

Dear Sir or Madam,

Proposed Residents' Parking Permit Scheme — Ascham Road Area

We — my wife and I — have objections both to specifics of the scheme and, more importantly, to the manner of the consultation and to the scheme in principle.

Specific objections

1. Provision is made for residents' parking in roads, such as Gurney Way and Ascham Road, in which residents already have parking space on their own property.
2. Three spaces only are provided in Atherton Close, where at present up to nine cars can park — as was pointed out in our comments in the questionnaire.

Objections in principle

The consultation

1. Inadequate support

The proportion of residents in favour of the scheme does not justify going ahead with it. On your figures, only 16.32% of residents support it. The failure of the majority to respond does not indicate equanimity on the scheme. Some will have missed the consultation; some will not have had time to respond because of heavy work and family commitments; some non-car owners will not have realised that they will be affected; some will have been away; some may not have received the form; and so on.

To pursue a scheme that will impose inconvenience and cost on everyone on the basis of 16% support is undemocratic and objectionable.

2. Inadequate response procedure

The requirement to email objections closes a key part of the consultation to public view, making it impossible for residents to know how many and what objections there have been, and as a result making a nonsense the whole consultation. How is the public to know if objections have been taken into account?

Objections to the scheme itself

1. Interference in the free movement of residents and visitors

No longer will it be possible for residents or their visitors simply to park. Residents will have to buy and display a permit; visitors will have to check where they are permitted to park, and when, and if necessary get a permit from the person they are visiting and return to their vehicle to display it. If residents or visitors fail to do these things, they risk being penalised. This is a pernicious interference in the free movement of people in their everyday lives.

2. Imposition of disincentives to family and community life

The imposition of what is in effect a tax on free movement will discourage people from visiting each other.

- People will hesitate to make social visits, as they will incur a cost for those they visit, and residents may hesitate to invite family or friends.
- The scheme will also impose a cost on carers and those they care for — patients, friends or family members; and when a carer's visits need to be frequent, requiring more permits than are permitted, the carer will be presented with an impossible dilemma — to risk a penalty or to neglect the person needing care.
- The scheme puts tradespeople and workmen at constant risk of penalty when they are unable to get a permit.

3. Penalising the poor

The costs of residents' permits and visitors' permits will be a burden for many people. The poor will suffer most — those whose lives are already constrained financially. They will have fewer family or friends visiting, fewer carer's visits, fewer visits from tradesmen or workmen. This is neither fair nor supportive.

4. Unfair discrimination between road users

All road users have an equal right to use the highway. The scheme privileges those road users who live beside the highway over those who don't, giving to those who already have the advantage of living here and taking way from those who don't. It is a rigging of the system for the haves against the have-nots, and a violation of the principle of equal access for all to the highways of this country.

5. Potential destruction of green landscape

The scheme gives residents who who have no drive of their own to park in, but who do have a front garden, an incentive to convert the garden to parking space — removing plants, trees and grass, turning the neighbourhood from a residential area relieved by greenery into one of barren and soulless streetscapes.

The scheme, in short, is misconstrued. The objective is good: to limit the number of cars crowding into Cambridge. But the method is wrong. It imposes costs and penalties, whereas it should create incentives and better facilities: as well as free park and ride, which we now have, more and safer cycleways, cheaper and more comfortable buses, and more of them, tax incentives for car-share schemes, etc.

These approaches do not interfere with everyday life, do not undermine family and community life, do not disadvantage the poor or those who do not live in Cambridge, and do not threaten what green there is in our residential streets.

We hope you will reconsider your policy.

Yours sincerely,

28 September 2018

ASCHAM ROAD RESIDENTS' PARKING CONSULTATION, REF. PRO481

Thank you for the circular telling us there was a majority of respondents in favour of residents parking, and about the revised proposals for residents' parking.

I cannot find the details of the proposal on the Council's website. I will have to make my comments from my memory of looking at the plans online some time ago.

Have the proposals been removed from the website? Although it is 28 September, the deadline, your website says the consultation period is over.

These are my comments:-

1. REASON GIVEN FOR SCHEME INADEQUATE AND UNJUSTIFIABLE The reason for the scheme given in the notice is for the need for residents to be able to park, the implication being that they cannot at present, because of commuter parking.

However, virtually every household in the area has room on its curtilage for off-road parking, often for two or more cars.

There is very little demand or need for on-road parking for residents. Until the new Milton Road Primary School was built, and before the De Greville commuter parking was dislodged to here, there were very few cars parked on Ascham and Milton Roads (people working at the school park on the roads).

2. COMMENTS AND QUERIES ON REVISED PROPOSALS

A. Pay and display parking - where?

This is listed on the legend for the map, but I cannot find any on the map itself. Where is it?

B. Limited waiting bays - time?

I cannot see how long one is allowed to wait.

C. Insufficient parking for non-residents There seems to be very few spaces, in only a couple of areas, for people who are not residents or residents' visitors. Residents' parking areas always used to be a mix of residents/pay and display areas, with a decent number of pay and display spaces for outsiders - why not here?

Are there enough? How are people going to find where they may park, if there are only a couple of areas? Would it not be better to have more areas (dual use?), and more evenly distributed in the area?

D. Insufficient allowance for visitors' permits.

We will be allowed a maximum of 20 permits a year, with 5 visits on each. i.e. 100 visits a year from friends/family, i.e. two a week. This hardly seems reasonable. This hardly encourages community, family, friendship. What of someone elderly whose family members pop by often?

Why the cap?

E. Unnecessarily long hours of operation?

If the intention (as declared) is to make commuter parking impossible, then it would suffice to make the hours of operation 12-1, as elsewhere in town. This would make things less complicated for residents' visitors.

F. Unintended consequence I - rat runs and speeding.

Before the new Milton Road School created a demand for parking in Gurney Way and Ascham Road, and before the displacement of commuter parking here from De Freville, there was a serious problem of speeding and rat running. Commuter parking acted as unintended road calming.

Rat running will recur, as the roads will have few parked cars as virtually all residents have ample off-road parking. Courtney Way/Metcalf Road likewise suffered from speeding/rat running.

Has this been taken into account?

G. Unintended consequence II - facilitating school run The proposed 9-3 hours of operation will make parking for the school run easy and will encourage parents to drive. Given the lack of demand or need for residents to park their car(s) in the road (ample curtilage parking), the roads will be pretty empty. School hours are 8.55-3.20, so parents can park outside the hours of operations.

Has this been taken into consideration?

H. Unintended consequence III - encouraging car use It will be much easier taking the car for short journeys as there will be no problem with finding a parking space on return, and no difficulties of having to manoeuvre in/out of driveways.

I. Unintended consequence IV - encouraging car ownership It will be much cheaper, and far less complicated to buy a residents' permit than to use visitors' permits. It will be much cheaper to have THREE cars with residents' permits than to pay for visitors' permits.

J. Sliding scale for residents' permits?

Why is there not a sliding scale, with second and third cars progressively more expensive?

K. George Street and Herbert Street - inclusion in Ascham area?

Might it be sensible to include them in the Ascham scheme rather than the Elizabeth scheme? The people I know in Herbert Street park in Gurney Way if Herbert Street is full, not in the "Elizabeth" area.

It makes much more sense logistically. If you try to park in Herbert Street and can't, you can come out of Herbert Street only onto Milton Road. It is natural and quick to park in Gurney or Ascham. To get to the "Elizabeth" streets, you have to drive down to Mitcham's Corner and go all round the block.

L. George Street and Herbert Street - timing of their parking scheme If the Ascham area is implemented before the "Elizabeth" area, parking will become chaotic and difficult for these streets, where all residents have to park in the road and which will have displaced commuters descending on it.

Should not the timing of the implementations of the two schemes take this into account, and the Ascham area be delayed, if necessary?

M. Carlton Way

On the map this is included (south side), like the other roads bounding the scheme (Gilbert Road and Milton Road). But no details are given as to parking arrangements.

N. Motorbikes/mopeds

Where are they to park?

