

Appendix 1(i) Detailed Consultation Responses

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
1	14	<p>A notice was put up on the lamppost near my house in Woodland Way yesterday, we are in support of the restrictions, but can I ask why it is just form school hours?</p> <p>Do you know when it would begin if it was to go ahead</p>
2	V1	<p>Good afternoon my name is I live at is more than enough room to extend into to make car park spaces the path then would connect to the path outside ... then back on to the normal path the other side of the flats. If this was to fail I would be quite happy to pay for a drive....</p> <p>Perhaps also there are houses in the street with multiple cars Perhaps except for the main car in the household all the others would require a permit.?</p> <p>I do understand where you are coming from as I was in a wheelchair for 3 months myself but people do have a right to park somewhere in there street</p> <p>Could you not also have the prohibition at just peak times say 8am till 1700 Monday to Friday?</p>
3	V1	<p>I have today 29/05/2021 received a letter from your office relating to proposed parking controls</p> <p>I have concerns, as I am sure any resident with a vehicle in Brook drive shares.</p> <p>I stated my concerns, reasoning and suggestions in writing when the council brought out its new parking policies around the roebuck ward in 2018 (my email is at the bottom of this email).</p> <p>I feel that the council has not relived the parking issue at all with the introduction of the 12 parking bays at the junction of Ashdown Road.</p> <p>And this you have admitted in your letter today I quote.</p> <p>"The recent feedback from residents suggested that vehicle's are still parked inconsiderately on verges and footpaths in brookdrive" which you are now taking action upon.</p> <p>Why Do you not ask the question, why is this still happening ??</p> <p>Is it because people are not using the new bays, because they are ?</p> <p>Is it because there are more Vehicle's than the Council assumed that just 12 bays would accommodate, yes a considerably lot more ?</p> <p>Is it because the council really didn't deal effectively and efficiently with the problem as they could of, yes it is.</p> <p>Especially the middle and opposite end of Brook drive</p> <p>I can not understand why on earth the council will not widen the road in the middle part of Brookdrive, there is plenty of room to move the pathway over by about at least a metre either side, this would allow double parking, or you could easily do as you have done on the junction cut into the green area, what is so precious about the large green area in Brookdrive it serves no purpose???</p> <p>There is also potential to create even more parking for around 6 vehicles if they remove the trees situated outside No 12 and No 30 Brookdrive.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
3	V1 cont'd	<p>As I understand the roots of which have already caused major issues with sewage pipes over the past months and have caused thousands of pounds of damage to the pipes, before long I am sure the roots and branches will be causing bigger issues to the houses close by.</p> <p>While I am on this subject of the trees, they are also causing a health and safety issue, as throughout the year they will drop blossom, seedlings and leaves, which when wet make the pathways extremely slippery, pathways which I will point out are becoming uneven because of the roots underneath, as I remember someone has already sued the Council for compensation for a broken wrist after tripping up the raised slabs on that particular pathway.</p> <p>For good measure I have also included my original email I sent within my concerns about the parking prohibition back in 2018</p> <p>Unfortunately it does make this email very long but I do hope you find it helpful in some way and maybe look at the parking problem more effectively and more long term, rather than just penalizing tax paying residents</p>
4	V1	<p>I received a letter this week regarding a proposal to ban parking on the verges on Brook Drive and I am against any such proposal as I was the last time this was proposed, and for the very same reasons. I don't like people parking on verges but people do it because there is nowhere else near their homes to park, I am very lucky in that I have a driveway to park on but most of the houses on Brook Drive have no parking allocations and there are more cars than space.</p> <p>When this was last proposed I suggested and the council then did put in parking at the bottom end of Brook Drive which has solved the problem at this end, as much as I hate to see green spaces turned into car parks it is the only way to fix this problem! simply banning people from parking on verges will move the problem from where it is to somewhere else, the cars won't simply vanish!</p> <p>If arrangements for more parking are put in place, then I would support a ban on parking on verges but if it is not then I am completely against it</p>
5	V1	<p>I'm emailing regarding the proposed restrictions you've put forward in Brook Drive and I have to disagree. I understand the reasons completely why but I feel that the proposed plans will only push these cars and vans into Tye End which is already very restricted in parking. The additional parking you've mentioned at the bottom of Brook Drive is being occupied by residents of Ash Down Road also. I feel there hasn't been any consultation or solution for parking around here by yourselves. The parking around here is already a big problem and with these proposed restrictions are only going to create a bigger problem. There are so many cars and vans in this little area and as we have a middle row house we're unable to have a drive installed or the funds and feel I'm being forced into taking on a garage which will add expense onto my already stretched finances which I'm the only provider of income into my household. We have so many abandoned and unoccupied garages behind us which could make way for residential parking around this area and solve part of this problem.</p> <p>Look forward to hearing from you</p>
6	2	<p>I have just had a letter from you regarding changes to parking restrictions in Broad Oak Way.</p> <p>As you have been monitoring the situation, you will well know there is not enough parking space available in Broad Oak Way and surrounding areas, especially since you introduced further restrictions a while ago. To introduce further restrictions will be more a disaster. The problem is not solved by putting those restrictions in but</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
6	2 cont'd	<p>just meaning there is more illegal parking.</p> <p>I am lucky enough to have use of my neighbour's driveway opposite the service yard entrance but if I, or indeed my neighbour whose drive it is, have a visitor there is often nowhere for them to park so the best way is for them to block the driveway. Your proposals will disallow this to happen.</p> <p>The actual problem is the number of commercial vehicles taking up the spaces. Yes, they belong to residents, but those residents have cars themselves and often multiple vehicles. When I mentioned this at the consultation of the last proposal of parking restrictions, I was told that people have to work. This is acceptable if you are talking sole trader who may be a plumber or the like but many are national companies and on occasions council vehicles.</p> <p>With the introduction of more driveways this reduces the number of street parking spaces. If the owner is not using their driveway the space still cannot be used. Also, these people rarely block their own driveways allowing spaces for others to use the remainder of the road. Sometimes they still park their vehicles in the road even when they have spaces on their driveways.</p> <p>Therefore, I conclude your first course of action, rather than washing your hands of the consequences and create even more parking problems is to contact the community to be more considerate in their parking and to place restrictions on commercial vehicles ahead of making a misery for the general public. So please focus on the real problem and try and solve it rather than shifting it to somewhere else. It is a fact that in today's world there are many (probably too many vehicles) but that is the life and they do not vanish just because you put in restrictions. Some of these issues have been created by your previous restrictions. Your election missives state that you have increased parking, but in reality, you have also reduced parking availability and seek to reduce it further in a world of increasing vehicles. As much as vehicles are a blight they are here.</p> <p>In addition, the size of vehicles attempting to access the service yard are too big for the purpose. Regularly the lorries have driven up onto the opposite grass verges causing damage. The same applies to the access road where a terrible mess has been created mucking the paving for pedestrians. If the access was made wider and concreted this would not happen. The driveway I park on has been damaged over the years by HGV's driving on it.</p> <p>If you really must put in restrictions the please leave the area outside the driveway free to allow visitors to park. Other users will not be able to park there as they will be obstructing the drive.</p>
7	13	<p>Response 7.0</p> <p>I am glad to see that at last something is being done about dangerous parking on the junction Woodland Way/Fellowes Way however I am afraid the proposal does not meet the requirements of the are.</p> <p>I cannot speak for other junctions but the specific problem with this junction is with people parking on Fellowes Way directly opposite the junction. This narrows the road and causes drivers to blindly navigate the junction. I have seen a number of near misses and the issues has been reported multiple times over the last two years</p> <p>If you wish to resole the problem double yellows should be placed on Fellowes way between the small cul de sac covering the length of the wooded area opposite the junction. If this is not done the safety will continue to be compromised. Example attached.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
7	13 cont'd	<p>Response 7.1</p> <p>Thank you for your latest letter regarding parking controls. I have given considerable thought to this matter and have mixed feelings regarding these proposals. My reasoning is based on law and my experience of what is achieved by such interventions.</p> <p>The Highway Code covers the parking regulations and this was enshrined in law by the Road Traffic Act 1930 which was updated by the RTA 1988 and subsequent legislation.</p> <p>Rule 243 is the appropriate part of the code which, among other things states "You MUST NOT park your vehicle"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposite or Within 10 Metres (32 feet) of a junction 2. In front of the entrance to someone's property 3. On a road bend 4. Where a kerb has been lowered <p>Rule 244 covering parking on a pavement.</p> <p>As can clearly be seen, the above rules already cover the proposed double yellow lines. They also cover the various concerns raised by my neighbours.</p> <p>I realise that a visible deterrent may assist those who are ignorant of the law but this should not be necessary if the existing rules were enforced.</p> <p>I also realise that, as long as the correct local traffic orders are properly made, double yellow lines become enforceable by traffic wardens.</p> <p>That said I do not believe this to be a real deterrent based on our experience with the recent pavement parking enforcement where tickets were issued over the first couple of weeks and then things went back to normal with no further warden activity.</p> <p>As an example when a person was regularly parking on the junction I am aware that it was relayed via OWL and resulted in a PCSO giving guidance. No further offending took place proving the existing rules work</p> <p>In short with the rules as they are, it is either required to place yellow lines everywhere that the Highway Code covers which would be rather a waste of time and money or, alternatively place them nowhere and enforce the current regulations fully.</p> <p>The above said, if this proposal does go ahead then it surely must include lines opposite each junction. Parking opposite a junction is arguably more dangerous as it causes blind spots and makes other cars navigate on the wrong side of the road.</p>
8	V1	<p>Thank you for the letter delivered the other day, I would like to make the following objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The additional parking spaces installed hasn't made any difference to the parking on Brook Drive. There wasn't enough parking spaces put in, you should have utilised all the green land at the front of the houses (both sides of the road), made more parking spaces and put double yellows down the section to encourage people to park in the spaces. To suggest that this proposal is warranted on this basis is completely illogical. 2. People are converting front gardens into driveways, which takes up the

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
8	V1 cont'd	<p>equivalent of two parking spaces in the street. The more people who convert are making the problem worse. Either everyone does it or no one does it.</p> <p>3. This is clearly a revenue driving initiative from the council. This will be farmed out to a 3rd party to issue tickets and collect the payments but none of the money will go towards dealing with the issue of the parking.</p> <p>4. You will clearly extend this proposal to Tye End - this street is too small to accommodate any such suggestion. I will not be happy if you proceed with this as I struggle to be able to get my car in and out of my driveway.</p> <p>5. Why don't you copy what they have in Barnsley? The pavement and road are the same level with no curbs and everyone parks half on the pavement/half on the road. One side of the street is clear for pedestrians to go up and down. Perhaps if you encouraged everyone to park on one side of the road it might help.</p> <p>6. You need to deal with the emergency services access, people park far too closely together and you can just about get a car through. There are specific bottlenecks which I'd be happy to show on a map - these need to be double yellowed.</p> <p>7. Why don't you actually mark the bays on the road with paint so you can maximise the number of cars able to park?</p> <p>8. There's a large block of garages at the rear of Brook Drive/Tye End - why don't you take these down and create some parking at the back of the houses? I don't believe all these garages are fully rented. Each time there is a parking proposal and this suggestion is made - you state they are all occupied. This is another trick from Barnsley - have parking at the back and maximise space at the front for short term visiting people.</p> <p>While you ask for feedback, the letter is clearly written in the fashion that you intend to proceed with this plan regardless of anything local people have to say.</p> <p>I think this council is absolutely terribly run - you are out to get every penny possible and make things difficult for people to live around here. You should be much more forward thinking and deal with the issues but this parking control will just make things worse.</p>
