

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH WILLIAM SMITH CLOSE, CAMBRIDGE

To: Cambridge City Joint Area Committee

Meeting Date: 14th July 2015

From: Executive Director: Economy, Transport & Environment

Electoral division(s): Romsey

Forward Plan ref: N/A **Key decision:** No

Purpose: To determine objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) associated with William Smith Close

Recommendation: a) Approve and make the Order as advertised
b) Inform the objectors accordingly

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Richard Lumley
Post:	Head of Local Infrastructure and Streets Management
Email:	richard.lumley@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 703839

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1** William Smith Close is a no through road located in the Romsey Ward of Cambridge. The Close is highly residential in nature with apartment blocks located at the western and northern ends of the street. Both blocks have access to an off-street car parking facility as do the majority of residents on the Close.
- 1.2** The proposal has arisen from former County Councillor Kilian Bourke and aims to introduce double yellow line parking restrictions on bends that are potentially hazardous to moving traffic. Refuse vehicles, in particular, have difficulty in accessing bin stores for the blocks of flats at the top of the street (Appendix 1).

2. TRO PROCESS

- 2.1** The TRO procedure is a statutory consultation process that requires the Highway Authority to advertise, in the local press and on-street, a public notice stating the proposal and the reasons for it. The advert invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a twenty one day notice period.

- 2.2** The TRO was advertised in the Cambridge News on the 27th February 2015. The statutory consultation period ran from 27th February – 20th March.

The statutory consultation resulted in three objections, one statement of general comment and one letter of support. These are detailed in appendix 2. The Police offered no objections and no other emergency service commented.

- 2.3** On the basis of this analysis it is recommended that this Order is made for the reasons:

- General road safety
- Facilitate the movement of traffic

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**
There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

The necessary resources to progress this project have been secured through the Transport Delivery Plan.

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

The statutory process for this TRO has been followed.

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

The statutory consultees have been engaged – (County Councillor, the Police and the Emergency Services).

Notices were placed in the local press and were also displayed on the roads affected by the TRO. The proposal was available to view at the Reception of Shire Hall.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The (former) Local Member, Councillor Kilian Bourke has been involved throughout the process and supports the proposal.

4.6 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Source Documents	Location
Draft Traffic Regulation Order Letters of Objection	Room 209 Shire Hall Castle Hill Cambridge CB3 0AP

APPENDIX 1 –William Smith Close (Location)



APPENDIX 2		
Objections or Comments		Officer Response
1.	<p>I wish to object to one aspect of the proposals to introduce double yellow lines in William Smith Close.</p> <p>Our objection is to the proposed yellow lines at the entrance to Rustat Road. There is no evidence that there have ever been problems of access for emergency or refuse vehicles at this junction. This has been checked with drivers of refuse vehicles who assure us there are never any such problems at this point.</p> <p>Publicity from local Councillors states that restrictions further down the Close would lead to displaced vehicles using this space. Seven of the eight houses near the junction, which would be affected by the proposed double yellow lines, have dropped kerbs. There is no space for parked vehicles without completely blocking the dropped kerb area.</p> <p>All the local streets in this area are fully parked by long term parkers, who use every available space to obtain free parking. But none of these parkers use this area of dropped kerbs. If they don't now, it is most improbable that restrictions further down the road would in any way change the position. So the displacement argument does not really have any validity.</p> <p>Thus, we believe that there is no need to impose parking restrictions in this part of the proposed scheme. Furthermore such restrictions would prevent legitimate short term parking by, for example delivery or tradesmens' vehicles</p>	<p>The proposal to install double yellow lines around the junction of Rustat Road and William Smith Close is not only designed to keep that junction clear of parked vehicles but it is also recognised as being good engineering practice and to reinforce the principles of the Highway Code.</p> <p>Whilst there may be no evidence that there are problems with access, it makes sense to anticipate such issues and mitigate against it. In addition, there is expected to be some displacement of parking which could manifest itself at the junction despite guidance stated by the Highway Code which advises motorists against parking near to junctions.</p> <p>Experience and evidence of parking practices in Cambridge City and elsewhere in the County suggest that motorists will park where convenient. Some will even park their vehicles in such a way that blocks or overhangs dropped accesses.</p> <p>Delivery vehicles may park during the course of carrying out their duties should they be in the process of loading or unloading goods from their vehicles. Tradesmen will need to park their vehicles in an appropriate, unrestricted section of highway.</p>

