

# **REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO PUBLICATION OF PARKING RESTRICTION PROPOSALS FOR NEWTOWN AREA, CAMBRIDGE**

## **OBJECTIONS**

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed replacement of residents parking with pay and display on Brookside. Having recently moved into the road the residents parking is something we rely on and would be concerned to see it reduced.

---

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal of making two out of the three residents parking permit bays in Brookside pay-and-display bays.

As residents ourselves for the past xx years, we have found it increasingly difficult to park in front of our own home. This has been especially since our daughter was born in (Month) 20xx. We have had to park elsewhere on numerous occasions, with all the inconvenience that it entails while carrying a baby and the necessary baby-related equipment we need to take with us.

The proposed move of reducing the residents parking spaces will only exacerbate this problem, which we find all the more unfair considering the parking provision is already inadequate for Brookside residents: with several schools on the street and some residents having more than one car, and thus more than one permit, making it even harder for their neighbours to find a parking space, we cannot see how this proposal could possibly work for residents.

Another foreseeable undesirable side effect of this poorly thought through proposal will be to offer a disproportionate parking advantage to the people living directly opposite the middle section, i.e. the only residential parking section that would remain, while greatly infuriating everyone else and putting neighbour against neighbour. This is not the way to encourage good neighbourly relations.

Where exactly will we be expected to park, with the parking provision thus reduced?

It goes without saying that nearby Newtown streets are also usually full, with their own residents trying to park near their homes.

Considering the current eye-watering cost of a yearly parking permit, and the simple expectation to be able to park near your own home, we find this proposal wholly unacceptable.

Instead, we would like to suggest adding parking bays on Brookside by converting some of the space currently only occupied by double yellow lines into parking spaces, and converting the spaces in front of 1-5 Brookside and 17-19 Brookside (both schools-only areas) into limited-time parking areas.

We would greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the rationale for this proposal and alternatives to it with council representatives face-to-face at some organised meetings.

---

I am writing to object to the above Traffic Regulation Order concerning the re-allocation of parking bays in Pemberton Terrace and Brookside.

Making two-thirds of the one-way section of Brookside into pay and display bays will significantly increase the number and frequency of vehicles along a very narrow road. A significant number of children, some very young, attend the schools situated on that part of Brookside and their safety is vital. More traffic movements will have an adverse impact on pedestrians and cyclists, both young and old.

I have lived on Brookside for over 20 years and the residents parking on Brookside has always been heavily used. If anything, given the number of residents who currently live there, there is more demand now, not less.

Both the County and City Councils and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have said that they wish to reduce traffic within Cambridge. The City Council is also introducing further resident parking zones across the city. Pay and display parking only encourages more traffic, not less. The environment within Newtown would benefit significantly if there were fewer pay and display bays and more residents parking bays, particularly so far as noise and pollution is concerned.

---

I am writing in response to the above Traffic Regulation Order, regarding the re-allocation of parking bays in Brookside and Pemberton Terrace. The reason given for the re-allocation is 'to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users and for preserving or improving the amenities of the area'. I wish to object to the TRO for the following reasons:

1. There has been no indication as to the hours of operation of the pay and display bays. However, presumably they are to be the same as the two-way part of Brookside which allows cars to park for a maximum of two hours. Residents' cars tend to be parked for long periods of time but pay and display will increase the amount and frequency of traffic movements on the narrowest section of Brookside (given its proximity to the Botanic Gardens, the Fitzwilliam Museum and the City centre). A significant number of schoolchildren (many very young) attend schools in the immediate vicinity and their safety and well-being is an important concern. A number of the schools, for example the Heritage School, have multiple locations and the children regularly move between sites or use the front gardens in Brookside. Any increase in traffic has the potential to place them, other pedestrians and cyclists in direct conflict with vehicles and would also increase air pollution, to the detriment of all residents. Safety would not be enhanced, nor would the amenities of the local area be preserved or improved by increasing the volume and frequency of traffic.
2. A survey undertaken by the local residents' association took place when at least 4 of the houses on Brookside were unoccupied. It also included a map of the proposed scheme. However, that scheme has been revised a number of times since then and the final version was only sent to residents a few days before the TRO was issued, so there was no time for the final version to be debated, particularly by those Brookside residents who would be most affected by the changes. They do perceive the changes as adverse, since there has been residents' parking on the one-way part of Brookside for many years.
3. The Statement of Reasons states that there is less demand for resident parking on the one-way part of Brookside. Having lived on Brookside for many years, I can vouch for the fact that there is, and always has been, considerable demand for residents' parking. The Brookside houses are now fully occupied and I believe there are a similar number of occupied residential properties on both Brookside and Pemberton Terrace, so the changes cannot be said to affect only a small number of residents. A number of the houses on the one-way part of Brookside do have off-street parking but that is also true of a number of houses on Pemberton Terrace, Panton Street, St. Eligius Street and Saxon Street.
4. Some residents voted in favour of the original version of the scheme, others voted against, some have not been given the opportunity to do so and a lot of residents expressed no view at all. Rather than implement the current proposal, may I suggest two possible compromises if changes are to be pursued, which would benefit all residents. One option would be to split pay and display and residents' parking between Brookside and Pemberton Terrace equally, with pay and display at the Bateman Street end of Brookside and the Brookside end of Pemberton Terrace. One other option that has been suggested in other parking schemes (Benson North and Queen Edith's Morley) is that the on-street parking is available for both residents' parking and pay and display i.e. 'mixed use'.