9	V1 & 10	<p>I write in response to the proposed parking restrictions/ prohibition in Brook Drive.</p> <p>I agree that at present cars parked on pavements and verges are causing problems for those wishing to use the pedestrian thoroughfares and also obstructing driver's sightlines.</p> <p>However, I also wish to draw attention to the fact that the problem is often transferred to the Tye End garage block, where I and my wife have our cars garaged. Cars which no longer park on verges park around the garages, against walls, obstructing entrances and exits to the garage block and access to individual garages (for which we pay), in spite of 'no parking' notices. I can only imagine that this problem will be exacerbated if/ when the new restrictions come into being.</p> <p>In a similar vein, double yellow lines at the entrance of the garage block into Brook Drive (nearest Ashdown Road) is a good idea, but wouldn't it also be a good idea to do the same at the exit of the garage block (adjacent to 61 Brook Drive), and also to reinstate signage designating exit/ entrance to the block at the same time? This would also allow a clear view when exiting Tye End into Brook Drive, often done blindly through parked cars on the green by the electric substation.</p> <p>In summary, I support the proposals, but hope this is done in tandem with increased enforcement against those 'fly parking' in the garage block, which seems not to be within police jurisdiction.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
10	12	<p>Dear Sirs, with regard to the proposed traffic order in the title of this email. This proposal was put to you when you first proposed any traffic orders relating to 28-35 Park View of which I am a resident.</p> <p>It was even brought to your attention by one of the local councillors, Mr. Doug Bainbridge but you decided not to pursue the idea of timed restrictions. The double yellow lines you installed in our cul-de-sac did deter people for a time but because of the sparsity of traffic enforcement officers people have developed a very casual attitude to breaching these restrictions. At this present moment in time as I am writing this email there are four cars parked in the turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac comprising 28-35 Park View and they have been there all night. This is not a one off, it happens on a daily basis. I realise that parking enforcement is not within your purview but unless these restrictions are rigorously enforced all you will have done is wasted your time and effort and the councils money. In fact I'm of the opinion that these restrictions could be self-financing if the fines are then used to finance the enforcement officers.</p> <p>My point is this, if you downgrade the current restrictions people will take even more liberty's and all you will have done is decorate the streets with yellow paint. If they refuse to take any notice of double yellow lines and all the associated signage you have installed there is very little chance of them being affected by single yellow lines.</p> <p>Thank you for your work and concern in this matter.</p>
11	V1	<p>One of the reasons which make Stevenage an attractive place to live is the quantity of open green space where birds, animals and insects can love and thrive to improve quality of life for residents. These areas are not only in parks and open spaces, but around housing as well, such as in Tye End. For this reason, I would like to express my strong support of the proposed verge and footway parking prohibition on Brook Drive, where cars are a serious problem. In fact, I would like to suggest that the proposal does not go far enough, and that this prohibition, when enacted, will cause issues elsewhere, such as along Tye End. Here, congestion and verge parking is becoming a serious issue in terms of access, damage to wildlife, as well as becoming increasing unsightly and disturbing to residents.</p> <p>I would suggest that, when cars are pushed away from the Brook Drive area, the owners will seek parking elsewhere, which will no doubt include smaller sidestreets where parking and space is limited and is on a first-come-first-served basis. Wildlife, grassy areas and trees are what make these streets so appealing. On Tye End, we have seen the destruction of grass and tree roots because cars are parking on the grass areas between the trees. In winter, these areas become quagmires of mud and drains become blocked as it is washed away, further exposing tree roots which will eventually undermine their health.</p> <p>I would suggest, physical barriers such as low wooden bars and/or bushes to stop cars parking on the grass and to preserve the wildlife areas which so greatly improve quality of life in these areas. I would further suggest investigation of the possibility of parking permits and marked parking bay areas so that certain residents can only park in certain marked areas.</p> <p>I do hope you can act to preserve the green verges and limit the cars parking where they shouldn't, in order to preserve the natural setting of Tye End.</p>
12	5,6,7	<p>Having received your letter regarding the above, I would like to point out that the major problem with parking is vans who park opposite Balmoral Close, which means you have to drive on the wrong side of the road to get to the small roundabout. Which in turns stops traffic coming from Knebworth and the A602. So please</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
12	5,6,7 cont'd	consider putting yellow lines there as well. Example yesterday no parking bollards had been placed in the area I am talking about, but still the vans parked there.
13	1	<p>In response to the letter we received about new lines being added at the top of Ashdown Road/Broadwater.</p> <p>While yellow lines will help that roundabout with the current issues, Parking still remains an issue there. It would be ideal for some additional inlay spaces added to ease the parking. Otherwise the plan for yellow lines is supported by me.</p> <p>However. My main proposal here would be to have some additional yellow lines added down Ashdown Road. (Please find attached a PNG of the drawing (TPE/03/19-5/01) you sent us with my proposal added on)</p> <p>I propose to have double yellow lines added to the top of Holly Leys where it meets Ashdown Road. The bend in the road is often a big issue for drivers as people tend to park their vehicles too close to each other on either side of the road. Currently is not illegal. However, there have been 2 times this year alone that I am aware of where ambulances had not been able to get passed due to the gap being too small. One during the day and one very late night. Both times they had to turn around and find another route (This was due to white vans being parked close to each other). There was a close call a few weeks back when a fire engine had to come down the street. But the fire was near the bend and they were able to get to it. I can even recall one time where a buss was not able to get passed due to two white vans (again) being too close to each other. But even with the vans not being there and cars instead, the gap is not very big.</p> <p>Add on the issue that people cannot see what's coming up or down until they're practically at the bend makes it a possible issue for an accident in waiting. I am not alone in this thinking either with my neighbours often making similar remarks.</p> <p>I hope this new proposal of mine is of good use to you. If you have any questions at all, I am happy to assist.</p>
14	V1 and 10	<p>We received two letters yesterday that cover two proposals for Brook Drive itself and its junction with Ashdown Road.</p> <p>We are in favour of the junction proposals as per drawing TPE/03/19-5/10 which show double-yellow lines placed opposite the parking area and extending to and around the corner into Ashdown Road itself, hopefully these will provide a consistently clear view in this area and turning space for cars using the parking area.</p> <p>We are also broadly in favour of the parking restrictions for the rest of Brook Drive shown in drawing TPE/03/19-5/V1 which shows the whole length of the Drive being subject to a verge and footpath parking ban.</p> <p>The problem of people using the footpaths, in particular to park on, is certainly a big one for the elderly, disabled, wheelchair/ mobility scooters and buggy users who would need to use the road or cross over (if possible given the parking and lack of dropped-kerbs) to pass parked vehicles.</p> <p>The issue with the whole length being subject to these restrictions is that there are many cars and vans that will need to find alternative locations to park.</p> <p>This could well lead to issues with households vying for the few road spaces that will be available, which will no doubt cause tensions amongst the residents.</p> <p>Could we propose some ideas for consideration:</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
14	V1 and 10 cont'd	<p>1) Free or discounted dropped-kerb installation - this could make it more affordable for households to open their front gardens to having their own driveways and thus reduce the numbers of vehicles needing to park on the road, verge or pavements. the current process and costs mean that many people can't afford to have a dropped-kerb installed. If this was a council sponsored and promoted activity it could result in quite a few properties taking this step.</p> <p>2) Measures to discourage multiple vehicle owners, for example a permit scheme to give Brook Drive residents priority over non-residents, or exclusive access, with the first household vehicle being free or low cost and subsequent permits to the same household increasing in price.</p> <p>3) Parking bays installed roughly opposite 68 Brook Drive, it would mean removing half-a-dozen trees but could provide parking for approx. 5 vehicles.</p> <p>4) Parking bays installed roughly opposite 43 Brook Drive, between the flat blocks, could provide parking for approx 8 vehicles.</p> <p>5) Parking bays installed roughly in front of 28 Brook Drive could provide parking for approx. 5 vehicles.</p> <p>6) Overhaul/ replace the garages between Brook Drive and Tye End to allow residents to park there securely. Even allowing people to use the rented garages to put their cars in, rather than only for storage, could make a difference. Since these garages were designed for previous generations of vehicles it might be necessary for considerable changes to be made for them to be useable.</p> <p>7) With the new housing development happening on Ashdown Road and Hertford Road it would be prudent to look at installing another set of parking bays between the Brook Drive/ Ashdown junction and the Malvern Close/ Ashdown road junction - the area that was being used as office space for the contractors doing the Hertford Road speed bump installations.</p> <p>8) More lay-bys installed on Ashdown Road could help with the road-parking that happens there on a regular basis, which reduces sight-lines and the chance of on-coming vehicles colliding.</p> <p>9) Apparently people in Broadwater Crescent use the Tye End car park, which then forces Tye End residents to find alternative parking locations - so this might be something to look at also, for example lay-bys could be installed in several locations around the Bus stops on Broadwater Crescent.</p> <p>10) Allocated parking for one vehicle per household - though I don't know if there would be enough space, especially for households that don't currently want or need one, but will in the future or how this could be enforced.</p> <p>I hope that these ideas might be of use and while I am not a fan of cutting trees down I feel that this could be compensated for by removing the very large trees along the brook in the Ashdown Road/ Hertford Road green area and replacing them with new trees that are unlikely to come down in high winds, spread fluff in early summer and shade all the gardens at the end of Brook Drive.</p> <p>Trees could also be moved and replanted in areas affected by changes.</p>
15	V1	<p>Dear Mr Leech</p> <p>Just opened and read your letter regarding the parking in Brook Drive, I must say how disappointed I am with your view that parking on pavements remains necessary.</p> <p>We are not just talking about a wheel on a kerb here its the entire car blocking the</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
15	V1 cont'd	<p>pavement I will forward you some pictures.</p> <p>There is not only the new spaces at the bottom of Brook Drive there are places on Broadwater crescent and even more in Nokeside. Even putting this aside because they can park on the pavement they just do, even if there is a perfectly good space available.</p> <p>I have witnessed children, wheelchair users, parents with pushchairs all having to step into the road to get around these cars.</p> <p>Large vehicles including fire engines have struggled along Brook drive due to this inconsiderate, unsafe and dangerous parking & I would expect the council to be more concerned with the safety aspect of this parking instead of people having to park a little further away.</p> <p>The police had to be called a couple of weeks ago due to a car not only on the pavement but blocking my drive, when the police officer arrived he personally was shocked at the parking on the pavement.</p> <p>Feel free to knock on my door to discuss</p> <p>I have copied TRO into this email so it can be used for the consultation.</p> <p>Look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Reply from Cllr Leech</p> <p>Dear Mr Summers</p> <p>Thank you for your letter, I have knocked on your door a couple of times this weekend but I guess you have been away enjoying the great bank holiday weather.</p> <p>To be fair to the council officers they are very concerned about the ability of emergency vehicles to move along Brook Drive and the safety of pedestrians, hence issuing the proposals.</p> <p>My aim is to get a full and balanced set of opinions from as many residents along Brook Drive as possible and in replying to the consultation you have aided in that so thank you for support in this process.</p> <p>I will try to catch you in over the next couple of weeks</p>
16	R2	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Yesterday a notice was put on lamp posts in our cul-de-sac, the parking restrictions were lifted indefinitely in 2019 due to limited space & access for vehicles to go in & out of the cul-de-sac. We have several houses beyond the cul-de-sac with footpath access only & all with vehicles & all the houses in the cul-de-sac have driveways including my own. Vehicles were unable to pass through to get to their homes or even leave the street due to limited parking space. And many a time neighbours were having to move vehicles to allow people in or out of the street including late at night. We have on call workers & they can be called out early hours or return early hours, we have been allowed to park with 2 wheels up on kerb due to space. Will this notice which I'm posting pic of below revoke this or will we now be able to carrying on allowing us to park with 2 wheels on kerb please.</p>
17	5,6,7	<p>With reference to the letter (ref: TPE/03/19-5/F) we recently received regarding the proposed parking controls in Hertford Road, the planned works are welcome. No one ever parks at the junction with Balmoral Close, which is the closest planned works to my property, but I think that may change due to the lack of parking for the</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