O. Very difficult/impossible for non-residents/visitors to park There will be people who are not residents or visitors who have perfectly good reasons for wanting/needing to park - workmen at rented houses (landlords not entitled to permits), people using local/Mitcham's Corner businesses

3. CONCERNS RE LEGITIMACY AND DEMOCRACY OF DECISION Your letter says out of the 446 households, there were 112 responses to the consultation, i.e. 25% of households. Of these, 65% support the scheme.

That means that there were c. 72 responses in favour. That means that 72 out of 446 household are in favour., i.e. between 1/6 and 1/7.

Your original letter said that the scheme would go ahead only if there was a "consensus" for it. Clearly there can never be a consensus (wrong word), but such a low proportion of residents wanting it is not a mandate. It does not seem right to implement a proposal which is supported by such a small minority of residents and by so few people.

I suppose you could say that the three-quarters of households (334) who did not reply are not bothered either way. True - but they also clearly are not in favour of residents' parking, or they would have voted for it!

best wishes

Dear Mr _

Thank you so much for taking the trouble to respond. I had been going to email you to check you received my comments ok, and obviously you did.

One thing I would add to my comments - re people from outside the area needing to park, for perfectly good reasons - people going to St Laurence's Church for mass/weddings/ funerals always need to park in Aschem Road/Gurney Way/Atherton Close, as there isn't enough room in the car park. We always see them walking to/from cars. Especially when there's a big funeral (and most Catholic funerals are big!).

There won't be anywhere for them to park.

More mixed use spaces?

My other thought is that if the plans have indeed been taken off the website, how can people who would like to know what they are look them up? Might it be better to leave them up (while making it clear that the deadline for comments has passed?)

best wishes

I am writing to express concern about the proposed scheme for the Ascham Road area as a resident of Gilbert Road who regularly parks on Gurney Way. I believe the proposed permit-only parking zones will merely displace commuters, creating more problems in neighbouring streets, particularly those in the Elizabeth Zone. This is particularly problematic considering many nearby streets already lack sufficient parking, and use Gurney Way, Ascham Road etc as overflow, which they would no longer be able to do once the scheme was in place. In the interests of the wider area, our scheme should certainly not be introduced before all neighbouring areas' schemes are implemented, and it would make sense if all schemes came into place at the same time.

The scheme for the Ascham Road area also does not seem to have been generated with regard to neighbouring areas that nonetheless use Ascham parking out of necessity. The Elizabeth Zone in particular seems likely to struggle to provide sufficient parking, and will no longer be allowed to share Ascham parking. I am aware that their proposed scheme looks likely to remove many parking spaces, which will worsen the situation for them further. I would urge the suggestions of the Chesterton Triangle Parking Report (<http://chestertontriangle.uk/parkingreport>) to be taken into consideration. A more joined-up approach to parking between the Ascham and Elizabeth zones would be advisable. If more parking spaces are to be removed as part of the scheme, new spaces must be created to ensure that their will be capacity for all the residents who possess a permit.

In general, I am against any introduction of residents parking schemes; leaving drivers to share public parking areas seems the best solution, with creation of new parking spaces implemented if necessary. As the situation currently stands, it seems likely that more permits will be given out than there are parking spaces, as has been the case in the Mill Road area, so I do not see what benefit the scheme will provide to residents given the associated cost. However, if a residents parking scheme must be introduced, I would urge that the impact on neighbouring streets which fall into a different zone be considered fully, and that they be consulted as well as the residents within the zone itself.

Kind regards,

(Letter separate - scanned)

Consultation on Residents Parking Scheme – Ascham Area
Reference Number PR0481

We are in favour of the proposal to introduce a Residents' Parking Scheme to include Metcalfe Road and Courtney Way. The scheme as proposed will address some of the problems caused by all-day commuter parking and by visitors using the facilities at the Castle School. We do, however, have the following concerns:

1. The proposed scheme does not address the problems caused by parking at school-run times. This includes blocking driveways and parking on verges and double yellow lines, in particular on the corner of Metcalfe Road and Courtney Way, which is particularly dangerous. This is a particular problem from 2.30 to 3.30pm each day. We therefore believe that the proposed operational times should be extended to cover the period from 8.30am to 4pm.
2. The junction of Metcalfe Road and Courtney Way is dangerous, and cars parked around the junction obstruct the view of approaching cars. We think that the double yellow lines on the south side of Metcalfe Road, ie on the inside of the bend, should be extended by one or two car lengths.
3. The draft plan shows bays double parked on Courtney Way, restricting the width of the carriageway. We suggest that consideration should be given to staggering the bays as is proposed for Metcalfe Road. We believe that the amendments suggested above would improve these proposals, and contribute to the improved safety of residents, visitors, and the students of all three schools in this area.

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached a document giving detail about an objection to the extensive use of double yellow lines in Metcalfe Road as part of the Proposed Residents' Permit Parking Scheme – Ascham Road Area, Reference PR0481.

I am submitting this objection on behalf of a number of residents of Metcalfe Road and this submission includes a petition against the double yellow lines.

Best regards,

We are writing to confirm our strong SUPPORT for the proposed Ascham Road residents parking scheme.

Hello

I am writing to you to express my concern about a notice that I saw on Guerny Way in Cambridge today. The notice stated that Guerny way and other roads around Guerny way will change, becoming permit holders only or having restrictions.

I am a student living at __ which is Number 1 on Milton Road. I have been parking my car along Guerny Way since I moved to Cambridge in September 2017 for university. With these new restrictions that you are implementing I will not be able to park my car along that road anymore which i'm sure you can understand is very stressful knowing that there are not many places to park in the area as it is.

is there anything that you can do to help me, I need to have my car in Cambridge and obviously it needs to be kept somewhere safe. I am willing to pay for a permit and I would like to find a resolution to this as soon as possible

Thanks

Hi,

With reference to PRO481, on-street parking control in the Asham Road area of Cambridge.

Could you please let me know when this is due to be enforced?

I know a lot of people working near the area park on surrounding roads. All this will be doing is to move the problem else where!

I don't agree with it.

Thank you
Regards

Dear Mr Graham Hughes

I am writing with regard to the parking restrictions being introduced in the Ascham Road area of Cambridge city.

I am a tenant living at [REDACTED] and as there is no parking space available with the property I currently park my car in Gurney Way. I understand from the proposals that only residents living in properties numbered with odd numbers on Milton Road will be eligible to apply for a parking permit. Can you tell me why this is please?

If allowed I would be very willing to pay for a permit as without one I have nowhere to leave my car. I understand as a tenant I have less rights than a resident, however the proposal to offer permits to people living in the properties indicated makes no sense as most of those properties (including every property on Gurney Way) has either a garage or a driveway and therefore presumably will not need to apply for a permit to park on the road.

Please could it be reconsidered which properties will be eligible to apply for a permit to enable me to do so?

Yours sincerely

Dear _

Thank you for responding to my previous email. I would also like my objection to the proposed parking restrictions to be noted. Having re-read my email I realised my comments may have been taken to mean that I was happy with the proposed changes.

There does not seem to me to be a good justification for bringing in these parking restrictions. If it was because people living in properties on Gurney Rd and Ascham Rd had nowhere to park outside of their own properties I could see some benefit to the residents, but the majority of residents have parking on their property and do not require street parking. The restrictions also will mean fewer spaces to park on those roads, so even for those able to get a permit they may find there is no space for them to park in.

Additionally the removal of the bays on Milton Rd makes no sense. If and when the plans for widening the road go ahead then there may be cause to remove these bays, but until that time it seems more sensible to leave them in use to ease the parking problems.

I understand that the restrictions will bring in revenue for the council, however the problems it will cause so many people living in the area, including myself, to not have anywhere to park surely needs to be taken into consideration. If the restrictions come in and I am also unable to apply for a permit, I would probably have to move. As someone who grew up around Cambridge and continues to live and work here I find it very disappointing that there is so little compassion for the needs of local people.

