

Report title: Trumpington Meadows, Cambridge – Consider Objections to Proposed Parking Scheme

To: Delegated Decision Meeting

Meeting Date: 12th August 2021

From: Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): Trumpington and Sawston & Shelford

Key decision: No

Forward Plan ref: n/a

Outcome: To consider objections and other representations received in response to the publication of a proposed parking scheme for Trumpington Meadows, Cambridge.

Recommendation: a) Implement the waiting restrictions as published.
b) Inform the objectors of the outcome.

Officer contact:

Name: Gary Baldwin
Post: Policy & Regulation Engineer
Email: gary.baldwin@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:

Member contacts:

Names: Councillor Philippa Slatter
Post: Trumpington Division Member
Email: cllr.philippa.slatter@gmail.com
Tel: 01223 706398

Names: Councillor Maria King
Post: Sawston and Shelford Division Member
Email: maria.king@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

Names: Councillor Brian Milnes
Post: Sawston and Shelford Division Member
Email: brian.milnes@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398

1. Background

- 1.1 The Trumpington Meadows development is located on the south-western edge of Cambridge, approximately 2½ miles from the city centre and adjacent to the park & ride site. The majority of the development site is within Cambridge City, but part of it is located within South Cambridgeshire District Council's administrative area. Trumpington Meadows forms part of the Cambridge Southern Fringe development area.
- 1.2 There is a pressing need to tackle congestion and improve air quality in the city. Hence, the planning vision for Trumpington Meadows was that multiple car ownership be discouraged to reduce the dominance of vehicular traffic with the intention of lowering vehicle emissions and encouraging a safer and less cluttered street scene. With this in mind, most dwellings are limited to one off-street parking space each. To avoid an overspill of parking onto the road network, it was deemed necessary to introduce some form of on-street parking control. Hence, the planning consent included a requirement to prohibit on-street parking for residents, but to provide facilities for visitor parking.
- 1.3 Trumpington Meadows is relatively remote from the city centre, but it is close to Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Trumpington park & ride site. Hence, there is a possibility of non-residents parking in the development to avoid car parking charges and on-street restrictions. The likelihood of this occurring has probably reduced since the removal of the £1 parking charge at the park & ride sites. In addition, the Council has an ongoing commitment to better manage parking in Cambridge's residential streets. As more parking restrictions are introduced in residential areas closer to the centre of Cambridge this will gradually increase the possibility of non-resident parking migrating to areas further out of the city. It is not uncommon for city centre workers to park in residential areas on the fringes of Cambridge and use a cycle for the final part of their journey to work.
- 1.4 Residents of Trumpington Meadows have several travel options available as an alternative to using private cars, such as park & ride, which provides easily accessible transport to the city centre and railway station. Bus services do not penetrate Trumpington Meadows itself. Local amenities, such as food stores, the local centre and country park are easily accessible by foot or cycle. The County and City Councils and Greater Cambridge Partnership have a long term strategy to offer more sustainable transport solutions to those who live and work in Cambridge.
- 1.5 Part of the Trumpington Meadows site is complete and the developer is ready for the County Council to adopt the roads as public highway under a section 38 agreement. At present a private firm is enforcing the no parking requirement, which applies at all times and on all days, although reports would suggest that there is little in the way of active enforcement currently taking place. The current arrangements cannot continue after adoption, so if some form of on-street parking control is to continue a TRO will need to be introduced, so that the Council's civil enforcement officers can enforce.
- 1.6 The published proposal is to prohibit parking on all roads due for adoption from 8am to 6pm on all days, except for the constructed parking bays which would be restricted to visitor permit holders only during those times. There would be no on-street restrictions in operation outside of those hours. These times allow residents to park on-street overnight, at which time the numbers of larger vehicles requiring access will be lower. Also, there is likely to be little or no enforcement of any restrictions between 6pm and 8am. It is logical to apply the

same operational hours to the visitor permit spaces or drivers will park on the road itself in preference to paying for a permit to park in the visitor spaces.