Both the Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership wish to reduce the amount of traffic within the city. This cannot be achieved if pay and display continues to be made easily available.

---

We the [REDACTED] in Brookside would like to add our support to the residents of Brookside in opposing the proposal to introduce "Pay and Display" provision for more cars on Brookside.

It is a very narrow street used by many children and their parents on the way to school and crossed at the two bridges by many older people.

It seems rather incongruous at this time when the whole world is attempting to reduce our carbon footprint including cutting down the number of cars in our cities to be introducing another facility that will encourage more cars, more pollution and more adverse health effects for the residents and local people.

We urge you to reconsider this proposal.

---

Thank you for making it possible to present objections to the proposed Brookside/Pemberton Terrace parking scheme. I am sure other people will have had a similar reaction to my own, but I can at least add my voice to the crowd. It is difficult not to see the proposed scheme as a major reversal of the parking scheme introduced more than 25 years ago, when Brookside was transferred from universal public parking to a Residents parking scheme, with specific No Parking domains identified by double yellow lines. Brookside is a very narrow residential street completely inappropriate as a public car park. You will be aware that it is one of the streets in Cambridge the most densely containing and being surrounded by schools, with the associated activity. The current residents' parking scheme provides a stable occupancy so that parents delivering or collecting their children from the surrounding schools are not competing with the early commuters and shoppers flooding into or out of Cambridge at critical times. A few Brookside residents have parking opportunities in Brookside Lane, but the great majority do not, and will thus have to compete for their residential parking with the commuters and shopping crowd who prefer not to use Park-and-Ride. It is clearly a depreciation of the quality of life and I stand with the many others who object strongly to this transformation.

---

This is to express my objection to the changes in the Residents Parking Scheme in Newtown (in addition to signing the ePetition PR0551). I am a resident of this area and am very concerned with the proposed changes.

First of all, there was no proper consultation and a very short timescale for responding. This may have prevented some residents from reacting if they do not approve of the proposed changes. Second, the three institutions directly affected by the proposed parking changes in Brookside lane were not informed. And third, and most important, making Brookside the public parking space will be dangerous for the many young children attending the schools at each end of Brookside lane.

This is a quiet residential area and should remain so.

---

I am writing with regard to the proposed reallocation of parking bays in Newtown, and proposed changes to Brookside residential parking bays in particular.

We have lived on Brookside, opposite our shared private gardens over the last seven years and have seen a number of changes, most not for the better sadly, to the area over that time. We are particularly concerned over this most recent proposed change to the area, which on paper may not mean very much but in terms of environment, conservation and safety to residents, and visitors, to the area is very worrying and should not be permitted to go ahead.

This part of Newtown is in a conservation area, and to ensure it provides continuing amenity as such relies on the balance of those who live in and maintain the area. The private gardens are shared space for all the properties on Brookside and frequent access for maintenance of the gardens is required as well as using the space for social and family use. Access to the gardens is directly onto the road and increased use of Brookside for visitor parking would increase the use of the area by those unfamiliar with the road and the gardens' access points. When children are playing in the gardens there is an increased and real safety risk to them as they currently enjoy the freedom of the gardens, with relative independence.

Brookside is not a thoroughfare - that is the role of the Trumpington Road on the other side of Hobson's conduit. It is a narrow road enabling access to the properties and along which pedestrians en route to the Botanical gardens frequently use the road to walk down next to the gardens, especially when in bloom. These gardens and residents' care of the gardens is part of the environmental amenity to the area. How are the proposed changes in parking considered in the light of amenity to the area? These changes are not to the benefit of the residents nor the conservation of the area's environment.

Finally, how have these proposed changes been arrived at? Has there been any monitoring of the area and necessity for these changes been assessed? This is the first time our feedback has been requested and it would seem that such proposals should be subject to planning and better local residents' consultation.

We strongly object to the proposed parking bay reallocation along Brookside and trust these changes will not be imposed on the residents.

---

I am writing to object to the TRO PRO551 relating to the moving of pay and display parking bays from Pemberton Terrace to the North and south end of Brookside. Consequently, the removal of residents parking bays off of Brookside to Pemberton Terrace. Which also has additional bike racks on Brookside and zip car bays to be installed.

I object for a number of reasons.

Firstly, for safety reasons.

The road of Brookside is very narrow with it narrowing further at the junction of Brookside and Pemberton Terrace.

The residents front garden gates open out directly onto the road where increased traffic will be attracted to searching for pay and display parking spaces. This is, undoubtedly a safety concern.