17	5,6,7 cont'd	<p>new flats. Flat residents will undoubtedly be forced to park along the road instead.</p> <p>With that in mind, as you will have workers in my area, and yellow paint available, please can I request that you also put yellow lines across the drop kerb on to my driveway as people regularly park over it already!</p> <p>My neighbour at ..., would also like yellow lines across their drop kerb for the same reason. I can ask them to put it in writing if you need to hear it from them directly.</p> <p>I don't think people realise (or more than likely don't give a hoot!) that a drop kerb includes the sloped kerb stones, not just the flat ones. When people park up to the flat stones, it makes it very difficult to manoeuvre on and off our drives or see any traffic driving along – although the road is a 30 limit, many drivers travel faster than that. It's so dangerous not being able to see what's coming, and an accident waiting to happen!</p> <p>Additionally, in-between both our driveways are two kerb stones, measuring 9ft (275cm). People think that that is an appropriate parking space - even though the average car in the UK is 14ft (440cm) – and obstructs both of our driveways at the same time! Ideally, we would like the yellow lines to run the full length of the drop kerbs, including this bit in the middle.</p> <p>Thank you, I look forward to hearing from you.</p>
18	5,6,7	<p>I have received your proposed parking controls for the junctions of Hertford Road with Balmoral Close, Caernarvon Close and Windsor Close with interest and some amusement.</p> <p>While I am not objecting to these proposals they seem to be only partially thought out and executed.</p> <p>I can only assume that there has been no site visit from someone from the Stevenage Borough Council Planning Department and presumably not by anyone with driving experience.</p> <p>The Highway code rule 243 states that there should be no parking opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction except in an authorised parking space.</p> <p>I accept that this is not law but it could help in a court case of a collision in a road traffic accident due to insufficient/inadequate parking restrictions and signage.</p> <p>From this it seems obvious that while the proposed double lines on the corners are just partialy reinforcing the Highway Code rule 243 there should also be double yellow lines OPPOSITE these 3 junctions for the specified distance.</p> <p>It gives the impression that you do not wish to upset the residents of the Hertford road with multiple cars that continually park on the road rather than use their driveways.</p> <p>I have lived at since it was built and at no time in that 40 ish years has there ever been a situation of cars parking on the corners marked on your plan for the proposed double yellow lines on the corners of Balmoral Close, Hertford Road junction. However cars continuously park opposite the exit of Balmoral Close causing an obstruction to those exiting.</p> <p>I have also been a bus driver on the route 8 until I retired some 12 years ago and can state quite categorically that the parking problem causing the obstruction to traffic and obscuring drivers sightline is caused by the residents along Hertford Road, namely 149,147,143 through to 117 and houses down toward Ranworth Ave by parking on the road outside their houses rather than in their often driveways.</p> <p>I await your reply with interest.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
19	1	<p>I am writing to formally object to the above proposed parking changes, I have highlighted below reasons for our objection.</p> <p>I object for these reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashdown Road is notoriously busy, with surrounding streets and cul de sacs taking parking away from the directly housed residents. • Additional bays have been installed, but on one verge they have only installed 1 space, where they could have definitely fit 1 more and I believe 2, so 3 total. • More and more residents are installing drives with the dropped kerbs limiting parking spaces on the road. • The dropped kerbs are also getting larger and larger again reducing space for non driveway owners. • We are unable to install a drive ourselves due to 2 rules stated by HCC. Our space is 30cm(!) short and there are trees over hanging (not directly in the way) where a dropped kerb would be installed <p>The highlighted issues above are only going to be made worse by the proposed changes to Broadwater. We have been increasingly more concerned by the parking in Ashdown Road receiving this notification has only added to the stress. Having only been living here for just over the year (during COVID) we on a regular basis are having to park at the other end of the road .</p> <p>I hope you show some level of sympathy to the circumstances we face on a daily basis. We would very much like the opportunity to expand on these concerns and discuss other solutions via conference call.</p>
20	V1	<p>I would like to voice my support about parking being banned on verges and footpaths in Brook Drive.</p> <p>However, I would like to ask, if this could be also extended to Tye End, as on it cars are regularly parked on the grass between trees.</p> <p>With the parking being banned, I hope the council is not thinking about removing green spaces or trees to make space for cars. I recently moved to the area and like the amount of green and hope it remains like this.</p> <p>I was quite upset when a large healthy tree was cut down by the council in a neighbours front yard a few months ago.</p> <p>I also don't own a car and wonder why public money is used to remove wild life area so that people can store their private property on it (Brook Drive new parking area). I feel with the garages, the on-street parking places, and enough space in the front yards for at least one car, there should be no need for another publicly founded car storage place.</p>
21	3	<p>Many thanks for the consultation letter.</p> <p>Please see below a letter sent to my local councillor..</p> <p>In summary parking should not begin until the end of property (No.). Having the yellow line extended would not be detrimental to anyone but would relieve the stress of having to ask people to move there cars from my access.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
22	1	<p>I have recently received a letter in regards to the new proposal for parking control in the area of Broadwater Crescent</p> <p>I strongly oppose these proposed parking controls at the SG2 8EZ location.</p> <p>In our neighbourhood, we have been parking over the curb onto the dead area of the verge for a long time. Only a year ago we were informed we won't be able to park over, making us use more road space, narrowing the road.</p> <p>We are already struggling to find spaces for more than 15 families, potentially with multiple cars. Meaning if we will be forced again to move our vehicles somewhere else it will cause tension and disagreement in the neighbourhood as there is not much space available to park our cars.</p> <p>Even if we tried to park somewhere else, this might cause property damages to our cars due to the disagreements or discomfort of other neighbourhoods because we are trying to use their parking space.</p> <p>It won't do any good to remove the existing parking lot in SG2 8EZ, not only devaluing our property value, but also the difficulties our elders will be facing to find space and to carry their goods into their property.</p> <p>As mentioned, safety is the main priority for all of us, as 1 of the best options could be to re-use the dead area, which we have been using for over 30+ years.</p> <p>Other options could be or move the bus stop further, where the road is wider (as even with no cars parks, blocks completely the road while stopping) or another option could be to remove the trees or lawn to create a parking area.</p> <p>We will take any necessary action to make sure this parking control won't occur on our street, as it leaves us at a great disadvantage.</p> <p>It is known Stevenage has really serious parking problems, so reducing it will only cause more problems than solutions. Instead of reducing parking spaces, increase the number of parking spaces, as more and more families will move into our city, will make it harder to live here, making the neighbourhoods more conflict and less safe.</p> <p>I hope you will consider all our statements.</p>
23	1	<p>I strongly object to the proposed parking controls at the SG28EZ location (drawing TPE/03/19-5/01).</p> <p>The reasons for this objection are the following.</p> <p>For the last 30+ years residents have parked on the road with half a car width on the dead verge between the bus stop on Broadwater Crescent and Ashdown Rd (see drawing TPE/03/19-5/01) without any issues or complains that I know of until just over a year ago we were forced by the council to not park on the 3' dead verge by the addition of a sign and fines. This meant the cars are now forced to park 3' further out causing a narrowing of the road. Taking into account of both sides of the road at this point we have 11 x 3 bed houses without driveways and a lot of these houses have more than one car. At a rough guess something like 16 cars. With the addition of these proposed yellow lines, we will have about 5-6 parking places meaning 10 cars will need to somehow find spaces in the already congested area. This will of course create tension and arguments throughout the area. In some cases, people will not want to move their cars for fear of losing the space and this will restrict people's freedom and possibly their human rights. The council has in my opinion created the entire issue and their solution to paint double yellow lines without creating additional parking space is ridiculous. This will of course reflect even more on the home owners by devaluing their property. In Stevenage buying a</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
23	1 cont'd	<p>house with parking is of utmost importance.</p> <p>A simple short-term solution to this issue is to allow us to park partly over the curb onto the dead area of verge as we did for over 30+ years previous and/or better still remove the trees and create a parking area. It has been known by the council that the entire town has serious residential parking problems and therefore I find it unacceptable that a lot more thought has not gone into the proposed changes.</p>
24	14	<p>Dear Councillor Leech</p> <p>Thank you for your recent letter on this subject. I am resident at ... Lodge Way and have lived here for almost 60 years and have been associated with</p> <p>the New Towns movement since 1956 and coincidentally was involved with the sale of the land on which the semi detached houses and bungalows</p> <p>stand to New Ideal Homesteads. In my view the proposed parking restrictions are essential to ensure the original purpose of clear visibility at the junction</p> <p>for motorists and road safety on the highway with the rights to pass and repass. The concept also had the safety of cyclists and pedestrians in mind.</p> <p>I would be happy to discuss the matter further should you so wish.</p> <p>Dear</p> <p>Thank you for responding to my letter. I am copying in TRO so that your well informed comments are added to their consultation responses.</p> <p>Talking to residents such as yourself with really in depth knowledge of their locale helps immensely.</p> <p>If I can be of any assistance on this or any other matter please let me know.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>Nick Leech</p>
25	V1	<p>Your ref TPE/03/19-5/F. Regarding the proposal for proposed verge and footway parking prohibition in Brook Drive, I am concerned if this plan has been thought through in regards to the vehicles that will have to be parked along this road. As the vehicles are parked on the footway are causing obstruction to pedestrians at present, where are the vehicles to be moved too? The additional parking at the Ashdown Road end of Brook Drive has not helped with the situation further up Brook Drive. The possibility of the vehicles then will be parked in Tye End, will then cause parking problems in Tye End? With vehicles being force to park further along Tye End. Tye End is already quite full with parked vehicles and is so narrow that big vehicles (refuse lorries etc) mount the footway to gain access and egress. Tye End being designed for 1950's traffic, not 2021 traffic.</p>
26	V1	<p>Dear</p> <p>Thanks for taking the time to get back to me on this, hearing a range of views really helps me in representing you to the council officers in a balanced way.</p> <p>I think that everyone I have spoken to sees parking along Brook Drive as unsatisfactory.</p> <p>I am cc'ing in TRO so that your views can feed into their official consultation.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
26	V1 cont'd	<p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Nick Leech</p> <p>Hi I live on the ... of Brook Drive at ... , Stevenage. Over the past few years and on many occasions contacted Stevenage borough council with my concerns at various people parking on the grass verges and pathways obviously it's got worse as the years go on . I have a dropped kerb and driveway which takes care of my household vehicles but getting off my driveway for the members of my family has become a lottery as vision is blocked by cars and Van's parking on the grass verges and pathways not only that we have quite a few elderly people up the street who I have found walking in the road as they can't access the path ! A part from the fact in the winter time the grass verges are a mud bath !! Disgusting as I believe the council go to a lot of effort and cost I'm sure to keep our town looking smart !! Anyone with a car can apply for off road parking as I and plenty of other people have done the same and just because they can't be bothered to walk to the parking bays I find it a feeble excuse!! Finally your colleague called yesterday to my house and to be honest I can't believe people are even talking about not going ahead with the parking restrictions !! It's a no brainer!! Many thanks</p>