2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The TRO procedure is a statutory process that requires the highway authority to advertise, in the local press 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 minimum twenty one day notice period. There is also a requirement to consult with certain organisations, such as the emergency services, and others affected by the proposals. All households in the part of Trumpington Meadows covered by these proposals were individually consulted by letter.
- 2.2 The TRO was advertised in the Cambridge News on 31st March 2021 and the statutory consultation period ran until 30th April 2021. It should be noted that these proposals were previously published in November 2017 and objections were considered by the former Cambridge City Joint Area Committee on 24th July 2018 and at a Delegated Decision Meeting on 16th August 2018. In both cases the decision was to proceed with the implementation of the parking scheme. However, primarily due to delays with the adoption process, the parking restrictions could not be implemented with the required 2 years of them being published. In this situation, Regulations dictate that the parking restriction proposals must be re-published.
- 2.3 A total of 71 written representations have been received, of which 50 objected to the proposal or are strongly opposed to some elements of it. These have been summarised in the table in Appendix 4 and the officer responses to the objections are also given in the table. A total of 10 respondents offered general, but sometimes qualified, support for the principle of introducing parking controls. The remaining responses neither opposed or supported the parking scheme.
- 2.4 The most common issues raised by those submitting objections were as follows:-
- Resident permits should be available to households in the area.
 - The parking scheme will create problems with households with more than one vehicle.
 - Parking controls are not needed as there are no real issues to resolve.
 - Many residents are now working from home, which was not the case when the parking scheme was originally planned.
 - Visitor permits issues, such as cost, complexity and inconvenience.
 - The proposed restrictions would actually force residents to use their second car more, i.e. to find parking during the day.
 - In post-Covid 19 times, residents need visitors and the scheme discourages that.

2.5 The most common issues raised by those submitting other representations were as follows:-

- The cost of visitor permits is too high.
- Due to a lack of enforcement action a significant amount of inconsiderate parking currently takes place, such as on footways and near junctions.
- The proposed parking scheme should have longer operational hours, e.g. 24/7 or extend later into the evening.

3. Conclusions and Options

3.1 It is clear that there are a variety of opinions on the published proposals, including some outright opposition to any form of on-street parking control. There appear to be several options available to take this forward as follows:-

No.	Option	Implications
1	Implement the scheme as published, i.e. a Restricted Zone imposing a general prohibition of waiting from 8am to 6pm with visitor permit holders parking only in designated bays. There would be no formal parking restrictions outside of those times.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would satisfy the principle of a low-traffic/ low parking neighbourhood and the planning condition.• May lead to some indiscriminate parking practises overnight.• No cost to the Council as the set-up costs are being funded by developer.• Issues around enforcement in the roads that are in SCDC's area.
2	Implement the scheme as published, but increase the operational hours either into the evening or to cover all days and all times. (Trumpington Meadows Residents' Association and some others want the parking restrictions to apply 24/7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Likely to be met with strong opposition from some people.• Enforcement outside of the working day is likely to be minimal, so there could be widespread abuse at those times.• Would require an additional TRO consultation and signing works that would likely have to be funded by the Council.
3	Consider some form of resident permit parking scheme, possibly prohibiting parking at all times or some lesser period on most roads, with permit holder only parking in the designated bays.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Goes against the general principle of limiting residential parking capacity.• The number of on-street parking bays is designed to allow space for visitors only.• There are around 800 households and only 150 on-street parking spaces.• Hence, would not satisfy the needs of residents, who having purchased a permit would expect to have a parking space.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of spaces could be taken by residents, leaving little space for visitors. • Would require an additional TRO consultation that would likely have to be funded by the Council. • May need to carry out the full consultation process as per the Council's agreed Residential Parking Scheme (RPS) policy.
4	Do not implement any parking restrictions and abandon the proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently few serious parking issues in the area, possibly in part due to existing notices and occasional enforcement. • If no restrictions are introduced this could lead to the roads being used as free parking by non-residents. • Contrary to the planning principles of minimising car ownership and having a less cluttered street scene. • Many residents would have purchased their home on the understanding that it would be a low-traffic neighbourhood and may feel aggrieved that the parking scheme is not being implemented. • If the parking creates an obstruction post-adoption the Council could have to introduce some form of parking control at the tax-payers expense. • If in future a residential parking scheme was to be considered it would need to compete for funding with other areas and would be subject to the Council adopted RPS policy and associated processes.
5	Do not implement any parking restrictions at this time, adopt the roads and monitor the parking situation (After a TRO has been published it must be implemented within 2 years, so the Council could defer a decision until March 2023).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no significant parking pressures on the roads, but this could change. • Would enable parking practices to be reviewed with no restrictions in place and allow parking to settle down in the post-Covid period. • Most existing traffic signs could remain in place, but properly covered and be utilised in future if necessary. • Enforcement complications in the South Cambs part of Trumpington Meadows, so