The drivers unfamiliar with the area will not necessarily be aware that the gardens are in constant use and enjoyed by students, young school children, senior citizens, visitors to the Botanical gardens and the residents of Brookside.

The gardens are obscured by vegetation along most of the gardens and it will be difficult for distracted drivers to be aware of the above users entering and exiting the gardens.

Also, there are two bridges that cut through the gardens from trumpington road through to Brookside. These are used by many pedestrians, cyclists and residents of Newtown.

The view of the road is obscured quite heavily from the bridges. Likewise the road users.

The residents of Brookside are very aware of this and are extremely careful when traveling down Brookside.

The same cannot be said for rat runners and road users unfamiliar to the area.

Most of the resident parking bays are nearly always full and are pretty much static. Residents tend to use their cars only very occasionally.

Which means most of the traffic that will enter Brookside with new Pay and Display will be foreign.

The Heritage school which has 200 staff and pupils is located at the junction and further up Brookside. The school has children as young as four that cross the road to access the bridge and gardens opposite. The line of sight is highly compromised if parked cars are outside the Heritage. The cars coming in and out of Pemberton terrace make it already, even more dangerous.

Most residents do not use the parking bays directly outside of the Heritage.

To have pay and display will mean that there could be a number of cars blocking the sight of children entering and exiting the school.

Also, the bike racks, which are a great addition to the area, would probably be better placed at the Botanical Gardens end of Brookside.

If it was where it is proposed then it would pose a further safety issue for the children and other bike users. As it is right by the junction of Pemberton terrace and corner of Brookside where the school is. This may encourage the children of the Heritage to use them instead of the ones provided by the school at the back of the Heritage.

This would mean the children, especially would have to cross the already precarious road junction to get to school.

I believe that there was a safety audit done on Brookside at the time of exploring the idea of two way cycling on Brookside. This they shelved, presumably, because of the narrow road and gardens directly opening onto the road.

It seems that the safety of residents and the institutions on Brookside haven't been thoroughly explored when putting the TRO together.

Secondly,

I feel that the residents and the institutions were not properly consulted at any time on any of the schemes that were proposed to the council.

Many of us in Brookside had only heard of this the day the letter informing us of the fait accompli.

The Newtown Residents association, which is not representative of the community as a whole, has apparently been instrumental in putting forward this and pushed it through without consulting the residents and institutions it would effect the most.

I feel they have not performed due diligence in representing all of the community it represents. I therefore ask for a delay in order to have proper consultation with all that this TRO would affect.

Thirdly

Pemberton Terrace is a wider road than Brookside and has pavements on each side of the road. Which of course, Brookside has only one pavement. It seems very strange to move a Pay and display from one larger road that can accommodate it to a very narrow road that cannot.

Panton Street is currently a two way road which attracts a lot of rat runners. It is very busy at times and cars need to pull in to allow oncoming traffic to pass. If there were lots of residents parking there it would make it extremely difficult for cars to do this and will cause untold amount of congestion on this stretch of road. When the pay and display is not busy it is easier for cars to pull in to allow incoming traffic to pass.

Both Brookside and Pemberton terrace have off road parking.

On Brookside. There are 7 flats that do not have access to off road parking but have parking permits.

A convent which is a HMO For elderly nuns that only has one at the back.  
A boarding house for young children that has none.  
Pemberton terrace only has three houses without off road parking.

I believe that both Pemberton Terrace and Brookside should have mainly residents parking. It would discourage drivers driving round the area looking for somewhere to park. Lower emissions in the area making the area a healthier place to live.

The pay and display is, it seems, very under used during the day but busy in the evening when it is free to park. We would very much like to know what the income is from the pay and display to warrant a huge and expensive move. Digging up of Brookside and presumably putting in electricity to the sites as well as new signage and not to mention the disruption to the residents and institutions.

Why do this and such cost when you wish to NOT attract more traffic to the city and residential areas. Brookside and Pemberton terrace are already rat runs and this will increase the volume of traffic to this area.

Wouldn't it be better to concentrate efforts and money into park and ride and better transport facilities to workers and visitors to the city? Than to encourage more cars into residential areas?

I truly appreciate that you have added zip car bays to the area. I think it is a great addition to our community.

However, wouldn't that be better placed for the whole community if it were more central to the whole area. Maybe Panton Street?

We have a petition on the above TRO551 with 184 signatures objecting to changes to the current pay and display and counting.

The link is below.

[http://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc\\_live/ePetitions.aspx](http://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/ePetitions.aspx)

Please would you consider the objections listed and the petition above and please allow the residents and institutions proper consultation before taking any actions.

---

I would like to make objection against the very surprising thing we heard, that you want to change the parking rules on Brookside and change it from permit parking into paid parking area.

Why this street? that is narrow, so not easy to park into, contains three schools, with children walking and playing there, crossing the roads opposite the buildings, where our private gardens are, elderly crossing the road to their gardens.

