turnover within the bays and the inconvenience this causes.

One objection was raised regarding the potential for parking migration into nearby unrestricted/less restricted roads. The objector stated that the proposals would cause vehicles to migrate into nearby roads to find longer stay parking and cause further issues for residents of these streets to find parking near to their home. The objection also stated these changes could not be introduced without a permit parking scheme in parallel to combat parking migration and this was a negative for the village.

Whilst this cannot be considered as part of this formal process, it is also worth noting that a petition with 3,840 signatures has been delivered to Dacorum Borough Council relating to the parking proposals in Kings Langley.

### Tring:

A total of 26 objections to the proposals were made to the proposal at Tring. The themes of the objections are summarised below:

| Key Theme                    | Number of Objections |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Changes will impact business | 20                   |
| Cost                         | 5                    |
| Parking Migration            | 1                    |

20 objections were received which stated that the proposed changes will have an impact on businesses. The objections centered around introducing charging driving people away from shopping in the town to out of town/online locations, as the prices are unaffordable and too high. It is stated that these proposals will cause businesses to close as a result of lower footfall.

Five objections were received regarding the costs of the restrictions, stating that the price rises were unacceptable and unaffordable and not in line with inflation. Objectors also stated that the council had forgotten there is a cost-of-living crisis and that it should be doing more to help people than hinder them further. They stated the current situation worked well and ensured a turnover of vehicles already and the proposal is just a money-making scheme.

One objection was raised regarding the potential for parking migration into nearby unrestricted/less restricted roads. The objector stated that the proposals would cause vehicles to migrate into nearby roads to find longer stay parking and cause further issues for residents of these streets to find parking near to their home.

**Location not specified:**

A total of 23 objections to the proposals were made to the proposals but could not be specified to a specified location. The number of responses by the theme of the objections are summarised below:

| Key Theme                    | Number of Objections |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Changes will impact business | 1                    |
| Cost                         | 1                    |
| Inconvenience                | 17                   |
| Consultation process         | 1                    |
| Parking Migration            | 2                    |
| Not valid objection          | 1                    |

One objection was received which stated that the proposed changes will have an impact on businesses. The objections centered around costs already being too high and that further increasing costs will drive people away from shopping in the town to out of town/online locations, as the price rises are unaffordable, which will cause businesses to close as a result of lower footfall.

One objection was received regarding cost stating that the price rises were unacceptable, unaffordable, not in line with inflation and pointless. Objectors also stated that the council had forgotten there is a cost-of-living crisis and that it should be doing more to help people than hinder them further. Respondents also stated the council should raise money through other avenues, rather than increasing parking costs.

17 objections were received regarding the inconvenience the restrictions would cause for visitors to the town centres. Comments were also made regarding disruption caused to traffic flow from vehicles turnover within the bays and the inconvenience this causes.

One response was received relating to the consultation process. The objector stated the document links do not reach the server and are not accessible to see what Cabinet have been provided with or considered and the EQIA Impact assessment was also not available. They state this consultation should be paused and re-set when those documents are available.

Two objections was raised regarding the potential for parking migration into nearby unrestricted/less restricted roads. The objectors stated that the proposals would cause vehicles to migrate into nearby roads to find longer stay parking and cause further issues for residents of these streets to find parking near to their home.

One objection to introducing permits was received which is considered to be a non-valid objection as this proposal does not include the introduction of permits.

To summarise, a total of 373 objections have been made to this TRO. The number of objections by key themes of the objection at each location has been discussed above. An additional 23 objections have been received which are assumed to be across the entire proposed scheme, as no location was stated within the objection response.