27	5,6,7	<p>With regard to the proposed new parking regulations, I am writing specifically about the changes proposed for Balmoral Close, your diagram TPE/03/19-5/07 refers.</p> <p>I am broadly in agreement with putting in Double Yellow lines, but feel that your scheme fails to make any real difference and does not address all the traffic safety issues brought about by selfish parking at the end of Balmoral Close. Your scheme needs to be extended to properly address all the safety issues. <i>If you are going to do a job do it once and do it properly!</i></p> <p>See attached commented copy of you plan ref TPE/03/19-5/07, on which I have indicated in green where I believe that the double yellow lines should be extended and added to for the reasons below.</p> <p>The main Safety issue that you have not addressed in the proposed change is Parking on Hertford Road opposite the Junction with Balmoral Close which is also really dangerous.</p> <p>Bearing in mind that Hertford Road is “no through” at the junction with Ashdown, meaning that Balmoral Close is at the end that all traffic passes in both directions from this part of the estate, it is the busiest junction.</p> <p>Virtually every time people leave Balmoral Close they turn right onto Hertford Road, if vehicles are parked opposite, which they do regularly (see picture from today), drivers from Balmoral Close have to turn out onto the wrong side of the road into oncoming traffic from the junction with Wotton Rd.</p> <p>Cars parked opposite the end of Balmoral Close and towards the junction with Watton Rd cause cars coming up Hertford Rd to pull onto the wrong side of the road before Balmoral Close. The view from Balmoral Close to the left down Hertford Rd is restricted and very bad if the vehicle on Hertford Rd is on the wrong side passing parked cars, I have nearly been caught out a few times by vehicles appearing suddenly on my left on the wrong side passing parked vehicles.</p> <p>Less of an issue but I think still necessary would be to extend the lines on Balmoral Close another few feet, at least to the First Turn off on the right in Balmoral Close to allow more space for turn in and exit from the Close before having to stop for oncoming traffic.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
28	1	<p>We are in receipt of your letter dated 27th May 2021 regarding the proposed parking controls at Ashdown Road/Broadwater Crescent junction and wish to put forward our formal objection.</p> <p>We can completely understand the need for the controls on the corners of the roads however the objection we have is to the proposed yellow line from the existing bus stop along Broadwater Crescent towards Ashdown Road Junction. We live at number ... and along with the bay in front of our house, the other side of the road is the only place we have available to park. Since the restrictions came in that stopped you from parking on the kerb, I can understand that this causes problems for the buses getting through, however this would now cause a problem that there is no other place we would be able to park. Ashdown Road is always full, down past Brook Drive, as is The Noke and the other side of the roundabout on Broadwater Crescent. As I'm sure you can appreciate there are a lot of houses on all these roads using the current spaces available.</p> <p>We did not wish to raise an objection without having tried to resolve this situation but due to the existing trees and our distance from the junction we are unable to have our kerb lowered to create a drive way which we would have happily paid for. Across from us there is an identical row of houses, all of which have cars so there would then be 10+ houses, some with more than one car with only 4-5 spaces available (depending on car size) and when I return home from work at 5.30pm, all those spaces outside our house are already taken.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate it is not a given when you purchase a property to have parking space available outside your home, to take away the only remaining available spaces that we could park in locally seems unjust. I don't think you could expect a woman on their own to walk the best part of 400 yards particularly late at night or in winter when it is dark early or if trying to carry shopping.</p> <p>It would seem a much more ideal situation to provide a row of paving slabs along the kerb opposite our property so people could park on those, therefore stopping causing an obstruction to the buses yet still having a little more parking available for the residents of this area and not damaging any of the grass.</p> <p>Below are my personal details, should you wish to contact me further, please do not hesitate to do so.</p>
28.1	1	<p>I would like to strongly oppose the proposed parking controls listed in your letter TPE/03/19-5/01 specifically the yellow line on the SG28EZ area next to the bus stop.</p> <p>Since we moved into our house and as we understand from our neighbours, quite some time prior, we have been able to park on the verge on the area from the bus stop to the top of Ashdown Road. This was never a problem until the council put in the restriction to stop us being able to park on what is in effect a dead area. We have seen first-hand that this has caused problems with traffic, especially buses getting through but the solution to remove the few remaining parking spaces available seems ridiculous. There are already parking problems in this area as all local roads are already overcrowded and there are no further spaces available if these were taken away.</p> <p>I agree that the cars being on the road does affect the traffic but by allowing us to park back up on the kerb in that area on dead space will alleviate the problem without causing further issues for residents to park. Society is such that there are</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
28.1	1 cont'd	increasing numbers of cars on the road, to limit parking spaces further makes no sense. There was no problem at all until we were no longer allowed to park on the kerb.
29	1	<p>I am writing to you, to express how upset i am regarding the new proposed Parking Controls on Broadwater Crescent SG2 8EZ - TPE/03/19-5F (Drawing TPE/03/19-5/01).</p> <p>I honestly do not understand the thinking behind these controls, & how Stevenage Borough Council (SBC) can possibly believe that this will improve the lives of the residents that live within the proposed area.</p> <p>You have claimed in your proposal that you are thinking of putting in double yellow lines, "as the current restrictions are causing obstructions"!</p> <p>It is Stevenage Borough Council that have caused these obstructions in the first place.</p> <p>I wrote to Mr ... back in May 2019 to express my concerns regarding the fact that SBC were going to stop people parking on the DEAD grass verges, & one of the many concerns i had at that time, was that I felt that this would cause more obstructions in the road, for emergency vehicles/buses, visibility etc, & would in fact make it MORE, not less dangerous for all.</p> <p>This of course fell on deaf ears, & the restrictions went ahead anyway.</p> <p>By submitting this new proposal of restriction, SBC are now clearly admitting, that the first load of restrictions has in fact made the road become more dangerous, as i had said.</p> <p>But now, rather than help the residents by reverting back to allowing them to park on the DEAD grass verges, AS THEY HAVE DONE FOR THE LAST 30 YEARS WITH NO PROBLEMS, SBC have now come up with the ridiculous idea of putting in double yellow lines???</p> <p>Can you please explain where you expect all of us to now park?</p> <p>I live at 350 Broadwater Crescent, & opposite me are SIX houses, set back from the road, that will in theory have nowhere to park, if you put double yellow lines on their side of the road.</p> <p>There is currently a small set back layby on my side of the road, which can fit FIVE cars. The majority of houses these days have on average two cars, so where will the other 12 cars now park?</p> <p>Currently my car insurance covers me to "park outside my house overnight" as i am sure most peoples without a drive does.</p> <p>By putting in these restrictions, you are in theory making mine, & everyone else's insurance invalid.</p> <p>After the terrible year we have had, & people losing their jobs, & struggling to make ends meet, you now expect us all to have to upgrade our car insurance to cover the fact we park nowhere near our houses. This will be at an additional cost to the residents & is completely unfair.</p> <p>I have fortunately managed to stay in employment through the pandemic, but work full time in, so by the time i get home of an evening, I will have nowhere to park.</p> <p>The last time i parked in a neighbouring road, due to lack of spaces outside my house, my car was vandalized, but as my insurance is for "parking outside my own house over night" i was not able to claim for this damage, & had to find the</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
29	1 cont'd	<p>money myself, yet more costs to the residents.</p> <p>Can you not, please, put us residents first for once, & revert back to allowing us to park on the DEAD grass verge opposite my house?</p> <p>Surely if needed, you could make this area in to a proper parking layby (as you have done at the top of Ashdown Road, & all the way up Oaks Cross) rather than just restrict us more.</p> <p>This would clear the road for buses, emergency vehicles, & solve the issues that SBC have created in the first place.</p> <p>After more than a year of lockdown, & not seeing friends & family, how are they now expected to visit when lockdown is finally lifted, if there is nowhere for them to park?</p> <p>This isn't just about parking restriction, this current plan of yours, is surely against peoples human rights & will severely effect peoples mental wellbeing!</p> <p>I honestly hope that you take my concerns seriously, & think about your residents, & scrapped this terrible idea.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing your response.</p>
30	1	<p>I of... Broadwater Cres, Stevenage, Hertfordshire, SG2 8EZ. am formally and strongly objecting to the proposed parking controls detailed in the letter sent by yourself dated 27 May 2021. The proposed controls are at the SG2 8EZ Location on your Drawing Number TPE/03/19-5/01 dated 04-03-2020.</p> <p>My reasons and details are:</p> <p>I have been a resident here for 10yrs and previously lived on The Noke since 1996 and parking on the stretch of road outside my current house had always used the verge in order to minimise disruption to the road and bus route and this never cause issue or complaint especially for the road users. In May of 2019 SBC wrote stating the intention of barring verge parking in the area and larger area. Many residents objected as this would cause disruption to traffic due to the vehicles being further out on the road and in the case of myself and my neighbours noted this would also impact on the bus route too, of course there was the concern that our vehicles would be hit by passing vehicles as well. The decision was made by SBC to go ahead with the planned banning of verge parking and now your "Project Broadwater Follow-up" as Titled on the mentioned drawing number document is in agreement with our original reason of objection to the barring of verge parking.</p> <p>There is massively insufficient parking not just in the initial area but the neighbouring streets and larger area too, The nearby garage block is not always lit at night and when it is it is very poorly lit, they are unsafe with no cameras and dark alleyways and even with these issues aside most up to date cars including my car do not fit in the garages (I have tried) so these are no fix.</p> <p>There is at least 10 3bed houses and the block of flats in our immediate vicinity with a large number of residing vehicles (not including any staying visitors or carers) and no other means of parking other than a small space for 5 to 6 vehicles (depending which vehicles and their sizes) but this falls drastically short of spaces required. This will undoubtedly cause tension and issues amongst people 'fighting' for parking places and will impact on our lives and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>I would also point out that in less than 9 years we will no longer be able to purchase new petrol and diesel cars and a further 5 years will see us only able to buy electric and with your proposed plan myself and my neighbours would not be able to affordably own a car as we wouldn't be able to charge up at home. This along with</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
30	1 cont'd	<p>all the mentioned issues and more will give a poor view of living in Stevenage areas making it harder to sell properties and thus would impact and devalue the properties which would raise more concerns and issues.</p> <p>There is a solution in that if the tree line was moved/removed and parking spaces 'end on' were put in their place currently I would see room for approx 6 parking spaces and if the Bus stop was to be relocated toward the junction with The Noke slightly this could be increase to at least 10 parking spaces. Alternatively Help with building driveways would be another alternative and would alleviate the amount of vehicles wishing to park in the existing spaces. I do however feel that Building for the Future would be in the best interest of not just the council but its residents too.</p> <p>With Regards</p> <p>In addition to the above letter, objection and details I ... of the same address also Object to the proposed controls as these will impact myself in much the same manner outlined by</p> <p>Regards</p>
31 (22.1)	1	<p>I am writing this email to let you know I strongly disagree to the proposed double yellow lines you are planning to do in our Street at SG2 8EZ (TPE/03/19-5/01).</p> <p>I understand it might be difficult for other cars to drive through this area, but the solution is not in taking our parking slot.</p> <p>Last year you told us it was prohibited to Park in the dead area of verge. It is already difficult enough to park in this area as each house has one or more cars, imagine how difficult it would be if you remove those areas.</p> <p>I strongly believe the solution is on making more parking spaces. Our health and safety is even more important. I think you should remove the grass and trees that are just next to the bus stop 'The Noke'. It will make our life much easier and it will be safe for other cars/bus/emergency vehicles to pass through.</p> <p>You haven't count on the fact that there are elderly people living in this area and using the parking in front of their house to have better accessibility to their travels. How difficult you want to make this neighbourhood life. When instead of helping us you will create conflict between ourselves for the few spots you will leave available.</p> <p>Also, as a woman it will be unsafe for me to try to park around the area after work, with the dark night and walking long distances alone.</p> <p>We will take any necessary action to stop this proposal and improve our neighbourhood area.</p>
32	11	<p>We would like submit a formal objection to the proposal of an extension of the existing "no waiting at any time" restrictions at the Broad Oak Way leading to Oakdell. We are completely against as this will cause even more problems with parking than we have now.</p> <p>At the moment we are really struggling to find a place to park our cars and during school run and matches organised at the next door football ground it is almost impossible.</p> <p>We have sent a query to the council in regards of purchasing a piece of land next to our house to build a drive but still have not heard anything what could resolve the problem. We have received only an automatic response that due to "covid" you are expiring delays in dealing with queries.</p> <p>Apologies for any inconvenience it may cause.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
33	3	<p>In regard to the above as a tenant of garage ... I would be very pleased to see the yellow lines extended as proposed in your letter dated 27th May. At the moment when leaving my garage most of the time it is impossible to see up or down the road. This is made more difficult by the 2 cars parked opposite the garage block. Whilst I do understand that parking in all roads in Stevenage is a problem the speed which some cars now come down Fellowes Way is making what I feel is a dangerous situation.</p>