It will become a constant coming and going of cars and an extra congestion when parents come to pick up their children, giving dangerous situations!

I read that there was said we don't use the parking places, ofcourse we do! and there are a few houses even that contain flats so there is multiple occupation! There is also a convent with elderly nuns using the parking spaces.

On the other hand; during the day, often the parking spaces on Pemberton Terrace, that you want to give permit parking instead of us, are almost completely empty.

The idea that we can park behind our houses isn't a good argument, because most Pemberton Terrace houses have parking places on their own terrain. I believe there are 3 houses that don't, so why not give them 3 permit spaces?

In these days, that everyone is worried about the environment and actions should be taken to get the traffic out of the city as much as possible. Where the using of the Park and Ride and taking public transport should be stimulated it seems a very strange thing to do, to take residents parking.

---

## Letter of objection

We have been appointed by [REDACTED] (the owners of a number of properties on Brookside) to review the above draft Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places Order with respect to the potential impact of the scheme on Brookside.

A review of the drawing prepared in support of the draft Order (drg. No. Newtown-GA-101 Rev G) would suggest that the effect of the proposed Order on resident permit parking spaces would be essentially neutral, albeit that 10 – 11 permit spaces would be relocated from Brookside to Pemberton Terrace; approximately a 125 m walk from the properties on Brookside. The existing permit spaces on Brookside would be replaced with pay and display parking.

As set out in the accompanying Statement of Reasons:

*“The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users and for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs”.*

However, this does not appear to justify or underscore the rationale used in deriving the draft Order.

Firstly, Brookside is a one way road with a single footway that is subject to a 20 mph speed limit and lies within a largely residential area. The road is largely given over to resident permit parking, which reflects the nature of the city centre road. There is little to impede the movement of traffic along Brookside at present, given the lack of opposing traffic, no pedestrian cross flow i.e. no second footway and no pedestrian desire lines save for a private garden area with a single point of entry.

To that end, it is unclear how changing the existing permit parking to pay and display would achieve the stated goal of facilitating the movement of traffic. Indeed, it could be argued that the introduction of pay and display parking would encourage a greater number of cars to the area over the space of a day, with delays introduced by drivers searching for and manoeuvring into and out of parking spaces.

Secondly, it is equally unclear how the increase in traffic that would result from the introduction of pay and display spaces could serve to meet the stated aim of enhancing road safety for all road users. An increase

in cars and a change in use of the parking spaces could lead to the potential for an increase in pedestrian or cyclist accidents. This might be due to cars pulling out of the parking spaces or drivers/passengers who were not familiar with the nature of the road opening car doors in front of passing cyclists.

Thirdly, the change to pay and display parking and the relocation of the permit parking spaces cannot be considered to preserve or improve the amenity of the area. An inspection of the two roads shows that Brookside has a more active frontage than Pemberton Crescent, which would support the current location of the pay and display spaces away from that area – as is the case at present. The displacement of the permit spaces, while not involving a great distance in itself, does not support the stated reason to preserve amenity as it would serve to negatively impact on the existing residents. The increase in vehicles movements on Brookside allied to the activity implied by short term parking would also serve to detract from the existing amenity of the area.

Based on the above, our view is that the proposed scheme does not represent an appropriate or understandable response to the stated reasons given for making the changes set out in the draft Order. As such, the Order would provide no obvious benefit to either existing residents or to the amenity of the local area.

Save for the additional revenue that further pay & display parking spaces might be expected to generate for the Council, this proposed scheme would appear to be a waste of local resources. It is considered that such resources would be better spent in other ways to improve the amenity of the area around Brookside and Pemberton Terrace.

On behalf of our client, we therefore wish to register an objection to the draft Order.

---

I'm writing to express my concern about the proposals to changing the parking on these 2 streets. I am a weekday daily user of this parking due to having children at a school in the area. I am also about to be employed part-time by one of the schools and will need access to parking for some of that time too.

Some of my concerns are as follows:

1. The proposal is to make the residents parking 830 onwards on Brookside. This seems hugely unwise given 4-7 schools and colleges in the immediate area have drop offs from 8-9. The parking in surrounding streets is used extensively from 8-9, but there will not be enough space for people to pay to park to simply drop off children, if they are restricted to pay and display bays only, from 830 onwards. Most of the local streets are, even if residents parking only, currently available for free parking until 9.
2. If the new residents parking on Pemberton Terrace has the same times as Brookside, this will contribute to the same problem.
3. It is not clear from the online plans, how many pay and display bays there will be on Brookside, and whether it will be as many as there are currently on Pemberton Terrace?
4. A significant issue for congestion will be that due to Brookside being one way, drivers will be forced to all arrive at the south end of Brookside, in order to find a parking space, so leading to more traffic on roads which are already very busy in rush hour, such as Trumpington Road.