So please note that I wholly object to the plans to introduce parking restrictions in the Ascham area.

Yours sincerely

To whom it may concern

I would like to object to the Ascham Road TRO scheme as I live in Chestnut Grove and our road has yet to have a solution to out of town parking being prevented. If the Ascham Road scheme goes ahead, this will only make our problem worse with those cars parking here. I also believe the consultation process was procedurally unfair as our neighbourhood was unrepresented.

Regards

Hello,

I live at _ _ _ _ .

When parking on Gilbert Road was prevented many years ago and later restricted on Milton Road, my life was made increasingly difficult.

I have now found that you are planning to make the North side of Milton Road unavailable to me too. I must object in the strongest possible terms. Most of the houses on the North side of Milton Road have drives to park in whereas on my side (even numbers) we mainly do not. I rely every day on the parking bays that are there.

As things are I am frequently forced to park in Gurney Way (again in front of houses mostly with ample driveways), far from my house, but the new plans would make even this unavailable to me.

Furthermore, things will only get worse when the terrible sky-killing development on the old Milton Road School site is complete. It's beyond my comprehension how planning in this once beautiful area can be so atrocious.

I know I speak for many with this objection.

Yours,

I'm a resident of _ _ _ with off-street parking for one car, so my concerns are for those residents without such possibilities. I think that any scheme should aim (a) to accommodate a maximum number of residents, and (b) to discourage commuter parking in the area, which blocks _ almost entirely every weekday. The scheme proposed falls short of both of these two requirements.

Dear Policy

I object to the parking scheme for Aschem Road PR0481 on the grounds that residents in the surrounding Streets were not fully consulted.

As a resident of ___ __ (without a parking scheme) this will adversely limit available parking especially because of all the commuter parking in our St.

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my objections to the above scheme, which I believe to have been drawn-up without following all correct procedures.

I reside at number ___ __ in a property whose frontage is blocked by various _ _ _ _ _ - so I have no option for parking at or in the immediate vicinity of my house.

Even though it is inconvenient and frequently full during working hours, I must find a place to park in a Milton Road bay, on Ascham Road, or on Gurney Way. This scheme would eliminate two of these three options, and likely render the third impossible due to the vehicles displaced by the changes to the others.

Whilst I am not entirely opposed to a fair and well-considered Residents' Parking scheme, limiting the scheme's eligibility to one side of Milton Road, a road known to lack off-Street parking, appears discriminatory. At the very least, all roads in the area whose residents park in or near the affected area outside of office hours should be eligible to purchase a residents' pass.

The northern Milton Road bays are vital to the functioning of my household - and if these bays are removed, then deliveries and essential access and loading may become impossible.

The scheme appears to be designed to ensure there is a parking shortage, leading to it being likely that I would have to circle during rush-hour, worsening the traffic and pollution situation.

Further, the scheme appears poorly conceived in that if I am forced to get into the car before 9am to move the car to a permitted place, then I will most likely drive to work rather than walking - surely, the opposite effect to that intended.

Finally, it appears that the previous Ascham Road consultation was procedurally flawed in that the views of nearby residents of the local area were disregarded.

Finally, County Policy dictates that such schemes must avoid simply relocating vehicles around their periphery - yet with the loss of so many spaces and with no alternative suggested for ineligible local residents, this test is clearly failed.

Best regards,

Hello

I live in ___, near Mitcham's Corner. As a resident with a car, I feel increasingly frustrated by the parking problems that I face. I have elderly friends in ___ whom I visit in the evening, and when I return home around 10 pm, I spend 10-20 minutes finding a space, and I often have to park in Ascham Road or Gurney Way and walk to George Street.

I am especially concerned about the plans to remove the Milton Road bays. These spaces offer much-needed relief for residents of George Street, and their loss will make the problems even tougher for us.

I worry that if I have to park in Ascham Road and leave the space by 9 AM, I will be more likely to drive to my place of work, instead of opting for a bicycle or walking.

This means one more car on the road each day.

I don't have the money to move house, given stamp duty costs, and if I do, I will be among the people driving in to my job in the city.

Please would you consider allowing George Street and Herbert Street residents to join the DeFreville or Ascham Road schemes?

Our parking problems are not going away, and the proposed TRO substantially impacts the 'amenity' of George Street as we are unable to park near our homes.

I'm very upset about the current TRO and I strongly encourage a re - think.

thank you

I am writing to object to the Ascham PR0481 TRO proposal. As a result it will make it harder to find spaces in the area. When Herbert street is virtually packed and regularly you have to find spaces in the street in and around the area, this will mean we have even less places to find space and will have to go even further afield to park. It seems extremely unfair, when streets such as Herbert street are so congested, it is a miracle if you can park near your house. Herbert street being nearer to town and having the impact of resident parking in Defreville has really taken the brunt of the parking issue, but seems to be ignored and Ascham, being further away, is getting something that will really effect parking in the area, and seems unnecessary. Please listen to residents who the parking issue truly effects. My neighbour is ___ years of age and regularly has to park on Milton road and Ascham road as she cant park on Herbert street, now, she is going to be even further away searching for a space because of this. Not fair!

Regards,

As a resident of ____, who already finds parking near my house a considerable problem, I strongly object to the proposed Ascham Road area TRO.

There are insufficient spaces in Herbert Street to accommodate our own cars as well as cars owned by residents of Springfield Road, who also park on Herbert Street. Space is also taken by commuters and trades vehicles. It is often necessary to park in Ascham Road or Gurney Road or on Milton Road. Without access to these roads it would often be impossible to park. So if there is going to be another area of residents' only parking, the Chesterton Triangle clearly needs to be part of it.

Strong representations were made at an earlier stage of consultation on the Ascham scheme, but these seem to have been simply ignored. This is grossly unfair and unreasonable. As we explained, Herbert Street, George Street, Springfield and Chersteton Hall Crescent are being squeezed by residents' parking areas on all sides — leaving us insufficient spaces to park near our homes. We need to part of one or other of these schemes — we are not large enough on our own to provide the necessary spaces.

I have already experienced occasions when tradesmen have been unable to park in order to carry out essential work. This new Ascham scheme will make the situation even worse, leaving us unable either to park ourselves or provide access for workmen when necessary.

It cannot be a reasonable or lawful use of the powers to make TROs in such a way as to deprive a small group of streets of sufficient space for their own cars, let alone to accommodate commuters and others displaced from surrounding streets. As we tried to explain at the earlier consultation — apparently without any effect — it is essential that Councillors consider the needs of the whole area. Otherwise we are left stranded.

Please consider seriously the effect of these proposals on neighbouring streets, such as Herbert Street, before taking them any further.
Thank you for your consideration.

I am writing to object against the proposed parking scheme on the Ascham/Milton Rd area. There is no need at all to change from its present position. The parking spaces on Milton Rd are absolutely essential as is ,to facilitate parking for guests, school drop offs and service vehicles for Milton Rd residents.

As a resident I can state that we have no parking problems on Milton Rd at all except on the 5th of November and Strawberry Fair day - we can live with that!

The proposals for any "residents parking" are nothing more that a cash cow for the council, if it isn't broke -don't fix it!

Yours sincerely,

Hello,

We are residents of _____, which is adjacent to the proposed Ascham residents' parking scheme, and we are objecting to that scheme being implemented on the following grounds;

- We objected to the scheme at the consultation stage, as did many of our neighbours, due to the impact of that scheme going ahead without a workable scheme for our area. We feel that our objections were ignored and the scheme should not be allowed to progress until an overall plan is in place
- The removal of the Milton Road (north side) parking bays will cause a parking shortage in our area (called Elizabeth by the Council) as those spaces are largely used by residents of Herbert Street and Springfield Road. If those spaces are removed without a workable solution for our area, then we will all be crowded out of parking in our own neighbourhood.
- We in _____ have been lobbying for residents' parking for many years and really need a scheme. The Council had put our area at a higher priority than Ascham. Due to the high density in our area, it has proved more tricky to find a workable scheme, but that is not a reason to progress a lower priority scheme ahead, especially as implementation of that scheme will make the problems for our neighbourhood even worse.