34	13	<p>We have lived near the junction to Fellowes Way in Woodland Way since 1982, nearly 40 years and would like to object to the proposed parking controls.</p> <p>Unrestricted parking in this location does cause an obstruction to traffic and it can obscure drivers' line of sight, but not in the way your proposal suggests. We both drive and have never seen vehicles parked where your plan shows the proposal for double yellow lines.</p> <p>The problem as we see it is that double yellow lines need to be opposite the entrance to Woodland Way. This is where we have often had close encounters with vehicles attempting to enter Woodland Way (see a similar example pictured below). Also when trying to exit Woodland Way into Fellowes Way vehicles are forced to approach Woodland Way on the wrong side of the road and then cut the corner! (again see an accurate example of this in the picture below).</p> <p>According to the Highway Code, motorists should not park "opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space". This rule can be used to support decisions made by the police or other officials responsible for parking enforcement. This is to allow drivers emerging from, or turning into, the junction a clear view of the road they're joining.</p> <p>I am sure you are aware of these rules taken from the Highway Code:</p> <p>Rule 242 You MUST NOT leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road. <i>Laws RTA 1988, sect 22 & CUR reg 103</i></p> <p>Rule 243 DO NOT stop or park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space <p>This is just an example below of the problem we regularly encounter(as if looking from Woodland Way). It shows a vehicle attempting to enter what would be Woodland Way from Fellowes Way and the difficulty caused by the blue car parked where yellow lines are really needed.</p>
35	4	<p>With reference to the planned double yellow lines on the Hertford Road side, opposite Kimbolton Crescent, I feel it would be beneficial to extend the lines to outside 55 Hertford Road, and in the opposite direction to at least to outside 75, and possibly 77 Hertford Road.</p> <p>The reasons being that often delivery vans and trade lorries park directly outside number 75, and this causes problems for buses and other vehicles being unable to pass through, because of the close proximity of the traffic island.</p> <p>Also vehicles, particularly larger delivery vans that park outside number 55, cause a danger to traffic, as vehicles have to move over to the opposite side of the road to pass, which can cause a dangerous situation with traffic meeting head-on from vehicles exiting left from Kimbolton Crescent, which generally only tend to look to the right for oncoming traffic at the roundabout, and not expecting to meet traffic head-on, without any previous opportunity to see if the road is clear.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
36	V1	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed ban on parking along the verges and footpaths in Brook Drive.</p> <p>Although I agree, there most certainly is a parking problem which needs the Council's attention, I would like to know where exactly we, as residents, are supposed to park at night if the verges and footpaths have a ban.</p> <p>You have not proposed a solution, just a blanket ban in our street.</p> <p>As the pathway parking is only on one side of our road, is it not possible to have 'no parking' between certain hours on the offending side? Between 08.30 and 09.30 and then again between 15.00 and 16.00 for example. The road is generally quiet for pedestrian use during the day, becoming busier around school opening and closing times.</p> <p>We have various green areas along Brook Drive, on both sides, which could be used as parking bays, including plenty of room for surrounding pathways as the grassed areas are very deep and housing set far back from the road.</p> <p>I would also like to suggest white parking guide lines painted along the length of Brook Drive, similar to the ones in the new bays along Ashdown road, as inconsiderate parking by some residents is a major problem.</p> <p>The 12 parking bay area is only used by residents living in the direct vicinity and is of no use to residents living further up the road.</p> <p>I live in the middle of Brook Drive ... and at night and weekends there is literally nowhere to park, and unfortunately my front garden is not deep enough for a driveway to be authorised.</p> <p>I recently had a doorstep chat with my local Councillor Nick Leach and his team. They are very sympathetic to the vehicle owning residents and do not agree with a total ban of parking on the verges and pathways in Brook Drive. They made it clear that unless people are prepared to disagree with the Council's proposal, it will most certainly go ahead regardless and with no alternative solution put forward in favour of the driving residents.</p>
37	13	<p>Sirs, re. your recent (undated) letter about the above, my wife and I believe that such yellow lines are an obvious MUST.</p> <p>The corners of Woodland Way and Fellowes Way are so sharp that no sane person would ever park on them but the yellow lines may well deter the odd idiot driver.</p> <p>However, if the recently proposed conversion of the nearby house in FW to a "dance studio" goes ahead, there may well be such overcrowded street parking that some drivers may be tempted to squeeze up to the corners and thus restrict access to our roads.</p> <p>So, absolutely, YES to yellow lines.</p>
38	5,6,7	<p>I fully support the parking controls proposed for the Hertford Road junctions with Balmoral Close Caernarvon Close and Windsor Close as on numerous occasions it is impossible to cross safely with a small child.</p>
39	13	<p>Response 39.0</p> <p>Whilst I fully support your proposals I have to say that yellow lines do not go far enough. They need to be extended to the entrance to 49 Fellowes Way. The reason being that up to four cars regularly park on what is a very dangerous bend. This</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
39	13 cont'd	<p>means that I, my family and the residents of 37A, 39, 41, 43, 45 and 47 Fellowes Way have to pass them by driving on the wrong side of the road in to a blind bend. I and my neighbours have had many close shaves and it is an accident waiting to happen. Your present proposals will not stop this happening. I have enclosed a site map showing quite clearly what I mean.</p> <p>This is a good opportunity to remedy a dangerous situation all in one go and I hope you will take that opportunity.</p> <p>Response 39.1</p> <p>I wrote to you on 29 May 2021 supporting your proposals for double yellow lines at the Woodland Way / Fellowes Way junction.</p> <p>I still support these proposals but now withdraw my suggestion that the double yellow lines be extended as far as 49 Fellowes Way. I think this extension would cause more problems than it would solve.</p>
40	12	<p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>We are dismayed that residents have asked for the introduction of yellow lines for this reason and at these times of the day. How incredibly mean spirited! And if the Council agrees, then we will have lost respect for you too.</p> <p>We can still recall the stress of having to drop children off at school on time and then rush immediately off to work. Unless the parents or carers are parking across people's drives and behaving unsafely, please just leave them alone. Life is hard enough for younger people these days.</p> <p>If you hadn't put double yellow lines further up the road near the junction, some parents could have still been parking there. More yellow lines will only push the parking into another area instead. People who live any distance from the school will still have to drive!</p>
41	1	<p>With reference to your letter of the 27th May regarding parking controls on Broadwater Crescent.</p> <p>I live at ... and I am greatly in favour of these proposals.</p> <p>I see many near misses where a car is trying to get into BWC from the garage compound and cannot see either way clearly. It is worst on the right as it's a convex curve greatly reducing vision and is also close to a zebra crossing.</p> <p>This proposal cannot happen soon enough.</p>
42	13	<p>Thank you for your latest letter regarding parking controls. I am delighted that you are putting double yellow at the junction of Fellowes Way and Woodland Way.</p> <p>I would however ask you to consider adding double yellow lines to the outside of the bend taking you round the corner of 37 Fellowes Way where a number of cars are constantly parked. These cars at one time parked on the bend with their wheels on the pavement which helped cars to negotiate the bend in both directions. SBC later introduced 'no parking' on the pavement which meant these cars severely restricted your ability to get round the bend without hitting one of them in both directions.</p> <p>There is already considerable opposition to a 'Dance School' being opened in the annexe to No 37 Fellowes Way which will mean a considerable increase in cars coming and going every hour while the dance classes are in operation (please see the objections set out against that Planning Application). There is also a new house being built next to No 49 Fellowes Way which will have the drive close to this bend.</p> <p>There is also a further problem in Fellowes Way where two cars are parked opposite the block of garages on the south side of Fellowes Way. When cars are parked outside the garages it is difficult for cars let alone emergency vehicles</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
42	13 cont'd	<p>(ambulances, fire engines plus large delivery lorries) to pass in both directions. All other cars on the south side of Fellowes Way park on their front gardens apart from these two houses. Putting double yellow lines in this location is well overdue. I have written to tro about this before.</p> <p>If you are serious about what you said in your letter 'that parking that is liable to cause an obstruction to traffic and obscure drivers' sightlines; and to obstruct access for emergency vehicles both during the day and in the evening then SBC should be giving serious consideration providing double yellow lines to the two locations I set out above.</p> <p>Further to my email below I have a further suggestion regarding the parking on the outside of the bend opposite 37 Fellowes Way. As an alternative SBC could relax the 'no parking' on pavement in this location.</p> <p>Would you please acknowledge receipt of my two emails.</p>
43	3	<p>I have received the letter regarding the new proposed parking controls between Broadwater Crescent junction and the extension of this on Fellowes Way. I wish to register my formal objection to this proposal.</p> <p>I live at number Broadwater Crescent Stevenage, SG2 8EQ which is the Parking within the area is very limited and very difficult as it is without the additional restrictions added. Residents that live on Broadwater Crescent tend to park on Fellows Way or other nearby side roads close to their properties. Currently there are occasions where I have had to park a 10-minute walk away from my property and walk with my 2 small children. whilst I would prefer not to have to rely on my vehicle it is not practical due to work and lifestyle.</p> <p>As you can appreciate and understand there is a higher influx of vehicles parked on the roads on a day to day basis which I would put down to Covid-19/ lockdown with most people working from home.</p> <p>To put things into perspective, I would usually work in ... and be away from the property from 7.20am -6.30pm and therefore my vehicle wouldn't be parked outside during the day. The same is for some of the other neighbours that also work away from the area.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the option to rent a garage is not feasible to all due to the additional cost implications of this, especially if you're not a council resident and would therefore be liable to pay and increased charge and VAT costs.</p> <p>In addition, I do not say this next part to cause issues with those that live on Fellows way from property 2-16 as we are all neighbourly. But some of the property owners or residents drive over the curb to park directly outside their property and then park their additional vehicles on the road in front of the property. I personally do not have an issue with this and do not park on the road in front as I do not want confrontation with anyone but I know that this would be presented as a rebuttal argument from the local authority as available parking within the area.</p> <p>In addition to this I recently applied for a drop curb application, which was unfortunately declined. The reason for the application was due to the issues of parking within the area and having a relative (mother) that requires more care and support needs that would be moving in. Unfortunately, where I have had issues with parking in the area, and with her limited mobility I have on 2 occasions received parking tickets where I have had to park on the grass verge to assist her with getting into the property and settled.</p> <p>Please do take into consideration those of us that have to live within the area. As a driver of 15+ years I can understand and appreciate why roads need to be made safe but driving in general is hazardous and there are multiple blind spots that you come across. I personally do not see vehicles parking on Fellows Way as a major blinds pot, especially considering drivers must slow down to manoeuvre around the roundabout.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
44	13	<p>We have observed obstruction to traffic and obscured sight lines on the junction between Woodland Way and Fellowes Way on a number of occasions. Therefore, we would be supportive of parking controls in the immediate vicinity of this junction as per the associated drawing.</p> <p>However, this proposal will undoubtedly move the parking problem elsewhere on Woodland Way and Fellowes Way. This parking problem could be further exacerbated when the proposed property adjacent to number 49 Fellowes Way is developed and if the proposed planning approval for dance studio operations at 37 Fellowes Way is approved.</p> <p>Street parking along Fellowes Way is already near or at capacity in the evenings and at weekends making access for tradespeople and visitors difficult. This area certainly could not tolerate further parking restrictions and the best solution might be to explore the provision of additional dedicated parking bays - as has occurred on other streets around the town.</p>