		a delay would allow further work on the anticipated CPE application process.
6	Other ideas, such as car club bays, short-stay, pay & display parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car club is a very good second car solution, so fits in well with the planning ethos. • Would require Enterprise to provide vehicles and further TRO work would be needed to allocate designated bays. • Parking allocated for short-stay use may overcome some concerns around visitor parking. • Any such ideas are unlikely to provide a comprehensive parking solution.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The planning vision for Trumpington Meadows is for a low traffic estate with minimal on-street parking to create a safer and more appealing environment.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The estate design and proposed parking scheme is designed to dissuade households from operating multiple vehicles in the interests of improving air quality.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The parking scheme setup costs, including traffic signage, will be met by the developer.
- Post-adoption the County Council will be responsible for managing the visitor permit issuing process and ongoing enforcement. There will be a cost associated with this, but also income.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The statutory process relating to the introduction of the required Traffic Regulation Order has been followed.
- There have been some challenges on the way that the Council has processed the required Traffic Regulation Order, but legal advice is that the required Regulations have been followed.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority, but officers have considered the impact on the protected characteristic groups of Disability, Rural Isolation and Poverty.

- Disability. Blue badge holders would be allowed to park in any visitor parking bays without the need to purchase visitor permits. They would need to display their blue badge. They could park on other lengths of road for up to 4 hours as per national concessions and without limit in any short-stay parking spaces. Those requiring medical support would be eligible for free permits.
- Rural Isolation. Trumpington Meadows is some distance outside of the city centre, but residents have several travel options available as an alternative to using private cars, such as park & ride, which provides easily accessible transport to the city centre and railway station. Local amenities, such as food stores, the local centre and country park are easily accessible by foot or cycle.
- Poverty. Cambridge City Council data from 2017 suggest that Trumpington ward has one of the highest number of low income households and this figure had increased significantly since the previous study. This may suggest that paid-for visitor parking will have a detrimental effect on residents. However, free parking is available at the nearby park & ride site and other transport options are available.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The statutory consultees have been engaged, including County and District Councillors, Police and other emergency services.
- Notices were placed in the local press and were available to view online or by request.
- All households located in the area covered by the proposed parking scheme were consulted individually by letter.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Relevant Councillors were given the opportunity to comment as part of the statutory process. No adverse comments were received.
- More recently there have been lengthy discussions with relevant County Councillors, all of whom, were elected in May 2021.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas

4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings.

Positive/neutral/negative Status: Neutral

Explanation: n/a

- 4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.
Positive/neutral/negative Status: Positive
Explanation: Will decrease use/reliance on the private car; encourage use of cleaner modes of transport, such as cycling and walking; and increase use of public transport.
- 4.8.3 Implication 3: Green spaces, peatland, afforestation, habitats and land management.
Positive/neutral/negative Status: Neutral
Explanation: n/a
- 4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.
Positive/neutral/negative Status: Neutral
Explanation: n/a
- 4.8.5 Implication 5: Water use, availability and management:
Positive/neutral/negative Status: Neutral
Explanation: n/a
- 4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.
Positive/neutral/negative Status: Positive
Explanation: Reduction in vehicle use will lead to an improvement in air quality.
- 4.8.7 Implication 7: Resilience of our services and infrastructure, and supporting vulnerable people to cope with climate change.
Positive/neutral/negative Status: Neutral
Explanation: n/a

5. Source documents guidance

5.1 Source documents

A document containing all representations submitted is available to view on our [Delegated Decisions - Openness Regulations page](#) and then by selecting this meeting date.

Appendix 1 – Location of Trumpington Meadows



Appendix 2 Proposed Parking Scheme Public Notice

The City of Cambridge (Civil Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2020 (Amendment No.20) Order 20--

Cambridgeshire County Council proposes to make an Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers. The effect of this Order will be to introduce on-street parking restrictions in Various Roads (as listed below) in Trumpington Meadows, Cambridge. All on-street parking in these roads will become No Waiting between 8am and 6pm on all days of the week, except in signed visitor permit holder bays. In that part of Osprey Drive near to the Sainsbury store, the signed parking bays will be restricted to a 1 hour stay (8am to 6pm) with no return within 3 hours. There will be no parking restrictions in operation outside of those times and any privately owned parking areas are not affected.

Roads included in the proposal and residential addresses eligible for the purchase of visitor permits include:- Argent Road, Avalon Way, Banner Road, Bead Road, Berwick Place, Carmine Road, Charger Road, Consort Avenue, Dove Drive, Falcon Road, Forty Acre Road, Hereward Road, Huntsman Road, Kestrel Rise, Kinsman Way, Mardler Close, Old Mills Road, One Tree Road, Osprey Drive, Otter Close, Piper Road, Proctor Drive, Renard Way, Rialto Close and Spring Drive. These roads are currently not adopted as highway maintainable at public expense, but the intention is that they will be adopted in due course.