I object to the Ascham scheme and would like it to be put on hold until the whole area can be progressed at the same time. I am a reviewer of the detailed report put together by _____ and ____ of _____. I would like you to take into account the strength of feeling, the amount of work, and the range of workable proposals included in that report. Please offer the whole area a parking scheme that will fulfil the requirement of allowing residents to park near their homes.

Regards

Dear Policy and Regulation Department

I live at _____, _____, _____ and would like to object to the Traffic regulation Order PR0481 relating to Ascham Residents' Parking.

I have researched the consequences of this TRO and I object in the strongest terms. TROs are supposed to improve the amenity of the streets and improve circulation of traffic, and are legally required to be implemented in a procedurally fair manner (RAC Foundation Report Number 10/115 Annex 3C 42). It is in fact harmful in a number of ways on the first two of these points and I believe that it was also procedurally unfair to residents in adjacent areas.

The urgency of my objection is heightened by the fact that the adjacent Elizabeth zone where I live has been denied a residents' parking scheme. County policy states that a residents' parking scheme allows residents, in the round, to park nearer their homes. We demonstrated in our recent report (<http://chestertontriangle.uk/parkingreport>) that this was clearly not the case for the scheme that was offered to residents of the proposed Elizabeth zone. What we were offered was therefore not a Residents' Parking Scheme according to County policy. We await an amended scheme that does follow county policy but so far there has been no official recognition from officers of this situation.

Here are the primary elements of my objection to the Ascham TRO:

1. The bays on Ascham Road, Gurney Way and Milton Road are used by residents on the South side of Milton Road as well as all of the streets within the "Triangle" between Chesterton Road and Milton Road. This parking is a vital amenity for us. The density of homes and low density of drives within the Triangle means that it is completely unreasonable to create a parking boundary along Milton Road, with a low density of cars owned on the North side kept on-street, and a much higher one to the South. It will cause dramatic parking migration, contrary to County Parking Policy which requires such migration to be avoided as far as reasonably practicable. It is completely practicable to revisit the boundaries, and indeed the numbers in our report above demonstrate this necessity. You should revisit the boundaries in line with your own policy.
2. It is unreasonable to remove the bays on the North side of Milton Road now when these vital bays are an amenity used by the aforementioned residents of the Triangle (including Milton Road South Side) and when the removal could easily be delayed at least until the City Deal goes forward. If the Ascham scheme is to go ahead before the City Deal, the county must take the risk that there is some revenue loss from the scheme and leave the free Milton Road bays in place until a solution is found for the Elizabeth zone that provides adequate spaces. Failure to leave the bays in place will cause residents of Milton Road, Herbert Street, George Street and Springfield Road to circle looking for spaces to park. This circling will cause congestion on Milton Road and Chesterton Road at rush hour as commuters return home. We know that the bays are used by Milton Road South Side residents because our parking report showed that these residents have roughly 35 cars parked on-street (versus 20 bays on the South side of the road) and because there are few homes on the North side of Milton Road without off-street parking. We also know that the Elizabeth/Triangle area is close to parking capacity now when these bays are included. Without those bays, even just losing the bays on the North side, we will most likely not have enough parking for residents at night. Again, residents will be forced to circle and will sometimes

end up parking in more remote areas such as College Fields, around a mile away.

3. It has been claimed by Cllr Scutt that the 9am-3pm M-F Ascham Scheme will mean that residents of the Triangle can park there without inconvenience. This is wrong. Those that commute daily by car can park there. Those of us that try not to use our car every day, and get caught without a space on our own streets, would have to go out to move the car before 9am, irrespective of whether we planned a journey or not. Those of us who waver as to whether to drive or cycle will most certainly be tipped into driving, especially if there are no spaces at home. This behaviour is inevitable as currently planned and creates congestion, contrary to the intention of the TRO. It can be avoided by reworking the boundaries or allowing those in the Triangle to buy permits.

4. Residents of adjacent areas, such as Herbert Street where I live, were told that we could object to the Ascham scheme at the previous stage, and did so. It was not obviously indicated anywhere that objections could only be raised by residents of the proposed Ascham zone. I believe that around 40 or more objections to Ascham came from our area (Elizabeth / the Triangle). This number was highly significant in the scale of the survey. Yet we know from a freedom of information request that they were not counted. In my view that consultation was procedurally unfair because it denied a voice to those critically affected by the changes and who reasonably expected to have one.

In summary, the resident vehicle numbers parked on-street in the Elizabeth zone / Chesterton Triangle are already very close to the number of bays, not due to excessive vehicle ownership but due to a lack of off-street parking and several narrow streets. The proposed parking zone design for the combination of Ascham, Elizabeth and De Freville has now been shown to be utterly flawed and must be revisited. The Milton Road bays (on both sides) and indeed the street parking on Ascham Road and Gurney Way are an important amenity for us residents of the Triangle. In the context of the Elizabeth proposals, which would remove a further 73 parking spaces and make parking impossible for around 50 or more triangle Residents every day, it is shameful and wrong that the Ascham scheme is being pushed ahead without a solution for Elizabeth.

Milton Road bays are a key element of the street and their removal will create perverse incentives to drive for us Triangle residents and will force us to circle the area and beyond, at rush hour, looking for parking spaces.

As a minimum we ask you to hold the removal of the bays on Milton Road until the last possible minute when the City Deal goes ahead. This harms no-one and by that point we may have a solution for the Elizabeth zone.

Best regards

Thanks for your reply. In light of new discussions this week I would like to add two final comments please, which I believe are distinct from my previous points.

1. If the Ascham TRO goes ahead, it will make it very difficult to ever obtain a satisfactory resolution for Elizabeth, because the boundary adjustments that we have proposed, which we believe are necessary to obtain a good outcome, would require Ascham to be consulted again when they already have a scheme in place. Their incentive will be to decline the changes. That by itself means that this process is discriminatory against Elizabeth residents who were more vulnerable to the consequences of the Deal, and were supposed to receive higher priority.

2. It emerged this week that the City Deal project do not presently feel obliged to replace the 40 spaces on Milton Road - only the ones that remain after the Ascham scheme has gone ahead. It is not clear what sequence of events led to this circumstance but it would seem highly convenient for the GCP if they only need to replace 20 rather than 40 bays. The GCP's promise and commitment was (I am told) to replace all of the lost parking, and allowing Milton Road bays to be removed for the Ascham project would seem to be a sleight of hand that quietly sets them free of this obligation. This is another reason why removing the bays in January 2019, for no real benefit, must be avoided.

Best wishes

To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to raise objections to the Ascham Rd parking scheme that has been proposed. I understand that it is scheduled to go ahead and I am very concerned about the impact it will have on the parking situation on Herbert Street. As a resident of ____, it is already difficult for me to find parking, and as a single parent with a baby in the car, this can cause a lot of stress. Sometimes I find I have to park on Milton Rd (not ideal with a baby and bags etc to get in the house) and I believe that the proposed parking scheme will also have an affect on the parking spaces on Milton Rd – North side.

I love living in ____ and have done so for over ____ years. However, the parking situation has sadly become a headache.

Please show some understanding, sensitivity and consideration.

Many thanks.

Dear Policy Team,

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed residents parking schemes on Ascham road area.

I'm a __ resident and have been living in the area for __years. I am a commuter and drive to work at a science park south of the city. My children attend __ school and we are an active member of the community.

Please listen to the residents, as we are deeply concerned about losing parking spaces which are already limiting.