45	V1	<p>To whom it may concern I am writing in response to your proposals to ban parking on the verges and footpaths.</p> <p>Whilst I agree in principal with this I feel that you are not aware of the issues regarding parking for residents of said street.</p> <p>I personally arrive home from work after 7pm and sometimes after 9pm most nights and am almost always faced with the prospect of looking elsewhere to park, quite often without success so eventually have to park opposite my house on the verge.</p> <p>I am not alone in this as I have monitored this and there are usually between 6-8 cars who have to park on the section of footpath between house number 29 down to the block of flats At the corner of Tye end. This is only done out of necessity as there's are no other spaces the entire length of Brook Drive, the additional 12 spaces created at the bottom are always full as the residents down at that end use them also there are numerous drop kerbs which mean the length of the road is irrelevant and as most houses have at least 1 vehicle and quite often 2 the parking spaces are not enough for the people living on the street. Also the bigger problem is that the stretch of Ashdown road at the bottom of Brook drive is also always full cars of residents having to park there which in effect makes that a dangerous stretch of road due to the narrowing of the lane, and cars traction fast also I have parked there twice over the last year and both times my car has been damaged once maliciously. I can't even find a space on Broadwater crescent to park.</p> <p>We have to face facts that most people now have to use a car to travel to work and I calculate there are over 50 households trying to find parking on a short stretch of road and most have more than 1 Vehicle.</p> <p>I can see a solution for the 6-8 cars parked on the small stretch mentioned above which means people have to cross to the other side to walk up or down Brook drive.</p> <p>Possible solution.</p> <p>Turn the pavement into parking parallel with the road between no 31 to the entrance to the flats and simply have the pavement behind it. IMO this could create around 8 spaces also a couple of diagonal spaces could be created by putting them opposite number 62 which is currently grass but 2 cars park on anyway Occasionally.</p> <p>The grassy area behind is more than wide enough to accommodate this and surely if safety is an issue then this would be a wise thing to do.</p> <p>This is the only stretch on Brook drive where there are cars on the pavement so this surely would solve the problem.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from someone.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
46	R1	<p>Thank you for your letter of 27 May concerning the proposed revocation of parking controls in Knebworth Gate.</p> <p>We have lived at 20 Knebworth Gate for 14 years and would like to express our serious concerns concerning the progressive parking difficulties and we do not support the revocation of parking controls.</p> <p>During the last two or three years in particular there has been a lot of increased parking difficulties in Knebworth Gate, especially on the verges at the entrance to Knebworth Gate and and on the very sharp bend that turns to the right. This includes a range of different vehicle types parking on the pavement on both sides of the road. On many occasions we have had to walk in the middle of the road, and not the pavement, when walking out of Knebworth Gate. When driving in and out of Knebworth Gate this parking has created a dangerous risk/hazard of a head on collision due to a very restricted view/obstruction and very limited space to manoeuvre. This is also a particular hazard during the winter months when conditions are icy. Having to drive on an icy bend with cars parked either side makes for a very dangerous manoeuvre with parked vehicles, as well as the possibility of approaching vehicles.</p> <p>The situation is a potential danger to cars/drivers/passengers as well as pedestrians who have to walk in the middle of the road to avoid the vehicles parked on the pavement.</p> <p>We feel very much that parking restrictions should be enforced, particularly at the dangerous entrance/bend described.</p> <p>Please do let us know if you require any further details.</p>
47	11	<p>This e-mail is in response to your letter dated 27 May 2021 concerning the extension of the “no waiting at any time” restrictions to Broad Oak Way.</p> <p>As I live at number ..., I have found it difficult to drive into this section of the road on football match days due to the poor parking of car owners. I am thus in agreement with the proposals outlined.</p> <p>However, I am disappointed that the extension to the “no waiting at any time” restrictions does not include the section of the road in front of The road here is narrower than the section outlined in your proposals. When cars are parked here drivers clearly find it difficult to keep to the road and vehicles do mount the pavement as shown by the many cracked pavement tiles in this area.</p> <p>Please could you consider extending the “no waiting at any time” restrictions to include the narrow road by house number</p>
48 (42.1)	13	<p>Dear ...</p> <p>Thank you for getting in touch. I am copying your comments to TRO so that they may be considered as part of the current consultation, especially with regard to the problem parking that does turn that end of Fellowes Way into a slalom.</p> <p>Many of your fellow residents have mentioned the Dance Studio and we are looking at the planning application.</p> <p>If I can be of further assistance please let me know.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p> <p>Nick Leech</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
48 (42.1)	13 cont'd	<p>Dear Nicholas</p> <p>I am attaching my letter regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Fellowes Way/ Woodland way and hope (if you agree with my comments) you can help get these issues resolved.</p> <p>You will see that I have addressed two other issues of parking in Fellowes Way which have been causing problems for some time. The first issue is the parking on the outside of the bend opposite No 37 Fellowes Way which has been exacerbated by the Dance Studio which has been in operation for 18 months but has been stopped temporarily pending the result of the planning application. Assistance is sought from you both for the parking restrictions and the planning application for the Dance Studio.</p> <p>A further problem is where two cars are permanently parked opposite the block of garages in Fellowes Way. This has been a long standing problem which has caused problems for all types of vehicles in both directions in Fellowes Way. This would be simply resolved by adding double yellow lines on the south side for the full length of the block of garages.</p> <p>Regards.</p>
49	11	<p>I am emailing you with regards to the proposed double yellow lines in broad oak way at its junction with cul-de-sac leading to Oakdell.</p> <p>I 100% support this proposal. This particular part of the road is not wide enough for two cars (one parked, one passing) meaning cars have to illegally mount the pavement in order to pass any parked cars. This is dangerous for the pedestrians using the pavements. There are a lot of children and parents with prams/buggies in the area that use these paths especially as it is a route to Fairlands Park and also in close vicinity of two primary schools and a secondary school. As it currently stands it is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Additionally the constant mounting of the pavement causes damage to the path and kerbs, there is water supply, drain pipes and sewage pipes that run under here which could be damaged as the path isn't designed for this kind of use.</p> <p>There is no need for people to park on this section of road as there is normally other parking spaces available further down the cul de sac towards Oakdell.</p>
49.1	11	<p>I'd like to formally agree with the plans for double-yellow lines along the narrow section of Broad Oak Way for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>Pedestrian Safety - This road is heavily used by pedestrians, with links to two schools, the Stevenage Football Club and Fairlands Valley Park.</p> <p>Passing Traffic has to mount the kerb and drive along the footway (in contravention to Highway Rule 30) to pass parked vehicles which requires pedestrians to take refuge in driveways as they pass.</p> <p>Damage to footways - There have been multiple repairs needed to these footways/dropped kerbs and recently a pipe running under the footway was damaged, requiring a neighbour's driveway to be dug up for repairs to take place.</p> <p>Existing parking provision - There is an existing provision for parking 50 yards past this narrow section created as part of the agreement for the new houses in Oakdell, with up to 150 yards of on-road parking, which is almost always completely unused.</p> <p>With the high risk of a pedestrian being struck by a vehicle, and the suitable parking provision further along this section of road, I see no issue as to why this cannot go ahead as proposed.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
50	14	<p>Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Formal Consultation of the proposed parking controls. I would like to make the 3 following suggestions.</p> <p>No 1: I would like to propose stop and give way lines be placed at the bottom of Grenville Way. Grenville Way joins in the middle of Lodge Way on the bend. There are currently no road markings there and drivers just pull out from the junction on the bend. It has it's own sight limitations down the road and there has been many near misses. Drivers from Grenville Way do not stop, they rarely ever look left to see what traffic is coming and when they just pull out it is dangerous for the driver driving along Lodge Way towards Woodland Way as well as oncoming traffic from the opposite direction.</p> <p>No 2: My second request for your consideration is for double yellow lines to be placed along the road opposite the driveways of No ... and No ... Lodge Way. The road is slightly narrower than normal and when a car is parked on the opposite side of the road it is impossible to pull off our drives without having to drive across the grass area's next to the footpath and a large section of the footpath itself and bump down the curb. It can also be difficult to pull on to our drive without mounting the curb, crossing the grass and footpath. This isn't good for our cars, the grass verges or pedestrians. I was in discussion with Stevenage Borough Council about this a few years back. An inspector came out nd attempted the manoeuvre himself and he agreed with me but nothing happened.</p> <p>No 3: There is an existing very large car park for people to use when they drive to Shephalbury Park. Access is from the A602 but there is no signage to make the public aware that the car parking facility is located there. Could a sign be placed at the junction of the A602 for Shephalbury Park be placed there? This would really help with the football teams that play there mid-week and Sundays. They currently block Lodge Way, which is a very small street and also Grenville Way.</p> <p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to help make safety improvement to our streets.</p>
51	4	<p>I am writing with regards to the letter dated 27th May 2021 regarding the proposed parking controls at the roundabout junction between Kimbolton Crescent and Hertford Road.</p> <p>I fully support the proposal but request if you would please consider extending the yellow lines as per my attached diagram.</p> <p>A transit van from 243 Kimbolton Crescent and commercial vehicle from 242 Kimbolton Crescent are parked daily in position A. This means that as you pull out of position B, your view to your left is totally obscured. It means that you have to pull out into the middle of the road to get a view and often into the path of traffic coming at speed from either direction. It is only a matter of time before a collision occurs.</p> <p>The parking situation in this area of Kimbolton Crescent is a highly emotive issue and I have witnessed arguments requiring a third person to become involved to separate the parties and I have also witnessed offensive and abusive notes being left of people's windscreens objecting to cars being parked in 'their' spot.</p> <p>The conflict around parking, in part, has arisen following the build of the new houses in Kimbolton Crescent and Spencer Way. The days of one car per household are long gone and with one exception, every one of these new houses in Kimbolton Crescent have 2 cars. NONE of them use their garages to store their vehicles. (I understand that this is their right and that they cannot be forced to use either their drive or garage.) This results in their second vehicle being parked across from their house including on road corners, which in turn has a knock-on effect as neighbours in the original Kimbolton Crescent houses are forced to park further down the road marked B.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
51	4 cont'd	<p>Many houses in SG2 8RN have at least 2 cars, some have 3 and at least 1 house has 4 cars. The parking is becoming an issue and is causing tension and frustration in the area. I appreciate that it is not within the remit of this proposal but it would be gratefully received if part of the green areas could be considered to accommodate additional parking spaces.</p>
52	R1	<p>I am writing to oppose the new proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>As a resident of Knebworth Gate for 11 years the parking on the curb as you drive into the road has become silly, although I believe this is as there is nowhere else to go. I firmly believe the parking in front of the green should not be removed as any visitors will have no where to park.</p> <p>Maybe just the curb before the bend could have a restriction?</p>
53	4	<p>Whilst some lines have been added as a token gesture, The yellow lines do not go all the way up to the corner of the road and large vans parked block view of on coming traffic and force out going traffic into the incoming lane, whilst they over take the parked vehicles. It is Deadly!</p>
54	13	<p>Regarding the proposed parking restrictions at junction of Fellowes Way and Woodland Way, I have no objections to this whatsoever, despite I believe it being implicit and covered in law by the Road Traffic act and that of the Highway Code. It is a dangerous junction, where the blind corner is very often undercut by vehicles entering into Woodland Way from Fellowes Way. To emphasise the no parking law at this junction, with the use of double yellow lines is a useful reminder of the danger of parking on junctions.</p> <p>I hope you do not mind but I would also like to take this opportunity of addressing another related local parking issue which has been raised within the local community.</p> <p>Proposals have been put forward, to request additional yellow lines on the bend of the Fellowes Way, top end Cul-de-sac. I believe this proposal has now been retracted but in case it still remains on file, I wish to oppose it and will give my reasons later if required.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed yellow lines at the junction in question.</p>