Visitors Permits cost £12 and each one is valid for 5 visits of up to one day's duration. A resident may apply for a maximum of 20 permits per annum allowing 100 visits. A resident who requires regular visits on medical grounds may be eligible for free visitors' permits. Blue badge holders can park in the visitor permit holder or 1 hour bays without limit and free of charge.

For further details of the above proposals please visit our [permanent traffic regulation orders page](#) and select PR0703. To request copies of documents please telephone 0345 045 5212 or use the e-mail address below.

Objections to the above proposals, stating the grounds on which they are made, or any other comments must be sent in writing to the undersigned or by email to policyandregulation@cambridgeshire.gov.uk by 30th April 2021 quoting reference PR0703. Comments received will be used as part of our consultation process and may be published, but will be anonymised, in any reports.

Steve Cox, Executive Director, Place and Economy, c/o Policy and Regulation, Shire Hall, Castle Street, Cambridge CB3 0AP

31st March 2021

Appendix 3 Proposed Parking Scheme Drawing



Appendix 4 Summary of Objections and Representations Received, including Officer Responses

No.	Summary of Objection/ Representation ranked by number of times mentioned (includes concerns raised in 3 or more representations)	Officer Response
1	<p><u>Proposed Restrictions</u></p> <p>There should be a residents' permit parking scheme and/or residents should be able to obtain a permit for visitor bays (This issue was raised in 19 responses)</p> <p>The restrictions will cause severe problems to those residents who own more than one vehicle (This issue was raised in 19 responses)</p> <p>There are currently very few parking difficulties during the proposed operational hours of the scheme, so there is no justification for implementing parking restrictions (This issue was raised in 15 responses)</p>	<p>This would be contrary to the overall planning principle to minimise the level of on-street parking. The estate layout dictates that there would be insufficient parking space to accommodate parking by residents. There are around 800 households and approximately 150 on-street parking spaces. Having purchased a resident permit, residents would expect to be able to find a parking space, but that might not be the case. In that scenario, a resident permit holders might choose to park outside of a recognised parking place, thus potentially causing an obstruction.</p> <p>The vision for Trumpington Meadows was that there would be limited off-street parking provided and the roads would be restricted to stop them being used as a de-facto car park. The estate design reflects this vision. Home buyers should have been fully aware of the restriction on parking in the development, but it is possible that this was not relayed to all, such as tenants renting in the area. Consideration could be given to providing car club bays in the area, which is particularly useful as a second car solution.</p> <p>Observations would suggest that there is very little obstructive parking during the working day, with spaces available in the proposed visitor permit bays. However, the developer claims that he receives regular complaints about indiscriminate parking. It is difficult to predict if and how this might change in the future, particularly if restrictions are introduced in other developments in the general area, resulting in some migration of parking. If the introduction of the proposed parking scheme was deferred this</p>

	<p>Many residents are now working from home, mostly due to Covid-19 restrictions, so the situation has changed since the parking scheme was originally planned. This means that many residents need to park at home during the working day, rather than using their vehicle to travel to work (This issue was raised in 15 responses)</p> <p>The proposed restrictions will effectively force car owners to move their vehicles before 8am and drive them back after 6pm. Many will re-locate them to the nearby park & ride site, thereby resulting in unnecessary mileage and undesirable environmental impacts (This issue was raised in 12 responses)</p> <p>The parking scheme should be operational at all times on all days. Parking will be unrestricted overnight, so drivers will park anywhere thus blocking roads to emergency vehicles and others (This issue was raised in 6 responses)</p>	<p>would allow parking patterns to be assessed with no formal restrictions in place.</p> <p>It is a fact that the planning application for Trumpington Meadows was considered around 10 years ago and home working was less popular then. Post-Covid-19, it is likely that working patterns will, in part, revert to normal. A deferment would allow time for this to occur.</p> <p>It is accepted that those households with more than one vehicle will need to find somewhere to park their other car(s). However, the creation of a low-traffic estate was one of the underlying transport planning principles.</p> <p>Any on-street restrictions could be in force 24/7 but that is seen as overly restrictive. Difficulties associated with non-resident parking usually occur during the working day, so any restrictions need to apply at those times and there is less justification for them overnight. Furthermore, there would be little or no enforcement of any restrictions overnight, so there may well be abuse of them. Regardless of any formal parking restrictions, all drivers have a wider responsibility to ensure that they do not obstruct the highway.</p>
2	<p><u>Visitor Permit Concerns</u></p> <p>The cost of visitors permits is too high (This issue was raised in 11 responses)</p> <p>Visitor permit arrangements are too inflexible and will be difficult for carers, tradesmen, deliveries, etc.</p>	<p>The cost of residential permits was reviewed by the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on 21st February 2018. Visitor permits previously cost the equivalent of £1.60 per day and it was decided to increase these to £2.40 per day. It is felt that there is a need for consistency across the whole city.</p> <p>It is relatively simple for a resident to obtain a batch of visitor permits and make them available to their visitors. In most cases, people will apply</p>

