

Agenda Item No:

Report title: Traffic regulation Order objections associated with the proposed waiting and loading restrictions around the junction of Mereside and Station Road, Soham

To: Cambridgeshire County Council's Traffic Manager and the local members representing the electoral divisions below

Meeting Date: 21<sup>st</sup> January 2022

From: Executive Director: Place & Economy

Electoral division(s): District of East Cambridgeshire, Parish of Soham

Key decision: No

Forward Plan ref: N/A

Outcome: To determine the objections received regarding the proposed waiting and loading restrictions around the junction of Mereside and Station Road, Soham. Potential outcomes involve the approval of the restrictions, as advertised - to satisfy perceived safety concerns - or in a reduced capacity - to satisfy the concerns of the objectors.

Recommendation: a) Approve the implementation of the restrictions as advertised  
b) Inform the objectors accordingly

Officer contact:

Name: Sonia Hansen  
Post: Traffic Manger  
Email: [Sonia.Hansen@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Sonia.Hansen@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
Tel: 0345 045 5212

Member contacts:

Names: Cllr Mark Goldsack  
Post: County Councillor – Soham North & Isleham  
Email: [Mark.Goldsack@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Mark.Goldsack@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
Tel: 07831 168899

## 1. Background

- 1.1 Soham is a town and civil parish in the district of east Cambridgeshire, which is located off the A142, between the city of Ely and the town of Newmarket (approx. 9km southeast and 10km northwest of the centres of each, respectively – Appendix 1).
- 1.2 Both Mereside and Station Road are unclassified roads, where Mereside runs along the western side of Soham, in the northern half of the town, and Station Road runs in a longitudinal direction, linking Mereside (at its southern end) to the town's main thoroughfare (known as Pratt Street, at its respective junction – Appendix 2).
- 1.3 In line with the re-opening of Soham railway station, the junction of Mereside and Station Road has been realigned, where the new access road to said station has had the effect of making this junction a crossroad. The realignment has tightened the geometry of the junction and because of the projected increase in pedestrian traffic, uncontrolled dropped kerb crossing points have been added.
- 1.4 The proposal, to restrict parking (waiting and loading) around the junction of Mereside and Station Road (around the access road too but this road is un-named and the extent of the public highway ends at the back of the newly constructed footway, hence its omission from the report title etc – Appendix 3), comes as a result of a privately funded highways improvement application from Network Rail.
- 1.5 The rationale for the proposal is to reinforce rule 243 of the Highway Code (drivers should not park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction) as well as to provide adequate visibility of the informal crossings. Note, this rationale is backed by the 'Traffic signs manual chapter 6 traffic control (2019)' where it states:

15.5.1. Minimum distances for visibility of crossings for approaching traffic are set out in Table 15-1. For more detail see 2.1.5.

Table 15-1: Recommended visibility distances for pedestrian crossings

85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed (mph)	20	25	30	35	40
Recommended stopping sight distance (m)	22	31	40	51	80

15.5.2. Pedestrians should be able to see and be seen by approaching traffic. Different groups will have different requirements – for example, wheelchair users and children may be harder for a driver to see as they are lower in the landscape.

15.5.3. Visibility should not be obscured or restricted by factors such as parked vehicles, trees or street furniture. Obstacles should be moved or removed wherever possible, especially if doing so enables a crossing to remain on the desire line.

## 2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The traffic regulation Order (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 11<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and the statutory consultation period ran from the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2021 to the 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2021.
- 2.3 The statutory consultation resulted in representations and queries from 4 residents, however, only 3 of the representations specifically objected to the proposals. The written objections are included in the table in Appendix 4, where, in the interest of data protection they have been redacted to omit identifiable information. The officer responses to the points raised, avoiding duplicate responses where possible, are also given in the table.

### 3. Alignment with corporate priorities

- 3.1 Communities at the heart of everything we do  
There are no significant implications for this priority, however, the implications for a select number of residents is that they shall be unable to park outside their properties and that alternative parking provisions may be contested.
- 3.2 A good quality of life for everyone  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.3 Helping our children learn, develop and live life to the full  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.4 Cambridgeshire: a well-connected, safe, clean, green environment  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 3.5 Protecting and caring for those who need us  
There are no significant implications for this priority.

### 4. Significant Implications

- 4.1 Resource Implications  
The necessary staff resources and funding have been secured through third party funding from Network Rail.
- 4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications  
The statutory consultees have been engaged, including the County and District Councillors, the Police and the emergency Services. The Police offered no objections, and no comments were received from the other emergency services.

Notices were placed in the local press and displayed on site, letters were sent to nearby residents and the proposals were made available for viewing online at <http://bit.ly/cambridgeshiretro>

- 4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement  
County Councillor: Cllr Mark Goldsack and District Councillor: Cllr Alec Jones were consulted. Responses were received from Cllr Goldsack in which he echoed the concerns of residents and requested that the lines be reduced, to maintain existing on-street parking practices.
- 4.7 Public Health Implications  
There are no significant implications for this priority.
- 4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas:  
There are no significant implications for this priority.

## 5. Source documents guidance

### 5.1 Source documents

Copy of the written representations (redacted) received during the consultation period  
Copy of the draft traffic regulation Order  
Copies of the consultation documents (public notice, site notice, statement of reasons and consultation letter – sent to residents and statutory consultees)  
Traffic signs manual chapter 6 traffic control (2019)

### 5.2 Location

Available upon request from the Policy & Regulation team  
([policyandregulation@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:policyandregulation@cambridgeshire.gov.uk))

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/traffic-signs-manual>