- removing the parking on Milton road will not benefit anyone. These spaces serve as overflow parking from George, Herbert, and Springfield terrace. I regularly park there when I cannot find a spot on my street.
- adding parking controls to ascham/gurney way only serves to increase parking pressure in the Chesterton triangle. (George, Herbert, Springfield). I also use ascham and gurney road as a place to park when I cannot park on my street.
- I urge the decision makers to please take a walk through the Chesterton triangle to look at our parking situation now. Or better yet, take a drive and attempt to park here! You will understand how our concerns are valid that our already poor parking situation will be made worse.
- Lastly, I want to address a fundamental problem that the city has in dealing with residents parking. The council assumes that residents are all local and can easily function without cars. This is nonsense. We are fed up. The area is an attractive place to live for families with good local schooling. All families that I know have at least one car, and often two. I urge the council to stop the trend of pretending that city living families can survive without cars. Protecting and improving our way of life should be a priority, not making it worse! It makes me very cross and we are considering moving away from the area if the 'parking apocalypse' does indeed mean that we cannot practically live here anymore. What a shame that would be.

Yours,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I hope this email finds you well. I, the homeowner of number __ __ __, have seen the proposed changes for residents parking in this area. I am writing to say that I think the proposed plans will be beneficial for the area, however, I am concerned as my property is not included within the proposed residents who will be able to obtain a parking permit.

I have lived in this property for __ years, in recent years parking has become difficult and I would benefit from being included in this scheme as you are planning to remove the already limited parking available near my property.

I would like you to re-consider your boundaries within this scheme to include my property, __ __ __, which is opposite numbers __ __ __, these properties are included within the current boundaries and most have their own private driveway parking, therefore, I find this proposal unjust as I do not have these facilities and am not included with the boundary even though it is on the same stretch of road.

I look forward to hearing from you

To whom it may concern. I need to raise my objections with you regarding your upcoming parking restrictions on Milton Road.

I am the house owner of __ __ __, __, __ __. If you take away the 20 spaces in Milton Road for parking it's going to push those cars looking for parking into Herbert Street. Our Street is already overwhelmed with cars looking for spaces and as every resident will tell you there are certain times residents can't find a space in the road due to computer parking.

I am also concerned about the loss of parking in Asham Road and Gurney Way as we use this as alternative parking because our road is full. This will also push those commuters in to Herbert Street.

County policy says that the design of residents zones must avoid cars relocating to nearby streets.

We have been waiting for a suitable residents parking scheme for a number of years but it seems other roads nearby are given priority over us.

Regards

ASCHAM SCHEME

Dear Sir,

This is yet, "another scheme to raise money from motorist".

None of these schemes result in improving the environment for the resident of West Chesterton.

To obtain a balanced assessment, all the local residents must be consulted.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

I am very concerned about the plans for the Ascham area TRO. I live in __ __ where parking spaces are over subscribed, mainly I believe due to commuters using the available spaces during the day and those coming into the city centre during the evening. I have been made aware that, not only will we no longer be able to use Ascham Road and Gurney Way but that there is also a plan to remove the extra spaces on Milton Road.

This will cause much inconvenience particularly as there are no current plans for Residents Only parking to be made available in the Chesterton triangle between Milton Road, Chesterton Road and Elizabeth Way.

It would seem to me that one way forward would be to postpone the Ascham scheme until an acceptable scheme for the Chesterton Triangle has been devised. I believe that the best way forward would be for Herbert Street to be converted to a Permitted Parking Area. This would mean that only residents of the triangle, ie Herbert Street residents, could park here. There would be no need to install parking spaces as I believe that a PPA would solve many of the current difficulties and that there would be plenty of room for all those who need to park here.

I look forward to a satisfactory resolution of the current parking problems in the very near future.

Regards,

As a long-term resident (__ years) in the Chesterton Triangle parking area, I am writing to express my strong objection to plans for parking in the Chesterton Triangle. The proposal to significantly reduce the number of parking places for residents, will have an extremely detrimental effect on the amenity of the streets, and will be particularly difficult for elderly people and families with small children as well as restrict access for builders and other trades people and health workers.

I, along with my neighbours, are keen to reduce the amount of car use and traffic. Transport in the neighbourhood and into the city centre are typically by bicycle. However, many are dependent on their cars for other uses. Current plans for the Chesterton Triangle Parking will INCREASE the amount of traffic in the area, forcing local residents to drive around for long periods of time searching for a parking space.

I urge you to revoke the current plans and pursue a workable scheme which will be of benefit to our neighbourhood and the city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dear Sir/Madam

I object strongly to the proposed change in parking restrictions in Ascham Road. You MUST come up with an equitable system for my and related streets (Springfield Road, Herbert Street, etc.) before taking this step. Your action will place more pressure on parking spaces in my street. Losing Milton Road bays is contrary to my parking interests & needs. I ask you respectfully to delay any measures on parking in the Ascham Road TRO until there is a fair agreed deal for the people on the south side of Milton Road such as myself.

Yours sincerely

Dear Madam/Sir

I am writing to let you know about my concern for the proposed Ascham Road area resident only parking.

I live on nearby __ and we are a family with one car. We have two children, _ and ___, and regularly find that we need to park in local streets as there are no spaces left on __. With kids and bags and bad weather it is already a challenge and this new scheme will only increase that stress.

The spaces in Milton Road north side and in Ascham Road are a much needed local amenity for me. If we can't park in our street and then do not have the option to park on other nearby streets then I do not know where I would park.

Furthermore, whilst I am driving round the local area trying to find a parking space, further and further from my home, I will be increasing the traffic in the local area in what is already a congested traffic area.

I ask that the resident parking in George Street and surrounding streets is prioritised before considering schemes in the areas North of George Street.

Many thanks

Monday 24th September 2018

RESPONSE to the CONSULTATION on ASCHAM ROAD TRO PRO 481

We object to the principles laid out in the Ascham Road area Traffic Regulation Order PRO 481 proposed to resolve residents' parking issues for the following reasons.

- The treatment of specific areas on a one-by-one, or first-come-first served basis, specifically Ascham Road, without taking into account the problems encountered by ALL the neighbouring streets will have the effect of pushing the problem along, not only simply kicking a can along the street, so to speak, but ultimately causing a pile-up of the problems on the areas least able to provide adequate parking for their own residents. This knock-on effect is against the County Council policy for resident zones.
- This piecemeal approach means that streets north of Milton Road considered first and without any reference to streets south of Milton Road get an unfair advantage due to the myopic process it, no doubt inadvertently, introduces into what should be a holistic solution for the benefit of all residential properties in the city.
- Herbert Street, being nearer to the city centre and without a satisfactory residents' parking scheme suffers more than Ascham Road from the ingress of non-residential daytime and sometimes longer parkers because from there they can easily walk into the centre across the Common or to catch a convenient bus from the bottom of the street. The recent report in the Cambridge News did nothing to help this effect but rather made it worse by making Herbert Street a 'target' for people looking for free parking near the city centre.
- This problem has got worse ever since the De Freville area was granted residents' parking, pushing the problem of drivers looking for free parking to streets north of Chesterton Road.
- The reduction of parking places proposed on Milton Road, and the even more severe reduction that has been suggested for Herbert Street will have the effect of increasing air pollution in the area as cars circle around at slow speeds looking for places to park.
- The Ascham Road TRO fails to resolve the parking problem for the whole area. It is very unfair to streets between Milton and Chesterton Roads which have been suffering much longer from the ingress of motorists pushed out from the De Freville scheme when that was introduced. It pushes the problems onto other streets thereby adding to the frustration and health issues from pollution. This will also have a deleterious effect on property values in Herbert and neighbouring streets.
- Despite these concerns being raised with City and County councillors dating back to the introduction of the De Freville residential scheme, officials seems not seem to have listened or learned from the effects that scheme had on neighbouring streets; they continue with piecemeal planning.
- The proposals for Ascham Road TRO will now squeeze further the problems being experienced by residents in Herbert and neighbouring streets.

Dear Sir, Madam,

I trust this email will receive due consideration as I write with the best intentions for long term planning of this corner of our beautiful city.

It appears that current plans are to reduce parking spaces drastically on the North side of Milton Road and that parking zones are being placed arbitrarily and with little thought for the needs of residents or, indeed, the long term effects on the current green spaces. The City Deal seems to focus on keeping traffic out (which in itself is essential) with little to no regard for the needs of the residents already in the city.