Some might argue I should be cycling into town from north Cambridge, or using a bus, instead of driving, but,

1. One of our children has a significant for-life visual impairment and I do not yet consider cycling on busy roads a safe enough way for her to travel.
  2. For 3 of us to travel by bus each day it would be prohibitively expensive (and time consuming).
  3. The cycle routes are not yet finished from north Cambridge and so I do not consider it safe enough for our family to cycle even without a child with a visual impairment.
-



**We have been made aware of the Notice of the above Order which the CCC proposes to make under the powers contained in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (as amended).**

We believe we have been inadequately consulted about these proposed changes and have just heard that consultation will be ceased on the 28<sup>th</sup> February 2020. The Public Notice which has been displayed is dated the 5<sup>th</sup> February.

**We urgently request that the planned works be delayed until an adequate consultation with all local stakeholders can be undertaken. We believe the planned works will put our pupils at greater risk.**

You will be aware of the following ePetition in support of our position:

<https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/ePetitions/tabid/115/ID/44/Object-to-Installing-Pay-Display-on-Brookside-CB2.aspx>.

As a major stakeholder on Brookside, Heritage School occupies 17-19 Brookside and has in excess of 200 pupils/staff accessing the buildings daily during term time, over half of whom are under 10 years of age. Because Brookside is a narrow, one-way street accessed by an alarming number of cars and taxis, we have a significant duty of care to ensure road, pedestrian and cycling safety for our pupils, parents and staff.

We already had the CCC Highways Dept come a few years ago to repaint the road markings on the treacherous corner of Pemberton Terrace/Brookside, where markings wear out quickly because of the volume of traffic. An order submitted on 30/04/2019 was agreed and never completed; it was cancelled without explanation on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019. A further request made on 30/01/20 for proposed works has now been granted but is as yet undone.

However, with the **Parking Bays Local Scheme on Brookside and Pemberton Terrace** hastily agreed within the greater Cambridge Local Plan, this seems an important time to raise our safety concerns within this area and comment on the proposals outlined in the Order.

Of major concern to us is the lack of double yellow lines across the our frontage (17-19 Brookside), in keeping with the provision made for St Mary's Sixth Form College and MPW Fifth and Sixth Form College at the Bateman Street end of Brookside. These are smaller educational establishments who cater for 15-18 year olds. **Heritage School has 200 pupils, over 100 of whom are age 10 or younger, making our pupils more vulnerable than those at St Mary's, SPF or MPW; the duty of care for road safety along our frontage is consequently greater.**

Currently, under Residential Permit parking, we have cars parked along the entire frontage of our buildings, which **significantly restricts line of sight** from the pavement and the corner with Pemberton Terrace making it very difficult to see cars and bicycles travelling north up Brookside before crossing. This poses a severe risk to our pupils, and other local children, who cross Brookside to access gardens along Hobson's Conduit. It poses a severe risk to pedestrians and cyclists crossing from Pemberton Terrace to the bridge over Hobson's Conduit to Trumpington Road. It also increases risk for our numerous supervised class groups that make use of the pedestrian bridge several times a day.

If Brookside (a narrow one-way street) takes all of the P&D bays from Pemberton Terrace, this will encourage more 'foreign' traffic to drive down Brookside looking for parking places. These drivers will not be aware of the many little children in the area or the extent of pedestrian and cycling traffic that uses the pedestrian bridge to Trumpington Road. Local residents, by contrast, are more aware of the local risks and do not tend to use their cars frequently during the day. P&D places would encourage greater car traffic by those unfamiliar with local needs and risks. More car doors opening onto a narrow pavement as well as onto a narrow street is of concern too.

We feel that our frontage needs to be marked with double yellow lines and with appropriate signage as MPW and St Mary's have further up Brookside (see pictures below).



It is only a matter of time until a severe accident takes place between a pedestrian or cyclist and a car (especially a taxi) at the corner where cars travelling north up Brookside meet Pemberton Terrace. We urgently need new road markings and a stop sign, or some other form of traffic calming, so that pedestrians and cyclists travelling west along Pemberton Terrace have a clear and strong right of way onto the pedestrian bridge to Trumpington Road. As noted above, the risk is exacerbated by having cars parked along our frontage, thus impeding line of sight south down Brookside for pedestrians and cyclists. This improvement would protect our pupils and the many pedestrians and cyclists, including from the Stephen Perse Foundation and other local and Cambridge residents, who travel this route.

Further, we feel there is a strong case to be made for making Pemberton Terrace one-way, west to east, as cars travelling north up Panton Street do not need to turn left onto Pemberton Terrace when Lensfield Road is available for that purpose. This would reduce congestion in the mornings and enable the creation of a dedicated east-west cycle lane on Pemberton Terrace.

We feel strongly that residential only parking on Brookside is much safer than a mix of P&D and residential parking. Relinquishing some of the P&D places on Pemberton Terrace in favour of more residential parking would, to us, be an acceptable compromise for securing a clear frontage to our buildings. Generally, we feel there is adequate provision for P&D down the Lensfield Road end of Brookside. The suggestion of a dedicated hire-car parking space is one we support. We do not feel the erection of bicycle racks will be of any use to our families; they seem rather pointless to us in the proposed location.