55	R2	<p>Further to my telephone conversation with you on Thursday 9.6.2021 where we discussed the contents of you letter dated 27.5.2021, my concerns are as follows.</p> <p>The statement that the road width in the carriage way is not wide enough to allow car parking on the carriage without causing an obstruction to the passage of traffic.</p> <p>The above car parking statement is not correct and needs to be reviewed, because the carriage way width has been designed 4.950mm wide, to accommodate a ridged vehicle and car to pass each other safely in opposite directions to and from the cul-de-sac in accordance with Communities and Local Government Department for Street Manuals.</p> <p>The above conditions means that between 2-3 cars 1900mm wide can be parked along the curved side of the road between No 58-60 Mandeville. Provided that no car parking is allowed on the other side of the road between No 51 and 57 Mandeville, with car verge parking restrictions being maintained. This procedure would ensure vehicles can pass by parked cars on the other side of the carriageway when entering and leaving the cul-de-sac with clear driving vision and head of vehicle accident collisions is totally avoided.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
55	R2 cont'd	<p>The above situation is a compromise in providing street parking for the neighbours located between No 61-69 Mandeville that have no car parking facilities who currently park their cars on the curved curb line entering the cul-de-sac and 20m up from the road junction up in Sleepers Hide.</p> <p>Prior to double yellow lines and car parking restriction being introduced in 2019. I have observed cars parking partially two wheels on the footpath, or four wheels on the footpath including parking on grass open area on occasions. These conditions obstructed pedestrians and the post Man walking the footpath, resulting in people walking across green open area or alternatively having to walk around the cars into the road which is a road safety mater.</p> <p>Proposals to widen the existing carriageway from 4.95m to approx. 6.0m, for providing road safety improvements and off-road car parking facilities.</p> <p>The Communities and Local Government Department for Streets document refers footway parking and the Disability discrimination Act 2005 and under section 6.3.16 to 6.3.19 states minimum footpath width of 1500mm. However, most local authorities will enforce 1200mm footpath width for pedestrian use in reviewing road safety issues.</p> <p>Therefore, the existing 1800mm footpath located either side of the existing carriage way can be reduced by an average width of 500mm for either side of the road. This would increase the existing carriageway width from 4950 to approximately 6000 wide and allow a car to pass safely between parked cars either side of the road at the entrance of the cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The above proposals should be given every consideration as a permanent solution to improve road safety, streetcar parking and to maintain a no parking on the footpath verge policy.</p> <p>Additional Community Car Parking Proposals</p> <p>There is an opportunity to provide car parking facilities to serve No 61-69 Mandeville at the rear of No 64 Mandeville, located at the bell mouth adjacent to the cycle track and grass open areas. The one-way access route would be from Oaks Cross to Broad Water main Road with double yellow lines being installed to control car parking down the lane to designated car parking areas.</p> <p>There also maybe the opportunity for Stevenage Borough Council to work in partnership with the local church at Sleepers hide and enquire whether visitor's car parking could be provided on a short stay basis.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I have lived at ..., and I am very much aware that my neighbours living between No 61-69 Mandeville occupy land locked houses with no parking facilities and it is important that maybe a residence car park parking scheme is introduced to satisfy their needs with allocated car parking within reasonable walking distance.</p> <p>I believe it would be beneficial for a traffic management survey and audit to be carried out in the future to review the above.</p> <p>My proposals that I have put forward for car parking on one side of the cul-de-sac road and for the carriage way to be widen are very practical and reasonable solutions for maintaining road users and pedestrians safety, in compliance with the Communities and Local Government Department for Streets document and Disability discrimination Act 2005.</p> <p>Further to my letter and Email issued 17.6.2021 timed 17.01.</p> <p>I arrived home yesterday evening at 8pm and on my arrival entering the Mandeville cul – de – sac the Black Car that is parking on the footpath verge in the photograph attached to my letter was not there parked between No 51- 57</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
55	R2 cont'd	<p>Mandeville . This meant I could see that the TESCO Delivery Van had driven passed two cars parked on the curved kerb line between No 58 and 60 Mandeville and was delivering grocers to No 64 Mandeville</p> <p>I parked my car and then watched the TESCO Van drive out of the CUL – De – Sac passed the two cars parked on the curved side of the road then drive down Mandeville Street with out any issues at all.</p> <p>I have previously , reviewed other streets nearby were the same condition are in existence, were there is car parking on one side of the road, and cars and delivery vehicles can pass safely on the other side of the road, without any issues at all , and car parking controls remain in place .</p>
56	10	<p>Objection to Proposed Parking Controls Brook Drive junction with Ashdown Road (No Waiting)</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 27th May 2021.</p> <p>I wish to formally oppose the proposed ‘No waiting at any time’ restrictions in their current format.</p> <p>The proposed restriction is directly I have had good opportunity to observe the junctions of both Ashdown Road and Brook Drive. I have not observed any of the issues outlined in the reasons stated for the imposition of new restrictions, and I would invite Stevenage Borough Council to share any redacted complaints which they have received about this junction. I don't believe that there have been any road traffic collisions in this period involving either vehicles or pedestrians.</p> <p>Despite having never seen a vehicle parked on the corner of the junction, I do not object to ‘No Waiting at any time’ restrictions being placed at the actual junction, as clearly forcing any vehicle onto the opposite side of the road is dangerous. My concern and objections are based on the distance that the restriction continues in to Brook Drive. I have no doubt that any person who regularly uses Brook Drive would agree that the proposed restrictions are being applied to the part of the street which is easiest to navigate.</p> <p>The reasons provided for the proposed control include lack of access to emergency vehicles. This part of Brook Drive is the only part of the entire street in which traffic can still pass a refuse vehicle while other vehicles are parked on the road. Although it isn't reflected in the planning application documents which just show ‘Parking Area’, there is a 230cm wide area between the marked parking bays and the carriageway. This is wider than most vehicles and is the same width as each lane of Brook Drive. This creates a natural passing point for two vehicles at one time for the entire length of marked spaces. Even with vehicles parked on the area opposite the parking bays, this still leaves a minimum of 4.6m for passing vehicles. A Scania Fire Engine is 2.3m wide. There are no other parts of Brook Drive which allow such generous access, but there appears to be no application to apply such restrictions elsewhere and it is difficult to understand why there is such inconsistency.</p> <p>The second reason quoted for applying restrictions was lack of visibility for traffic approaching the junction. Driving along Brook Drive towards the junction with Ashdown Road there is a public green to the left, and a public green to the right. There are existing controls on Ashdown Road preventing verge parking. This allows a good view from Ashdown Road to Brook Drive and vice versa. This is not impeded by vehicles parked in the proposed control area (other than the actual corner) as Ashdown Road is a steep hill, so regardless of the direction of travel, you can see both roads.</p> <p>I have no doubt that this proposal is made with the best of intentions, however I believe that the control will result in unintended consequences and reduce road</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
56	10 cont'd	<p>safety in Brook Drive. Since 'No Verge Parking' was introduced in Ashdown Road, significantly more vehicles park entirely on the road at the upper sections nearer to Broadwater Crescent. This has been effective in reducing the speed at which some drivers travel along the road as more caution is required with there being poorer visibility and points at which only one vehicle can pass. It would only require one visit to understand that some people now drive irresponsibly fast from Hertford Road towards Ashdown Road until the point they are forced to slow down due to vehicles parked on Ashdown Road. Preventing parking on the whole section of the proposed part of Brook Drive will create an extension to the Ashdown Road racetrack. Brook Drive is already used as a rat run to Broadwater Crescent. A clearer road would be a great advantage to those driving in a hurry as there would be no need to slow down or give way to other drivers. Any increase of vehicle speed is of concern, especially next to where children play, and on a road which needs to be crossed to access parking bays.</p> <p>The proposal does reduce parking which is disappointing as the other proposed control for Brook Drive (verge parking) will increase demand for parking on this part of the street. The huge benefit which was provided when 12 new bays were created two years ago will be halved if 6 spaces of on street parking are lost. This combined with the number of local unrentable council owned garages which remain boarded up (29 as of 2018), create quite an issue for local residents.</p> <p>I believe that controls at the junction only would be of greater benefit in promoting road safety than those which are currently proposed. I would be keen to discuss this further.</p>
57	3	<p>Dear Nick,</p> <p>I am emailing you today to express my feelings about more parking restrictions being put in place in my street.I have lived ... in fellowes way since 1995 and have always had issues parking. This has only been due to most people having 2 or more vehicles.. There is also an issue with large vans,most of which belong to tenants who live on broadwater crescent. I believe a more fairer way of dealing with parking issues would be permit parking. I would love to have my driveway done but i am a household that does not live with any benefits to top up money so my wages are bills and not much else. So maybe the council should help council tenants to have driveways done.</p>
58	12	<p>Thank you for your revised proposed parking restrictions for park view (cul de sac serving number 28 -35). We welcome the proposed removal of double yellow lines and introduction of single yellow line from outside number 34 and into the turning head.</p> <p>. There is a small gap between our dropped kerb and the dropped kerb ... next door. This is often used as a parking space. However, it is not large enough for a car (you may just fit a smart car) to be parked without a set of wheels overhanging either our dropped kerb or the dropped kerb of the garage. It also means we cannot safely get off our drive around any parked car there and have to use the turning head to turn round. Please can you advise how this will work once the turning head can be parked in. Please note, we have been advised by your council office that the space between the two dropped kerbs is not a space and we are to contact the traffic warden to issue tickets. We have contacted the traffic warden several times and they have come out as people are moving their cars. Number ... runs a swim school from her house so there is always a constant stream of traffic parking there and obviously the time it takes a for a traffic warden to come out means that they have moved before he gets there (each car is parked there for around 40 mins). When the parking restrictions first went in your office advised that yellow lines would go down there to prevent roller parking there and creating a safety issue. The</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
58	12 cont'd	<p>markers were sprayed up but we are still waiting. Please can you advise further. We have paid a lot of money to secure safe off-road parking and would like to be able to use it without obstruction or safety issues and without having to regularly contact the traffic warden. I would be grateful if you could contact me regarding this further.</p> <p>Also, one last moan 😊, we fully support the proposals of changing the double yellow lines to a single from outside number 34 as your map indicates. If these plans were to be changed to include the removal of double yellow lines outside number 35 and replacing with single yellow lines we would not support it. Before the restrictions were put in, we could not get off our driveway due to the swim school users</p> <p>Thanks for your help. We have many photos of the parking over the dropped kerbs and vision restrictions cause by it if required.</p>
59	8	<p>Thank you for planning and regulation letter dated 27/05/2021.</p> <p>I appreciate the efforts you are making to revoke the yellow lines to encourage parking from the bend where it causes danger.</p> <p>I think that you could have been more generous with this slightly and revoked at least to the front porch of 83 Blenheim way , this would still be on a straight part of the road and offer 1 to 1.5 more parking spaces. At the moment all of the revoked lines are under 4 lime trees and although lovely people are reluctant to park under trees due to the mess their cars get into.</p> <p>At the moment they are 5/6 cars that regularly park on the bend and I think a little extra would go a long way especially when it is not under the trees.</p> <p>Please consider my request I've lived in ... since 1997</p>
60	12	<p>Hi, I'll be blunt.</p> <p>The only thing that will work is if double yellow lines are put down, up to number 17 as this address isn't being used / occupied and hasn't been for many years for very long periods & people are still parking their constantly. When a resident moves in there permanently as will do one day, it will be a problem for them, as they want be able to get out of there own drive.</p>
61	3	<p>I am writing in respect of the formal consultation (ref: TPE/03/19-5/F) concerning the extension of double yellow lines into Fellowes Way at the junction with Broadwater Crescent.</p> <p>I own one of the properties that the extended lines would cover and I see no benefit to this change, as we have not witnessed any traffic or parking issues with the lines as they are.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would make it more difficult for delivery and trade businesses to access our property and others nearby. The main bottleneck caused by parked vehicles is actually further into Fellowes Way than this planned extension and therefore it may actually exacerbate this as people are forced to park further up the road (or on the nearby grass verges and damaging them, which has been a problem in the past).</p>
62	10 & V1	<p>Have tried to e-mail this to tro@stevenage.gov.uk to object to the propped parking. Your Ref : TPE/03/19-5F. The e-mail just keeps bouncing back, not very good if you are asking for peoples opinions to reply to this e-mail address. Please could you forward this on to the right department. Thank you.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