Neither does there seem to be any joined up thinking between developments of with new multi-resident housing where previously there was only one family. where are all these families meant to park their cars in the absence of e.g. underground parking?

Given these and many other serious concerns regarding the plans under the City Deal my objections are as follows:

1. An earlier Ascham consultation was procedurally "unfair" (in quotes as this is a proper legal term, not a whinge) ignoring the objections of many of us; indeed it appears that the objections were not even read let alone taken into account!
2. A timed parking ban, regardless of how short, will force all residents to drive their car (as they will have to move their car) rather than use public transport, bike or walk.
3. Forcing people to circle round and round looking for a place to park as close to their home as possible will increase the levels of pollution
4. Worst of all, those houses that have the luxury of a front garden will be forced to turn this green space into a car park, thus increasing the risk of flooding, long term pollution and all the health risks that these incur.

A. The proposals state that "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". It seems that the reason is to provide benefits to non-residents while denying residents any benefit at all.

B. Please halt this process until further thought can be given to the matter. The Council's proposed actions do nothing to enhance the life of this city, nor will it encourage outsiders from driving into town.

C. Improved public transport, particularly at rush hour, would bring wider short-term and long-term benefits to the city as is widely reported from cities with a system that meets the needs of the widest range of the people.

D. Insist that all developments place underground garages for the residents of the buildings they are creating. Every new development should have an underground (or roof-top) garage either for residents or for rent. Relevant streets could then become off-limit for parking and that would enhance the beauty and health of this city for the long term future.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/ Madam

I contacted your department a couple of months ago objecting to the proposed new parking permit area north of Milton Road (Ascham Road area).

I believe that my concerns have not been listened to and so am putting them in to another e mail.

I live in ___. I do not understand why there has not been an overview approach taken of parking in this part of Chesterton. The DeFreville area was given permit parking a couple of years ago. The Herbert Street/GeorgeStreet area should be the next area to be dealt with but instead there has been a jump to the Ascham Road area. This is a very piecemeal approach and shows no joined up thinking.

Our area is going to be hemmed in with more cars using it during the day when people park to go into town. It's really difficult now so heaven help us if that happens. As it is there are more cars than parking spaces most nights.

I believe the previous consultation was procedurally unfair as there was no proper scheme advocated for the Herbert Street area. I do not think this is either fair or transparent. For example Ascham Road houses have drives, most residents there can park besides their houses. This is not something we can do in Herbert Street\George Street. Why is the Ascham Road area seen as a priority over our area?

This will have several consequences for me if it is allowed to go through.

Firstly, at present I often cannot find a space in my street. During the day I often have to circle around until I find one, up to 20 minutes sometimes. This is not good for my health or that of the environment.

Secondly, I am female and at night I often end up parking on Ascham Road or Milton Road. This makes me feel uncomfortable sometimes. I do not want to walk even further at night.

If I have to park there, under the new scheme, I would have to move my car by 9am. Again I will end up using my car to make more journeys if I can't leave it there. There won't be any space left in Herbert Street. Where exactly am I meant to park my car? This seems counterproductive to say the least.

I hope that my concerns and those of my neighbours are listened to and a workable scheme can be put in place for the Herbert Street area followed then by the Ascham Road area. Or maybe both areas could be dealt with together at the same time as one cohesive area?

I would like to object to the Ascham residents parking scheme.

I live in __ and am amazed that residents from the immediately adjacent Chesterton triangle (or Elizabeth) zone were excluded from consultations about this scheme . This seems to be an oversight in view of the fact that the design of the scheme means that we shall be adversely impacted to a significant degree.

The Ascham scheme quite unnecessarily involves the loss of parking bays on the north side of Milton road. These bays are used primarily by residents of Elizabeth zone out of necessity as parking in the zone is at full capacity .

The bays will disappear with the Milton road upgrade and I gather the GCP is exploring ways of mitigating for their loss but to lose them prematurely before then will put undue strain on an already very tight parking situation for Elizabeth zone.

The Ascham scheme will simultaneously displace commuter parking in to Chesterton triangle and remove the option for triangle residents to seek spillover parking in Ascham road or Gurney way when their streets are full. The result would be that they will be driving around looking for spaces locally before seeking parking further afield on Hurst park avenue for instance.

If a resident from Elizabeth is forced to resort to parking in the Ascham zone in the evening , they will then be adding to the traffic the following morning as they dash to collect their car before 9am and then repeat the process of driving around the streets looking for a space to park .

From a survey of car ownership undertaken by the residents in the triangle it is evident that parking for residents is at full capacity now. Anything that reduces the number of spaces available to the residents will cause chaos.

I am a resident of ____, likely to be badly affected by this proposed TRO. I object to it in the strongest terms because:

1. At consultation stage, the expressed negative views on the draft proposal of many local residents from adjacent areas were set aside. Residents such as myself who currently are forced to use parking spaces on the proposed Ascham area, because of the greater competition for parking space in their area, have therefore been deliberately ignored. This appears to be an abuse of due process. This is especially not a justifiable procedure when there are strong spillover effects into adjacent areas from the scheme. It is the responsibility of the agencies here to consider a wider set of impact effects before introducing such a scheme.

2. The recent detailed survey of Triangle residents use of on-street parking provides evidence that shows this proposed TRO will exacerbate the existing problems generated by commuting-based congestion in the lower Milton Road and surrounding areas. It will make the problems of resident parking greater in Herbert Street and the rest of the Triangle area. Residents such as myself who are often forced to find parking overnight in the Ascham area will increasingly find it difficult to find parking spaces in the considerably reduced provision of on-street parking in the remaining streets where there are currently no resident permits.

3. I support the need for a broader Milton Road development as a public transport and commuter cycle artery for the City, and agree with the long term objective of considerably reducing private vehicle commuting into the City. This will though only sensibly be achieved through a carrot and stick approach involving the provision of better public transport services and resisting the parking of private car commuting flows. But this approach also requires a comprehensive integrated parking provision for existing residents and not a piecemeal damaging resident scheme such as this TRO that involves 'beggar my neighbour' transfer of parking space deficits to adjacent areas as one short-sighted TRO succeeds another.

4. I support the use of residence parking permits as part of the rational management of on-street parking given the needs for private transport by many residents who have no other choice. This Ascham TRO should only go ahead in tandem with a TRO for the whole of the adjacent Triangle area. Indeed, the logical ordering of proposed TROs should be the Triangle before Ascham. This proposal should therefore be 'parked' until a Triangle scheme is agreed.

5. It is unacceptable that this proposal includes the removal of the existing parking spaces allocated on the north side of Milton Road prior to that major work being undertaken. The period before the Milton Road development takes place should be used to better plan parking provision and their replacement elsewhere. In the interim these spaces should be left as they are, available to residents north and south of Milton Road.

I hope that these views will be taken into account when you consider this TRO proposal.

I object to several aspects of this plan:

1. Eliminating MILTON road parking spaces. Our area does not have enough spaces and these ones are needed for overspill from neighbouring streets.
2. Another residents parking scheme simply moves the problem to another place, another part of town
3. A consequence of 1 and 2 is that we'll just have more cars circling, looking for spaces.

Why can the council not employ a bit of joined up thinking on this? Look at Cambridge as a whole rather than as a series of zones competing for your attention on parking and other amenities! Before Cambridge becomes uninhabitable by anyone other than students, why not improve Park and ride, improve public transport in and around. You could make the whole city residents parking, why not, at least there would be clarity, and use the money from that towards improving cycling walking and public transportation. All this fiddling round the edges is inefficient, ineffective, and encourages nimbyism rather than improving sense of community and sharing.

I would like to object to the proposals for Ascham parking scheme. The piecemeal approach to residents parking, which started with the Defreville scheme, is simply pushing the problem onto surrounding residential streets. This proposal means the Milton Rd triangle (including Chesterton Hall Crescent, George St, Herbert St) are in-between two such schemes, creating increasing problems for residents in this area. A holistic approach, which in particular deals with the issues of on-street commuter parking and parking for guests staying at local B&B, Airbnb and apartment hotels, needs to be agreed before restricting parking in the Ascham Rd area.