---

I am writing in response to the TRO Consultation PR0551. I share the substantial concerns raised in this online petition:

<https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/ePetitions/tabid/115/ID/44/Object-to-Installing-Pay-Display-on-Brookside-CB2.aspx> (Full text included below)

I do not share their outrage at the lack of consultation since that is what is happening now. Nevertheless, I hope that there can be constructive dialogue between the relevant stakeholders, including local residents and businesses.

The full text of the petition:

We the undersigned petition the council to Reject Cambridgeshire County Council's PR0551 Proposed Amendments to Parking Restrictions – Newtown area, Cambridge issued the 5th February 2020. We, the unsigned, object to the removal of Resident Permit parking and replacing it with Pay & Display parking on Brookside (Bateman Street to Pemberton Terrace section), where it is proposed to convert the northern and southern sections of existing Resident Permit parking to Pay & Display parking, in addition the southern section being extended southwards by 20 metres to provide an additional length of Pay & Display parking.

**Justification:**

The section of Brookside between Bateman Street and Pemberton Terrace is a narrow, one-way street with the front gardens of schools and residents across the road, and with schools at the beginning and end of the road. This section of road is currently only Resident Permit parking, which is always occupied, and the section at the southern Bateman Street end (outside MPW and the Stephen Perse Foundation) has double yellow lines or zigzag SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR lines.

Removing the Resident Permit parking and installing Pay & Display parking will increase risk of serious injury to:

- School children (Heritage School, Stephen Perse Foundation, and MPW) arriving to school, leaving school during the day for activities, or when crossing the road to front gardens. This risk is particularly

acute outside of Heritage School, which has over 200 pupils, half of which are aged 4-10 years old, where the line of sight is most compromised by parked cars,

- Resident children crossing the road to their gardens,
- Resident senior citizens walking in the area or to their gardens,
- Cyclists going the wrong way down Brookside,
- Visitors to the Botanical Gardens who walk down Brookside, often entering resident gardens.

Installing Pay & Display will create additional foreign traffic turning off Trumpington road, into Bateman street and then left into Brookside to try and find parking. These drivers will not be local people with local knowledge of risks to children or residents or of others who cycle or walk the wrong way down the road. The turning into Brookside is almost blind as the railings and plantings obscure the view of the driver. Front garden gates often swing into the road. Local residents and business users are aware of these factors and drive slowly.

A particular concern is line of sight down Brookside for residents, school children and other users wishing to cross Brookside. This problem is particularly acute at the northern end of Brookside outside Heritage School. There is a serious risk of injury to school children crossing Brookside, as they are unable clearly to see a car approaching up Brookside due to parked cars. This same risk applies to all cyclists and pedestrians crossing from Pemberton Terrace to the pedestrian bridge across Hobson's Conduit to Trumpington Road. Heritage School reports numerous 'near misses'; poor line of sight at the northern end of Brookside is a serious accident waiting to happen. Installing Pay and Display parking on Brookside will make matters worse.

There was a proposal to install two-way cycling on this section of Brookside. However, after a report it was concluded that this was a safety concern. See paragraph 4.4 of Cambridge Traffic Management area joint committee report dated 24th April 2006.

Additionally, removing residents parking from this section will cause residents to drive around the local one-way system creating a greater environmental impact.

It is proposed to remove the Pay & Display from Pemberton Terrace and replace it with Residents Permit parking. Pemberton Terrace is a two-way street on what is effectively a single lane road, given the current parking on the north side of Pemberton Terrace. This parking is not much used for much during the day. With all spaces potentially full of Resident Permit parking throughout the day there will be no space for drivers to pull in to let others pass, leading to more frequent bottlenecks, including when lorries or delivery trucks drive down Pemberton Terrace from Brookside. Regardless of how parking bays are distributed on Pemberton Terrace, consideration should be given to making Pemberton Terrace one way from west to east.

Residents, schools and other business users of Brookside have not been consulted on this proposed scheme. We, the undersigned, given the objections stated above, demand that this scheme be sent back to consultation. This will allow residents, schools and other business users to have their say so that a more appropriate scheme can be created, one which balances various needs and serious safety concerns more effectively. Under the current proposal, the safety of residents and school children will be compromised further by encouraging more foreign traffic on Brookside.

---

## **SUPPORT**

I am writing in favour of the parking scheme.

It is widely recognised that a significant number of out-of-area drivers enter New Town looking for Pay & Display Bays, often cheaper than Central/Lion Yard parking. This is mainly a residential area and the impact of increased volume of cars and the associated pollution and safety risks to residents and the many school children using narrow pavements and blind corners cannot be underestimated. We have had two major incidents this past year with a) a coach hitting a cyclist, seriously injuring them, and b) a taxi hitting a Bellerbys student who was attended to by staff from St Mary's.

Re-siting the bays as proposed serves to move Pay & Display bays to the perimeter of New Town, as should have been designed many years ago. It moves Residents Parking Bays closer to residents where many streets currently have no parking with owners' vehicles often 50m-100m away, down quieter back streets which are more prone to break-ins & theft as seen the past 18 months.