62	10 & V1 cont'd	<p>We want to object to the stupid proposed parking in Brook Drive Also having discussed this with our neighbours we are all in agreement that this will not work and is unnecessary . By putting double yellow lines down Brook Drive opposite the junction of Ashdown road is a crazy idea. It doesn't need it it works perfectly as it is. The parking bays work really well, if we cant park in the bays we have to park on the side of the road where we used to park before the parking bays....the bays alongside where do we park when the bays are full and your stupid yellow lines are in place. We fully understand stopping the parking on the pavement. Why not worry about all the vehicles parked down Ashdown Road opposite the junction of Brook Drive. At the moment from 7 am in the morning we have all the construction workers parking down Ashdown Road. What happens when the new builds are finished(Malvern Place,)they have allocated spaces probably for one car but most houses have 2 where will these park. Why not put more parking bays on the grass where the Highways had their cabins for so long while they were working on the roads. Or cut into the grass verges down Ashdown Road. Another point is to change the sign at the entrance to Brook Drive to no parking on the verges from Ashdown Road end this is far cheaper than putting double yellow lines.</p>
63	03 Rev1	<p>We live at the ... Fellowes Way, Stevenage, Herts SG2 8BW. ... and this road is already overcrowded with parking cars we do not agree with any extension double yellow lines as it will make even difficult for people to find space for parking. My parents have ongoing appointments and we will be struggling if other cars take over our parking space.</p>
64	R1	<p>Dear sirs, I would whole heartedly applaud the removal of parking restrictions in Knebworth gate.....with the exception of the corner of the culdesac sac entrance. People often park on the bend and in the event of an emergency I doubt (for eg) a fire engine would be able to gain access .</p> <p>Maybe restrictions from the corner down to the main road might be sensible?</p> <p>Within the culdesac , I think restrictions should definitely be removed as we struggle for parking at the best of times</p> <p>I think most residents would totally back the partial redevelopment of the grassy area if it provided some much needed visitor parking !!</p>
65	R1	<p>With reference to your letter dated 29 October 2021 regarding the proposal to permanently remove the verge and footway parking prohibition in Knebworth Gate, I am in total agreement.</p> <p>I believe that there is no need for these parking restrictions in Knebworth Gate, and they should be removed.</p>
66	R1	<p>I live at no. ... Knebworth Gate and I strongly request no parking controls are enforced. I already feel that there is not enough parking for residents as it is let alone stopping residents parking near their garages or along the pathway. As we live near a main road the closest we would be able to park would be Roebuck Gate if we were not able to park within the close, this is not ideal.</p>
67	R1	<p>With reference to your letter.</p> <p>I would like to have the present situation whereby there are NO RESTRICTIONS to parking at Knebworth Gate to remain permanently. That is to say that we can continue parking partly on the road and partly on the pavement with NO RESTRICTIONS.</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
68	R1	We DO NOT wish for the parking controls to be implemented as parking on the footpaths in the only way we can park and not being able to will cause congestion and take away parking availability
69	03 Rev 1	<p>I am writing regarding your latest communication, Received 03/11/2021.</p> <p>I think the new yellow lines should be on the South side of fellowes way - Option B. This would mean that everyone will then be parked on the same side of the road as residents who live further up Fellowes Way also park on the north side of the road and therefore there will not be any obstruction to emergency services or anyone else driving up/down Fellowes Way.</p> <p>That being said your consultation is STILL NOT ADDRESSING THE CAUSE which is lack of parking. Everyone on the south side of the road could have a drive but everyone on the north side of the road, myself included, living on the large green area, can not have a drive. We have no choice but to park on the roadside. Why is your consultation not addressing this fact. All you are doing is taking away much needed parking spaces. Why haven't you come up with alternatives? The large green, for instance, could be used to create many parking spaces.</p> <p>It's all very well putting yellow lines all over broadwater/stevenage and whilst I do agree, there is a problem, your solution is only going to create more problems. Not everyone who parks at the bottom of Fellowes Way, lives in Fellowes Way. I know of at least 2 cars that are parked, where the owners are actually residents of Broadwater crescent, Where parking is also a problem.</p> <p>Let's create positivity and not negativity by coming up with some proper solutions instead of creating new problems, after all, your title is Parking management officer, is it not?? I put it to you, that you should start acting like a parking management officer and not a problem creating Officer.</p>
70	R1	Thank you for calling to explain the situation to me, I would be very happy if you were to permanently remove any parking restrictions as we have limited parking here as you have seen and the road has no direct access to anywhere else.
71	R1	<p>As far as I'm aware there were no issues or complaints about parking until the council put the signs up seemingly as a matter of course (as they did for the whole area) without any specific reason.</p> <p>When the signs went up some people were perplexed and unhappy and did complain and they were taken down. I, and others, had assumed that that was the end of it. Why was it felt that a consultation is necessary? I'm guessing there have been no complaints since they were taken down as this has always been the norm which people were happy with until the restrictions were imposed unnecessarily and since the restrictions were removed things have gone back to normal again. The only traffic here is from residents and their guests, delivery drivers and people doing works. No football fans park here. On the bend it is safer to park partially on the pavement as otherwise if people park wholly on the road it hampers access for all residents and anyone entering the street, and this particularly relevant to access for emergency services vehicles and this is potentially more dangerous. It was evident that when people were parking fully on the road a fire engine would not be able get into the street Has anyone from the council actually visited the street to make an assessment?</p> <p>You say that no response will mean the restrictions are re-imposed, when it makes far more sense to do the reverse and leave things as they are and always have been except for that brief period when restrictions were imposed apparently for no other reason than that they were imposed on the whole area. Why consult on the</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
71	R1 cont'd	removal of something that was neither necessary or desired and is in fact dangerous? My view is leave well alone. Many people will no doubt not read the letter and will therefore not respond as there is no expectation of this being an issue as people have assumed it had gone away. If you put signs up again people will then notice and will complain and they'll get taken down again. This would be a waste of everyone's time and the council's money. Like I say, my view is that the best course of action is to leave things as they are with the restrictions removed.
72	7 Rev1	<p>I refer to your letter regarding the formal consultation for parking controls at the Balmoral Close / Hertford Road Junction Ref TPE/03/19-5/F/07.</p> <p>It is good that you have taken on board the concerns from the residents of Balmoral Close regarding the parking opposite the Junction by the residents in Hertford Road and have proposed double yellow lines on both sides.</p> <p>As all of these properties in Hertford Road have drives and off road parking I find it strange that the drives are often empty and their cars parked on the road causing an obstruction and for traffic to drive on the wrong side of the road, in particular buses.</p> <p>Could I ask what distance is proposed from the finish of the corners into Balmoral Close?</p> <p>The recommended distance, Highway Code rule 243, is 10 metres or 32 feet either side facing the direction of the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Is this what is proposed?</p>
73	R1	I write to confirm that am in favour of permanent removal of the verge and footway parking prohibition in Knebworth Gate.
74	07 Rev1	I agree that double yellow lines should be put in place at the Balmoral Close junction.
75	R1	<p>I'm writing to you in relation to the permanent removal of parking controls in Knebworth gate.</p> <p>I reside at ... Knebworth Gate and agree the parking controls should be permanently removed, Knebworth gate is a dead end and only used by us the residents, as most households have more than one car included we need to have the ability to park our cars so the removal of the parking controls should be agreed.</p> <p>As Knebworth Gate is residential and has no through traffic cars being parked on the pathways or verge do not cause any obstructions or issue to the residents.</p> <p>Please take this email as my confirmation that the parking controls should be removed.</p> <p>Thank you for the letter giving us the opportunity to voice our opinions before the close of this matter</p>
76	13 Rev1	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 29 October 2021 regarding parking controls.</p> <p>I agree with the double yellow lines being put both sides of the bend at the junction of Fellowes Way and Woodland Way but see no need to put double yellow lines on the straight north side of Fellowes Way. You haven't done this further down Fellowes Way so why do you think it necessary in this location.</p> <p>There is considerable frustration from residents regarding cars parked on the</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
76	13 Rev1 cont'd	<p>outside of the bend taking you round the corner of 37 Fellowes Way where a number of cars are continuously parked (a point I raised in my earlier letter on the subject). At that time I was suggesting adding double yellow lines at that location but have since changed my view and believe it would be better if the 'no parking on pavements' was lifted in this location. This would ease the problem of negotiating the bend. SBC have recently granted planning consent for a Dance School to be run from 37 Fellowes Way and this would help with the additional parking generated from this activity.</p> <p>You have not shown double yellow lines in Fellowes Way where two cars are parked opposite the block of garages on the south side of Fellowes Way. When cars are parked outside the garages it is difficult for cars let alone emergency vehicles (ambulances, fire engines, refuse trucks plus large delivery lorries) to pass in both directions. All other cars on the south side of Fellowes Way park on their front gardens apart from these two houses. Putting double yellow lines in this location is well overdue. I have written to tro about this before. This is a dangerous situation which has been allowed to continue for far too long.</p> <p>If you are serious about what you said in your letter "that parking that is liable to cause an obstruction to traffic and obscure drivers' sightlines; and to obstruct access for emergency vehicles both during the day and in the evening then SBC should be giving serious consideration providing double yellow lines to this location outside these garages. In the case of the bend outside 37 Fellowes Way SBC should relax the 'no parking on pavements' in this location.</p>
77	R1	<p>I would like to confirm that I would like the restrictions on parking on the verge or footpaths in Knebworth Gate to be removed please.</p>
78	R1	<p>I confirm that I live at number ... Knebworth Gate and wish for the permanent removal of parking controls at Knebworth Gate.</p> <p>There is little parking at the properties so the verges and footways are vital for friends and family to park</p>
79	13 Rev1	<p>Regarding your proposal of additional double yellow lines at the junction between Fellowes Way and Woodland Way.</p> <p>I live at ... and already struggle to get in and out of the driveway when vehicles park adjacent to and opposite the drive. I know that the next door neighbours and those opposite suffer the same problem.</p> <p>It seems to me that the double yellow lines you propose would push the visiting vehicles further along Woodland Way and therefore outside our houses which causes us problems not of our making.</p> <p>As all the houses in Woodland Way have their own driveways then maybe extending the yellow lines further along Woodland Way would discourage the visiting vehicles from parking there because of longer walks. Another option would be to make our end of Woodland Way residential parking only.</p>
80	03 Rev1	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 29-10-21As the tenant of garage number... I would much prefer option A. As I have pointed out</p> <p>before because of the number of cars parked along the road and the two sometimes three cars parked opposite the garages</p> <p>it is impossible to see up or down the road and so is becoming really dangerous when trying to leave the garage block. This is not</p>

Response no.	Plan no.	Comments
80	03 Rev1 cont'd	<p>helped by the speed which some cars travel up and down the road. Fellowes Way now has a new generation of young children</p> <p>and I feel something should be done very soon to make the road a safer place,</p>
81	R1	<p>With reference to your letter dated 29/10/2021, I am writing to voice my opinion about the parking restrictions in Knebworth Gate, Stevenage. I would like you to either restart enforcement against vehicles parking on the verge and footpaths. Or maybe replace the green area available with car park spaces. Possibly install metal railings on both sides of the footpaths with double yellow lines as well. This will allow disabled mobility scooter user to ride on the footpath as intended and not on the road and therefore avoid having an accident. Parking fines or tickets only work if they are enforced which means preferably before 9a.m. and after 6p.m. and at weekends. This may be a lot to ask, but at least emergency vehicles will be able to get into the street if this is done. I shall look forward to your reply at your earliest convenience.</p>
82	03 Rev1	<p>I am writing in respect of your letter of October 29th, reference as above.</p> <p>Thank you for acknowledging the concerns raised about the double yellow lines and for consulting residents further with a choice of solutions.</p> <p>We would prefer that the double yellow lines be painted on the north side of the road only, as per Option A on your letter.</p>