	<p>We understand that the majority of the householders who would be affected by these proposals regarding the Rustat Road junction, object to them and we urge you to heed these objections.</p>	<p>After carrying out an extensive informal and statutory consultation there have been only 3 objections including yours. The County Council will always consider feedback received to every proposal.</p>
2.	<p>I live at the entrance to the street, and have rarely seen any evidence of inconsiderate parking in this area. Cars very occasionally park on the pavement for a short amount of time, but there is enough space (particularly outside my house, where the pavement is wider) for a car to park without blocking either the street or pedestrian access.</p> <p>I understood from Kilian Bourke, the Liberal Democrat County Councillor, that there is anecdotal evidence of inconsiderate parking at the entrance to the street. I have requested details of this evidence, and although Kilian forwarded my email to Officers in the Council, no details have been forthcoming.</p> <p>I also understood from the Romsey Liberal Democrat fliers that the reason behind the proposal is to allow refuse collection vehicles to access the street easily. I have spoken to refuse collectors on a couple of occasions recently to ask them about difficulties accessing the street. On both occasions I was told that the problem is not at the entrance to the street, but that it occurs further down, where the road bends - the first bend, where the lay-by is, causes problems as cars regularly park on both sides of the street there, as does the second main bend, where the double-yellow lines are proposed.</p>	<p>Cars should not park on or near junctions in accordance with the Highway Code, neither should they park with two wheels up on the pavement unless specifically authorised to do so by the relevant displayed signs.</p> <p>Without regularly patrolling the area it would be difficult to obtain such evidence in photographic form. The anecdotal evidence has been supplied to us by the Local Member and in turn supplied to him by residents of William Smith Close by word of mouth.</p> <p>Refuse trucks are just an example of what types of vehicles may find accessing William Smith Close difficult. The central issue is inconsiderate parking by vehicles that makes passing difficult or dangerous. As there will be restrictions further along the Close, further parking restrictions around the junction with Rustat Road would not only mitigate against people who parked here but is also regarded as good engineering practice.</p>

	<p>I cannot understand why the proposal is to introduce parking restrictions at the entrance to the street, where there simply is not a problem. I also do not believe that a problem will develop here as a result of introducing double-yellow lines further down the street. Cars come into the street early in the morning and are usually parked for the length of the working day, so they are very unlikely to park so near the junction for this amount of time, let alone in front of someone's driveway. I believe that parking restrictions here would not only be unnecessary, but would be unfair. It would prevent occasional visitors from parking (considerately) outside our houses. It would also prevent me from parking briefly if I need to load/unload anything, as I (unlike all my neighbours) do not have a driveway or dropped kerb.</p> <p>I also cannot understand why the proposal does not include introducing double-yellow lines in one part of the street where the problem clearly does occur, and that is the opposite side of the street to the lay-by. The most recent flier sent round by the Romsey Liberal Democrats includes a photograph of the refuse truck blocked in this exact location (not, as claimed, at the main bend in the road further down) - roughly outside no. 14 William Smith Close.</p>	<p>Parking on a junction is not advisable as stated in the Highway Code. The proposed restrictions would not preclude anyone from unloading or loading goods from a vehicle.</p> <p>The proposal is designed to regulate the parking down the Close and not to exclude parking from occurring completely. The main bend is the part of highway that presents most of a hazard to passing vehicles due to issues of poor visibility. The County Council seeks to find a balance between making the highway safer and maintaining a decent level of available parking space for all to use.</p>
3.	<p>I wish to object to the proposal.</p> <p>It is not the case that the area near the junction is subject to antisocial parking (for example by commuters using the rail station) in the way that the other areas are. Strangers rarely park outside our houses and when they do, it is for</p>	<p>Experience and evidence of parking practices in Cambridge City and elsewhere in the County suggest that motorists will park where convenient. Some will even park their vehicles in such a way that blocks or overhangs dropped</p>

