

Meeting: Portfolio Holder Decision

Portfolio Area: Economy, Enterprise & Transport

Date: DD December 2025

Consideration of consultation responses: proposed double yellow lines in Sish Lane and Titmus Close.

Author – Liviu Azoicai (Traffic & Parking Enforcement Manager)

Contact Officers – Liviu Azoicai (extension 2295)

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1. To detail responses received to a statutory public consultation on proposed double yellow lines in Sish Lane opposite its junction with Broxdell and in Titmus Close at its junction with Sish Lane for consideration by the Portfolio Holder.
- 1.2. To enable the Portfolio Holder in consultation with Ward Councillors to decide if and how the Council will now proceed with these proposals.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. That proposed double yellow lines in Titmus Close are not implemented.
- 2.2. That proposed double yellow lines in Sish Lane are implemented with a shorter length as shown on plan TPE/03/25-02/01/Rev1.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. Under an Agency Agreement with Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) (the Traffic Authority for the area) Stevenage Borough Council (SBC) is empowered to make Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for the control and restriction of parking and enforce those restrictions through Civil Parking Enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 3.2. In December 2024, Stevenage Borough Council received a petition signed by 30 individuals from 15 different households from Broxdell area of Stevenage. They expressed concerns about road safety related to vehicles parking in Sish Lane near its junction with Titmus Close. The petitioners asked the Council to introduce double yellow lines.
- 3.3. After consulting with the Portfolio Holder in line with the Council's petition rules, it was decided that double yellow lines should be formally proposed and a public

consultation to be held to provide an opportunity for those likely to be affected to express their views before a final decision was taken.

- 3.4. After consultation with the Police and HCC, neither of which raised any concerns, authorisation was given by Kathryn Carr, (Strategic Director) for the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order for public consultation in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 3.5. These formal proposals for statutory public consultation were advertised through a Notice of Proposals that was published in the Stevenage edition of The Comet on 2 October 2025. Copies of this notice were also erected on local street furniture, and notification letters were sent to addresses in the vicinity of the proposals and to statutory consultees. The consultation continued until 25 October 2025.
- 3.6. Deposited documents including the Notice of Proposals and a Statement of Reasons for proposing to make this Order, together with copies of the draft Order and map showing the locations and effects of the Order, were made available for the public to inspect at the Council's offices in Daneshill House and via its website.
- 3.7. The consultation having been completed, it is now necessary for a decision to be made on if and how the Council should proceed with the introduction of and changes to parking restrictions that have been proposed.

4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION AND OTHER OPTIONS

Summary of consultation responses

- 4.1. A total of 16 written responses were received about the proposed parking restrictions during the public consultation stage. Copies of the responses are included in Appendix 1: Detailed Consultation Responses.
- 4.2. One of the responses received was a petition signed by 74 individuals from 53 different households. The petitioners opposed the introduction of proposed double yellow lines outside properties 177, 179 and 181 Sish Lane. The petition highlighted that these households rely on that on-street area for parking their vehicles because their properties do not benefit from off-street parking facilities.
- 4.3. The proposals were clearly opposed by 10 responses, four expressed concerns/suggested alternative solutions and two expressed their support for introduction of double yellow lines.
- 4.4. Broad themes in consultation responses included:
 - i. Concerns that the proposed restrictions if implemented will lead to a parking displacement causing issues in nearby areas such as Titmus Close.
 - ii. Concerns about the impact of restrictions on those residents who regularly park their cars on-street in that area because they live in properties without off-street parking facilities.

- iii. Concerns about the impact of restrictions on those residents with disabilities or are elderly and are unable to park further away from their property.
- iv. Concerns about vehicles regularly speeding in that area of Sish Lane. Suggestions for traffic calming measures to be implemented.
- v. A request for a diseased tree to be removed to allow property occupiers in that area to apply for a residential dropped kerb.
- vi. A suggestion to allow residents to park their vehicles on the verge.
- vii. A suggestion to redesign the parking layby located in Sish Lane adjacent to Trigg Terrace to increase the number of parking spaces.