Yours

Dear Sir or Madam

I would like to raise objections in the strongest possible terms regarding your proposals for residents parking in Ascham Road and the surrounding streets, and the utterly pointless removal of spaces from Milton Road.

I live in __ on the other side of the proposed new parking boundary and I have severe difficulty in parking in my own street. I work at home __ or __ days a week but am often forced to leave my car on Milton Road or in Ascham Road. Meanwhile George Street is filled daily with the vehicles of out-of-town commuters, builders, residents of new flats on Chesterton Road and even houseboat owners from the River Cam! If your scheme goes ahead I'm likely to be circling the area in my car at rush hour trying to find somewhere to park - hardly assisting with your desire to limit traffic in Cambridge.

Meanwhile the council has given permission for three new 3 bedroom houses to be built in the street (replacing one old house) - which will put even more pressure on parking in the street.

I already objected to your proposals during the earlier consultations but I understand that the comments of those who do not live in the new parking area were simply ignored - a shocking and unfair act given that county policy clearly states that new residents' parking zones must not lead to cars relocating elsewhere (an effect which George Street residents have already suffered from, when the De Freville area was made residents-parking-only).

Anyone who lives here can see that your new policy will be an unmitigated disaster, and yet you seem determined to press on regardless. You must delay the Ascham scheme until problems in our own area are sorted out.

Yours faithfully

Dear Sir/Madam

I live in __ __ __, which is adjacent to the proposed Ascham TRO parking scheme area.

The scheme as proposed will have a significant impact on us, and I don't think that the needs or views of residents in the adjacent area between Milton and Chesterton Road have been taken into account.

Due to the parking scheme established in the De Freville area a few years ago, the traffic and parking problems on our road have increased exponentially. Traffic circles on our road constantly looking for a space, the turning circle is now being used as a car park and I am not able to take my car out during the day because it is too difficult to find a place on the street to park when I return.

If the proposals for the Ascham scheme go ahead, it will make it impossible to find somewhere even outside our street to park, as we will no longer have access to Ascham or the North side of Milton Road and the traffic circling problem will significantly worsen.

Please could you reconsider this short sighted scheme, which only takes into account the needs of a small number of residents, and will be extremely problematic for all the residents of the area on the south side of Milton Road.

Please rework a proposal which deals with the needs across this area equally.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the Ascham PRO481 TRO on the grounds that it leaves Chesterton Hall Crescent as the only possible unregulated parking space in this area for local and outside Cambridge visitors. The traffic in the road is already heavy with cars looking for possible parking spaces and turning to leave the cul de sac. We have asked for a parking scheme since the De Freville estate scheme came into action but Ascham Road seems to have unfairly jumped the queue and leaves neighbouring streets such as ours even worse off than it is now.

The parking cars makes the road less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. This is a danger as it is the way to Milton Road School for many of the De Freville school children. It is thought to be a safe street and there are many small children on little bikes using the road and this is dangerous at the moment and will be more dangerous if traffic flow increases, which is bound to happen with the proposed scheme.

It does seem unfair that this scheme is being considered while our suggested schemes have been ignored by councillors and officers.

I do hope you will ignore this scheme and come up with one that benefits all of the area and not just a favoured few.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir or Madam

after carefully studying the Ascham parking scheme report I hereby formally object to the proposed approach. Parking is an issue in the whole area and the loss of over 20 parking spaces on the North side of Milton Road will put further pressure on an already strained situation.

I know that many of our elderly neighbours are reluctant to move their cars during the Day because of concerns over losing their parking spaces and not being able to find a different space or having to park far away from home.

The parking spaces on the North side of Milton road are an important amenity many of us depend on and taking away these spaces will have a negative impact on traffic. Residents will be forced to circle, looking for spaces and the proposed 9am - 3pm scheme will encourage many to drive to work after parking in Ascham adding to the number of cars on our already crowded roads.

I believe the report clearly shows that the scheme simply does not work for us.

Kind Regards

Dear __

Thank you for your email. Please find the link to the report I had mentioned in my email below:

<http://chestertontriangle.uk/parkingreport2018>

Kind Regards

I should like to raise the profoundest objections to the proposed Ascham TRO, which, although it does not include this street, impacts on my household at ____, ____. The scheme specifically for my area having been set aside for now.

I teach at ____, __. miles away. I am not able to cycle owing to an ____. My __ is a __ at __ who cycles to work but uses car for out of hours or out of area work and her on-calls. We need a car. The right to park close to our home is important to us, especially as we are ██████████ who often leave or return home in darkness. We also have close, dependent, family who live in a rural area in __, far from any station. If these schemes have an aim of reduce vehicle traffic it may be an ideal but individuals do not just operate lives within the city.

The proposed Ascham scheme fails our, adjacent, area in so many ways that it is quite hard to understand what it intends to achieve, given that it removes the existing right to be able to park near one's home. Past consultations have seemed to ignore practical objections to unworkable proposals. These narrow, Victorian and Edwardian streets have charm and those who live here choose to do so, and accept that there is some difficulty in living a C21 life in such areas. There are advantages such as the deterrence of traffic that has to come through, doing so at any speed. Most residents have small cars and self-police the spaces by parking tightly and considerately. I think most would accept that this is the price of living centrally.

However, for us, the removal of parking spaces on the north side of Milton Road significantly reduces the possibility of finding a place near home and any subsequent reduction of places on Herbert Street would make local parking functionally impossible. I have sometimes circled four or five times looking for a slot, meeting others engaged in the same pursuit. As the report states, the inevitably increased amount of this sort of aimless searching around these narrow streets will make them less safe as cars are forced to back up (notably dangerous when it is onto Mitcham Corner) and for passing cyclists; compete, crossly, with others, and risk damaging or impeding other cars as they force themselves into tiny spaces. Occasionally I have to park on a meter on Mitcham Corner in the hope a place will soon become available in Springfield Road, Herbert Street or on the north side of Milton Road; often I park in Chesterton Hall Road, occasionally George Street, then Ascham Way and Gurney Way.

The only minor improvement that I can imagine adding any amenity here is to extend the double yellow lines on the corner, turning to the north, where Springfield Road emerges into Herbert Street to remove a single parking space as a vehicle parked here can stop all other traffic getting by. Probably the removal of one parking space at the Co-Op end, might achieve the same benefit and reduction of frustration. If a notice could warn that neither Springfield Road nor Herbert Street is suitable for large vans, things could improve significantly. Removing Milton Road parking just exacerbates all the issues here.

But what is crucial is that the Ascham Road scheme is not viewed as a discrete scheme resolving (possibly) issues in one area to the considerable disadvantage, increase in amenity and safety of the neighbouring area.,

Yours,

Good Morning

Please find below our objects to the Ascham TRO scheme

Objection to The Ascham Road Residents' Parking TRO

It is 6 years since the De Freville area Residents' Parking scheme was introduced, and in that time we have made many representations to our councillors for a scheme to be developed for the Chesterton Triangle area encompassing Springfield Road, Herbert Street, George Street, Chesterton Hall Crescent and Hawthorn Way

We object to the development of the Ascham scheme on several grounds:

- Our area was considered a priority, and then was overlooked as the Ascham Scheme was put forward, and there seems to be no justification for the Chesterton Triangle scheme to have been shelved in this way
- Our streets are used as a free car park for countless commuter cars, and overnight visitors. The constant searching for car parking spaces will only get worse if our Residents' Scheme is not given some priority
- When the Ascham Scheme was in consultation phase, the objections from the wider area were ignored, and this surely cannot be correct procedure

We would like to stress that we feel the Chesterton Triangle area residents have been ignored and let down by the council in this instance, and that we need action to restore the priority for a Residents' Parking scheme in our streets.