It is good that a Street Car Bay is being added to the area. My concern about the Cycling Bays is that these should be better situated close to the Botanical Garden on Brookside, near the entrance and not where proposed (it being not particularly close to any amenities or shops, with the majority of cyclists more likely to cycle on to the centre to park there). At present there are many cycles being locked to Brookside railings opposite the entrance, blocking the pavement for all pedestrians, both residents & visitors, and damaging the area's historical features (these being privately owned requiring their owners to give time and money to their repair, which they won't due to the ongoing issue of lack of cycle parking). I urge the Committee to ask the planning team to revise this aspect of the bay planning as this would significantly improve the scheme and further encourage use of cycles to the Botanic & wider area, and address residents' concerns.

---

We are just writing to you to say that we are in favour of the proposed residents' parking bays for Pemberton Terrace, replacing the existing pay and display bays. We have lived at 5 Pemberton Terrace for 23 years, and have had to endure parking at some distance from our property. Our vehicles have been damaged on St Eligius Street (which is far too narrow), broken into on sections where there is no domestic housing, and our son's car has been stolen.

We are both in favour of residents' bays on Pemberton Terrace, and this is what we previously voted for during the consultation period.

---

As a resident who experiences the problem of parking in this area of Newtown, I would support any increase in residents' parking along Brookside and Pemberton Terrace. The difficulties of parking are acute at 'dropping off' and 'picking up' times of the schools, especially Heritage School and the Stephen Perse Junior and Senior Schools. It is imperative therefore to give priority to those who live in the area either as property owners or renters of property.

---

As a resident of Norwich Street, I am emailing in support of the scheme relating to Residents' Parking bays in the Newtown area. I very much hope this scheme will go ahead as it will assist residents in this area.

---

I am a resident in the Newtown area and I am writing in support of the parking scheme to have resident bays on Pemberton Terrace, retain some resident bays on the one way stretch of Brookside and place a cycle rack and car hire bay on the two way section of Brookside.

**Ref PR0551**

Congestion, excessive through traffic and lack of local parking is an ongoing issue in this residential area and the proposed parking scheme would help to address these issues and has been voted for by residents.

The scheme was taken forward to the council because it received majority votes on a number of occasions. The scheme is for the benefit of local residents and their visitors, especially those on Pemberton Terrace, Panton Street etc. We are very fortunate that we have had councillor support and council officer engagement. GCP have also agreed to fund it.

### **Background information**

Residents' parking has been on the local agenda for many years and in 2013/ 2014 residents voted to address the lack of residents parking for many in the area and especially on Pemberton Terrace, with the council. Since then Councillors and council officers have worked hard and been in support of addressing a scheme which considers the wider benefit of residents on Panton Street, Pemberton Terrace, Saxon Street and St Eligius Street who do not have their own private parking.

Residents, the RA committee and Traffic Review Group have been informed and responses taken to the council and the scheme has moved forward due to a majority support from the wider community.

After discussions with residents in 2018 - Brookside resident requests were taken to council officers and the scheme was amended to retain some resident bays on the one way section of Brookside.

In 2018 a survey was carried out amongst local residents - which was passed as a majority decision. This survey enabled the residents' scheme to move to a public consultation Traffic Regulation Order. The council aims to place resident bays nearer to a wider number of residential properties and pay and display bays nearer to institutions - which should help residents and could help some congestion issues.

As I understand it a petition which has been put forward against this disregards our local residents' democratic process over many years and contains many names that are not residents in the Newtown area.

I am writing in support of a scheme which has been on the local agenda for many years and has the full support of the majority of local residents.

---

I am writing in favour of the parking scheme ref PR0551.

I am aware that residents' parking has been on the local agenda for many years. It has been recognised by many residents as well as councillors and council officers that redistribution of the parking bays for the wider benefit of the community in North Newtown is needed.

In 2013/ 2014 residents voted to contact the council to consider the lack of nearby residents' parking for many in the area including those on Panton Street, Saxon Street as well as Pemberton Terrace. There had been previously been some changes to parking hours but this did not address the geographical problem of bay locations for so many residents. As far back as the 1960's there have been requests for resident bays on Pemberton Terrace.

Councillors and council officers have worked extremely hard and have supported the need to consider the wider benefit of residents on Panton Street, Pemberton Terrace, Saxon Street and St Eligius Street who do not have their own private parking. Residents, the RA committee and local residents' Traffic Review Group have been informed and responses taken to the council. The scheme has got to this stage due to a majority support from the wider community.

After discussions with residents in 2018 - Brookside resident requests were taken to council officers and the scheme was amended to retain some resident bays on the one way section of Brookside.

In 2018 a survey was carried out amongst local residents - about 500 households were posted with questionnaires including Brookside and surrounding streets. There was also an online survey available. The survey results passed as a majority decision in favour of the scheme. This survey enabled the residents' scheme to move to a public consultation Traffic Regulation Order.