<p>no more than a minute or two, because they would block access to our drives. The most recent communication we have had from our local Councillor Kilian Bourke and campaigner suggests that the proposed restrictions further down the Close will have the effect of displacing the problem to the junction unless restrictions are also introduced at the junction. That seems highly unlikely to me.</p> <p>I fully understand the need to ensure that the waste and recycling lorries can easily gain access, but I have lived here for nearly 17 years and have never seen or heard of any such problems at the area near the junction.</p> <p>One of my neighbours has recently asked the bin collectors whether they ever had problems accessing the Close. On both occasions, they reported that there were no problems at the junction but there were problems further down.</p> <p>It has been noted that one must not park within 10m of a junction, and I fully understand that, but one of the options which the proposal will presumably take away from us is for visitors to park considerately on the kerbs outside our houses. This happens rarely, the kerbs are quite wide and the cars take up little of the width of the road. It certainly does not appear to cause problems for the waste collection lorries. I also note that the version of the proposal available online indicates the restriction will stretch for 12m from the junction, not 10m.</p> <p>I would also like to note that the parts of the proposal concerning the Close further from the junction with Rustat Road may well not</p>	<p>accesses.</p> <p>Refuse trucks are just an example of what types of vehicles may find accessing William Smith Close difficult. The central issue is inconsiderate parking by vehicles that makes passing difficult or dangerous. As there will be restrictions further along the Close, further parking restrictions on and around the junction with Rustat Road would not only mitigate against people who parked here but is also regarded as good engineering practice.</p> <p>Cars should not park on or near junctions in accordance with the Highway Code, neither should they park with two wheels up on the pavement unless specifically authorised to do so by the presence of associated signs. It is an offence to park a vehicle on the pavement. The proposal is for double yellow lines on both sides of the road for a distance of 12 metres from the junction of William Smith Close and Rustat Road, minor amendments could occur.</p> <p>The proposal is designed to regulate the parking down the Close and not to exclude parking form occurring completely. The main bend is the</p>
--	--

	<p>solve the problem of access for the waste collection lorries. The most recent letter we have had from the Liberal Democrats shows a photo of a lorry unable to get down William Smith Close due to parked vehicles, but it is not in any of the zones where double-yellow lines are proposed.</p> <p>It appears that one part of this proposal is unnecessary and the other two parts will not solve the problem they are seeking to solve. I believe the proposal needs to be carefully rethought.</p>	<p>part of highway that presents most of a hazard to passing vehicles due to issues of poor visibility. The County Council seeks to find a balance between making the highway safer and maintaining a decent level of available parking space for all to use.</p>
4.	<p>General Comments</p> <p>Restrictions do not go far enough, what is needed is a total prohibition of cars parking in the Close as Residents have their own off-street car parking as well as two large car parks.</p> <p>There is a lack of parking enforcement in general.</p>	<p>The County Council seeks to find a balance between making the highway safer and maintaining a decent level of available parking space for all to use. A total prohibition on parking is overly restrictive and would not meet popular support.</p> <p>The County Council works closely with the Police whilst utilising its own Civil Enforcement Officers to ensure that the enforcement of parking restrictions does occur as and when resources are available.</p>
5.	<p>Support</p> <p>We strongly support the proposed restrictions. They are a realistic way of managing the over-parking by non-residents on our streets.</p>	