Reasons for recommendations

- 4.5. It is acknowledged that several properties in that area of Sish Lane adjacent to its junctions with Broxdell, Broadview and Barclay Crescent do not benefit from off-street parking facilities and some of these households rely on the existing kerb-side space for parking their vehicles. Prohibiting on-street parking in that area would lead to a vehicle displacement affecting parking in adjacent streets such as Titmus Close.
- 4.6. After taking in consideration the concerns listed in article 4.4.i. related to parking displacement, it is recommended not to implement the proposed restrictions in Titmus Close and to implement the proposed double yellow lines in Sish Lane with a reduced length as shown on plan TPE/03/25-2/01Rev1. This means that the likely parking displacement will consist only in two cars which can be parked elsewhere in Sish Lane or in the nearby Council's garage compounds subject to garage availability at the time of the application.
- 4.7. It is recommended that the proposed double yellow lines in Sish Lane are introduced with a reduced length as shown on plan TPE/03/25-2/01Rev1, therefore, parking outside properties 177 -181 Sish Lane will remain unrestricted as requested by those who signed the petition as mentioned in articles 4.2 and 4.4.ii above.
- 4.8. In response to concerns mentioned in article 4.4.iii above, residents that are blue badge holders can apply for an advisory disabled parking space to be marked as close as possible to their property to help them park near their homes.
- 4.9. The concerns about vehicle speed listed in article 4.4.iv were shared with the Highways Department at Hertfordshire County Council who is the local highway authority in Stevenage and has the legal power to implement traffic calming measures or no entry signs at Sish Lane junction with Grace Way.
- 4.10. The diseased tree outside properties 179-181 Sish Lane is located on land managed by Hertfordshire County Council. Stevenage Borough Council requested their approval to remove it. This has been granted recently, and the tree will be removed in due course as part of the routine tree maintenance schedule. The Borough Council will plant new healthy young trees elsewhere in the street.

- 4.11. The grass verges are part of highway land managed by Hertfordshire County Council. The Borough Council does not have the authority to replace them with permeable paving grids as suggested in article 4.4.vi above.
- 4.12. The mentioned parking layby in article 4.4.vii is located opposite properties 165-169 Sish Lane and currently can accommodate approximately six parked cars. If the layout of this layby is changed into a perpendicular parking area by removing a significant grass area, then approximately 16 vehicles would be able to park, a net gain of ten parking spaces. The costs for these works will be approximately £43000, funds which currently are not available to the Borough Council's Engineers. Furthermore, the green area is adopted highway land maintain by Hertfordshire County Council and the Borough Council does not have the power to authorise such works considering that it will breach the County Council's adopted Transport Policies.

Next step

- 4.13. If it is decided to proceed as recommended, then the Traffic Regulation Order will be sealed and those who took part in the consultation will be notified accordingly. The short length of double yellow lines could be marked before the end of the current financial year, depending on the timing of the decision, the weather conditions and other factors.

Other options

- 4.14. If it is decided not to proceed as recommended in article 2.1 and 2.2 above, the alternatives are:
- To implement the original proposals unaltered. This is not recommended as it would not address residents' and others' legitimate concerns about the potential impact of restrictions.
 - To decide not to progress the proposal and end the entire project. This is not recommended as it would not address the road safety concerns related to vehicles parking in Sish lane opposite Broxdell junction. Those concerns were raised through a previous petition signed by 27 individuals in December 2024.
 - To prepare and consult on proposals for additional, different or significantly altered restrictions. This is not recommended as there is little justification for doing so. It would unduly delay the completion of the project and would not represent good use of resources.

5. IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications

- 5.1. If it is decided to proceed as recommended a capital budget is available for the implementation of the scheme.
- 5.2. If it is decided not to proceed, a capital saving would be made.

Legal Implications

5.3. None identified.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

5.4. None identified.

Service Delivery Implications

5.5. The addition of new parking restrictions will place further demand on limited parking enforcement and administrative resources, increasing the likely need to expand the service in future.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

5.6. Petition dated December 2024.

5.7. Deposit documents for formal public consultation.

5.8. Template letter from formal public consultation.

5.9. Appendix 1: Detailed Consultation Responses.