The scheme does not address wider traffic concerns specifically or pay and display policy or issues with school traffic etc. However - the council have proposed placing the pay and display bays nearer to

institutions which council officers have considered could help with traffic issues and benefit schools. There is currently considerable school traffic which drives down Brookside so the safety issue is already a problem - this scheme won't give any additional safety problems to what is already happening - and the scheme may actually help. (For example congestion may be reduced as those visiting schools can use pay and display bays) I suggest any continuing safety issues could be addressed in a separate schemes/work with the schools etc.

The RA hopes to continue to work with councillors, council officers and schools to tackle wider traffic issues at a later stage but this scheme is not specifically aimed at those issues as it primarily addresses the residents needs of the wider community, especially the many residents on Panton Street, Saxon Street, Pemberton Terrace who do not have private parking and who currently have to use other streets - sometimes driving around several roads in the area to find parking. All Brookside residents have their own private parking and consequently council officers have been supportive to rationalise the resident parking bays which would provide a fairer system that benefits a much wider number of households in several surrounding local streets with no private parking.

The council proposal aims to place resident bays nearer to a much wider number of residential properties and pay and display bays nearer to institutions. The current scheme also includes a cycle rack and a car hire bay which can encourage more sustainable transport in the area. Council officers, councillors and residents have worked very hard over many years to put forward a scheme for the wider benefit of the local residential community.

I strongly urge you to support this scheme.

---

I am writing in general strong support of this scheme which involves creating residents' bays on Pemberton Terrace with the re-location of the paying bays to Brookside. The Brookside houses already have parking close to them along Brookside, some of which will remain, but also importantly along Brookside Lane where they have garages and parking spaces; whereas Pemberton Terrace does not.

I would like to ensure that we do not lose the global number / envelope of residents bays, or even hope they might be increased because already parking close to the houses is a real issue for us.

I think more thought needs to be given to the actual location of the cycle parks (the need of which I would challenge by the way). From a safety point of view it needs to be moved further away from the junction of Brookside / Pemberton Terrace / the small bridge over the conduit because already this area is highly congested at certain times of day with parents bringing children to school.

I would suggest that the cycle part, if it is really needed should be moved further north along Brookside nearer to Lensfield Road.

The residents' parking has been on the local agenda for many years. In 2013/ 2014 residents voted to address the lack of residents parking for many in the area and especially on Pemberton Terrace, with the council. Residents have been informed of meetings with council representatives and councillors. Councillors and council officers have worked hard and been in support of addressing a scheme which considers the wider benefit of residents on Panton Street, Pemberton Terrace, Saxon Street and St Eligius Street who do not have their own private parking.

Residents, the RA committee and Traffic Review Group have been informed and responses taken to the council and the scheme has moved forward due to a majority support from the wider community. After discussions with residents in 2018 - Brookside resident requests were taken to council officers and the scheme was amended to retain some resident bays on the one way section of Brookside. In 2018 a survey was carried out amongst local residents - which was passed as a majority decision. This survey enabled the residents' scheme to move to a public consultation Traffic Regulation Order.

The scheme does not address wider traffic concerns or pay and display policy or issues surrounding schools. The council aims to place resident bays nearer to a wider number of residential properties and pay and display bays nearer to institutions - which should help residents and could help some congestion issues.

---

We are writing **in favour of PRO551** re parking on Brookside and Pemberton Terrace. The redistribution of the Pay & Display and the Residents' Parking spaces has been under open discussion for some years and has received majority approval on a number of occasions at the Residents' Association meetings. The existing RP bays in Brookside which it is proposed should become P&D bays are not in front of any private residences which in any case have parking space and garage at the rear in Brookside Lane. It will also mean that the Heritage School will have more adjacent P&D spaces for the parents to use when delivering/collecting their children.

Our County Councillor and City Officers, as well as our RA committee, have put a great deal of work into this project over several years.

---

I wish to support the proposal. Residents' parking has been on the local agenda for many years.

In 2013/ 2014 residents voted to address the lack of residents parking for many in the area and especially on Pemberton Terrace, with the council. Residents have been informed of meetings with council representatives and councillors. Councillors and council officers have worked hard and been in support of addressing a scheme which considers the wider benefit of residents on Panton Street, Pemberton Terrace, Saxon Street and St Eligius Street who do not have their own private parking.

Residents, the RA committee and Traffic Review Group have been informed and responses taken to the council and the scheme has moved forward due to a majority support from the wider community. After discussions with residents in 2018 - Brookside resident requests were taken to council officers and the scheme was amended to retain some resident bays on the one way section of Brookside.

In 2018 a survey was carried out amongst local residents - which was passed as a majority decision. This survey enabled the residents' scheme to move to a public consultation Traffic Regulation Order. The scheme does not address wider traffic concerns or pay and display policy or issues surrounding schools. The council aims to place resident bays nearer to a wider number of residential properties and pay and display bays nearer to institutions - which should help residents and could help some congestion issues.

---