	(This issue was raised in 9 responses)	online. Safeguards have to be built in to avoid non-residents fraudulently applying for permits, so applicants must provide proof of residency. A range of permits are available, such as tradesmen permits, free permits for those needing regular visits for medical reasons and for healthcare workers. Short duration stops, such as for deliveries and taxi drops, will not be affected as it would be permissible to park almost anywhere for such purposes.
3	<p><u>General Issues</u></p> <p>As we, hopefully, return to normal after the Covid-19 pandemic, it is important that residents are able to welcome visitors back in the interests of their wellbeing. The proposed parking scheme will make this very difficult (This issue was raised in 10 responses)</p> <p>Some residents claim to have no off-street parking available, so the scheme will cause significant problems for those with only one vehicle (This issue was raised in 7 responses)</p> <p>The house builder promised that unrestricted on-street parking would remain available, even after adoption (This issue was raised in 7 responses)</p> <p>Alternative modes of transport, such as the bus service to/from Trumpington Meadows, are poor, so do not incentivise residents to give up their cars (This issue was raised in 3 responses)</p>	<p>The proposed parking scheme is intended to reserve parkign spaces for visitors, albeit a cost is involved between 8am and 6pm. However, it is hoped that other transport options will be chosen and parking is free at the nearby park & ride site.</p> <p>It is understood that all dwellings have at least one parking space available to them. It is posible that there is some misunderstanding about what areas the proposed parking scheme covers. There are significant areas of private off-street parking that are not part of the Council's published proposal.</p> <p>There was a requirement for the developer and their agents to inform all potential buyers of the planned on-street parking restrictions. It is impossible to determine whether this actaully took place in all cases or, indeed, what verbal assurances were made.</p> <p>There are very regular services from 7am to 6.30pm from the Trumpington park & ride site. It is accepted that bus services do not penetrate Trumpington Meadows itself, so they could be improved upon. It is hoped that better transport options will ultimately become available through the Greater Cambridge Partnership initiative.</p>
4	<p><u>Council Policy Discrepancies and Statutory Processes</u></p> <p>Some of the documentation, specifically the reasons for the</p>	<p>There are specific reasons defined in Regulations for introducing Traffic Regulation</p>

	<p>restrictions, was misleading and inadequate (This issue was raised in 5 responses)</p> <p>The proposed parking scheme for Trumpington Meadows is unlike any other residential parking schemes in Cambridge and does not follow the Council's agreed policy (This issue was raised in 4 responses)</p> <p>The traffic signs for the proposed parking scheme were installed in 2018, so the Council has pre-empted the legal process and already decided that it will be implemented (This issue was raised in 3 responses)</p>	<p>Orders, which sometimes do not appear appropriate. The main reasons for introducing on-street parking controls are in the interests of safety, traffic management and to preserve the amenities of an area. It is felt that the public notice and other published documentation adequately set out what was being proposed and other information, such as permit costs. It is clear from the responses received that residents understood what the proposal is and the likely impact on them.</p> <p>The parts of Cambridge where residential parking schemes are in operation are predominantly in areas containing houses that were built many years ago and in most cases have little or no off-street parking. Those residential parking schemes are intended to give residents priority over on-street parking spaces. Trumpington Meadows is a newer estate where it is understood that the majority of homes have at least one private parking space. The planning vision was to limit on-street parking availability to create a cleaner environment a less cluttered street scene. Hence, the Trumpington Meadows scheme cannot be compared to residential parking schemes elsewhere in Cambridge.</p> <p>These proposals were previously published in November 2017 and the Council decided to proceed with the implementation of the parking scheme. As a result, the traffic signs were installed on private land by Barratt Homes in expectation of the scheme being implemented. However, primarily due to delays with the adoption process, the parking restrictions could not be implemented within the required 2 years of them being published. In this situation, Regulations dictate that the parking restriction proposals must be re-published. The signs are supposed to be covered, although it understood that some coverings have become detached. The signs are not enforceable until such time as the Order has been brought into operation.</p>
--	--	---