Is it feasible to join us in with either the De Freville area or the Ascham area? This would in our opinion give more flexibility.

If something does not happen soon about the parking issues in our local streets, especially if the Ascham scheme goes ahead in spite of our objections, the situation will be intolerable for us.

Dear Council,

I have become aware that there will be a reduction of twenty parking bays to the north side of Milton Road. My family live on __ and have been there for over ten years. We are very aware of the parking situation which is at bursting point on our road. There are a number of occasions when we can't park on our own road and need to park elsewhere. The only option we currently have is to use the bays on Milton Road. If these are all used, which they invariably are, then Ascham Road is another option, even though a bit far if you've just come back from holiday and need to unpack the car! However, if these areas are going to be either taken away or only permitted to be used for reduced hours, then the obvious question is, where do we park? If we need to move the car before 9am from Ascham Road, then again, where do we move the car to? This causes a number of people to drive around the area unnecessarily, adding to traffic during rush hour and wasting people's time and causing more cars to be around when the local kids are going to school and nursery. This totally goes against the Statement of Reason.'to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety'.

I'm not happy about this proposal and respectfully ask the Council - what's the point? Isn't this a waste of everyone's time with the effect of being left with fewer spaces? In addition, the houses that will be granted permits all have driveways!

I hope there is a solution to this. One, in my opinion being do nothing. But the current proposal will disadvantage everyone in the vicinity.

Regards

I am contacting you because of my grave concerns about the proposed Ascham Parking Scheme.

As someone who lives in the area very close to this (I live on __), I feel we have been ignored in the whole process to design this parking scheme. We have ahead of us the prospect of being surrounded by two parking schemes (Ascham and the area around DeFreville) neither of which we can join and inadequate access in our own area.

This can only mean we will be unable to park, circling around trying to find one of the few places that exist (our streets are narrow and clogged with cars already) or have to drive further away to find parking. Our cars won't disappear, but have to go somewhere. County policy is supposed to prevent cars having to relocate to the parts of the city. The problem will not have been solved, simply moved further away.

Additionally as someone whose partner [REDACTED], the fact that the already difficult parking situation will be made even worse is very concerning. If we are to need carers in the future, to visit our home, where will they park? Have the practical effects of this on ill/older/disabled people been considered?

Please can this scheme be put on hold until a better scheme can be designed for us? Surely the people of our area deserve not to be left with a situation that is impossible to live with. The County Council is supposed to help our lives not make them worse...

Dear Sir or Madame,

I am writing to you in order to voice my objections to the proposed Ascham Parking Traffic Regulation Order. I previously voiced my objections during the earlier consultations, but my views appear to have been ignored. It is my understanding that under the TRO about 20 parking spaces on the North side of Milton Road will no longer be available to Herbert Street residents and residents of the Chesterton Triangle for no good reason. This will significantly worsen the parking shortage in Herbert Street, which has been well documented. I regularly use the parking spaces in Milton Road and Ascham Road as I usually find it difficult to find a parking space in Herbert Street. These spaces are in my view essential and removing them will force us to park further away from our home – this clearly contradicts county policy which states that the design of resident zones must avoid cars relocating nearby.

Removing the ability to park on Ascham/Milton Road between 9am and 3pm Monday to Friday will force me to move my car every morning and will therefore encourage me to drive to work rather than cycle, which I currently do. This will therefore add to traffic and pollution in the area.

The current parking situation does not only cause inconvenience and affects the traffic in the area, it also affects the provision of vital council services to Herbert Street residents. For example, regular access to Herbert Street for larger vehicles, such as bin lorries, is currently very difficult. Parking is always used as an excuse by the refuse collection service for a failure to collect our rubbish as advertised – this now happens on a frequent and regular basis. The proposed TRO will not improve this situation but will make it worse and will make the work of the council's staff more difficult. With no prospect of finding a parking space close by, residents will need to temporarily park in the middle of the street and block access in order to load and unload their car or to drop off or pick up their young children as there will no longer be sufficient parking spaces available nearby. Journeys to and from remote parking spaces and repeat journeys of the refuse lorries will generate additional pollution and congestion, both of which are avoidable with a better scheme.

The issues with parking in Herbert Street and in the Chesterton Triangle as a whole are well known. I would like to encourage you to consider a solution which addresses and improves the parking situation as a whole for the benefit of all residents in the area rather than focus on a street-by-street solution which makes the overall traffic situation worse.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration of my objection.

I look forward to hearing from you.

With best regards,

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed parking changes that will mean we lose at least 20 parking spaces on the North side of Milton road.

My _ lives in _ _ which already has parking problems and this will make the problems worse. Please consider the affect that these changes will have on the area as a whole and not just Ascham.

I visit my _ often and already have problems finding a place to park. Removing these parking places will just exacerbate the problem and I think it will often mean I need to circle the area for longer looking for a space.

Best regards

This scheme will cause a reduction in amenity for residents of George Street. Currently, parking on the North of Milton Road and in Ascham Road is used by residents living in the terraced houses in the triangle between Milton Road and Chesterton Road where there is less than one parking space per house. If the Milton Road scheme is to reduce parking on Milton Road, the scheme should include creating alternative arrangements such as parking on Chesterton Road.

We object to the Ascham Road scheme going ahead before there is a solution to the much more acute parking issues for the triangle area. Commuter parking will be displaced from Ascham Road to the triangle, exacerbating the problem that occurred after the De Freville scheme was introduced, which caused displacement of commuter parking from Pretoria Road to the triangle area, particularly Chesterton Hall Crescent.

Both the De Freville area and the proposed Ascham Road area had/have inconvenience in parking, whereas the triangle area will end up with it being impossible for residents to park near their homes or within a reasonable walking distance.

These micro schemes are making it a have and have not situation for resident parking rather than sharing the completely adequate space there is for resident parking in the area as a whole. This is evident by walking around the areas at night, and seeing the many spaces available in the De Freville area. Streets like Springfield Terrace have no parking at all. Uneven parking provision for individual streets or areas is only to be expected in a historic city, and until recently provision was shared across a wide enough area for this to be workable.

Residents have a car for a variety of reasons. For example, we have elderly relatives who have given up driving themselves which means reliance on our car, even though we both cycle to work. An irony is that this scheme is being done to reduce commuting, but residents such as ourselves will have to commute by car rather than bike at peak commuting time if we can only park near our home outside 9am - 3pm. Even if we did change to commuting by car, there is then the concern over falling sick overnight and having the car ticketed while too unwell to move it.

If micro schemes are to go ahead with very uneven provision i.e. some areas have fewer places than half a car per household, and others have space for multiple cars per household, residents who neighbour a different scheme must be allowed to buy permits for both their own area and a neighbouring area. This seems to already occur for e.g. the north side of Chesterton Road who we believe can buy permits for the De Freville area.

There are possible solutions to address resident parking and commuter parking issues in this area, for example merging the different resident scheme areas, introducing on-street parking on Chesterton Road, allowing residents to park in metered bays in neighbouring areas, or mitigating edge effects by allowing purchase of permits by residents in neighbouring schemes. We object to the Ascham scheme going ahead before a solution is found for the area as a whole, since it will reduce amenity for us, making it less likely we can park within a reasonable distance of our home, and even forcing us to commute by car.

To whom it may concern:

I write to register my objection to the planned change of parking regulations Ascham TRO PR0481.

As a resident of Herbert Street, I believe that the process by which these proposals have arisen to be unfair. Moreover they are poorly timed and will lead to the needless removal of spaces. Moreover, I believe that the proposals will cause more driving and slower traffic.

Residents of Herbert Street are being steamrolled:

- * The parking that we use on Ascham Road and Gurney Way will soon be in a residents' parking zone that we can't access.
- * The 20+ bays on the North side of Milton Road could have stayed around until our parking problems were solved, but instead they will go now, for no real benefit, and taxpayers will pay for the pointless extra work.
- * Our objections at the consultation stage were binned, even though they would have changed the result.

I implore the Council not to proceed with these proposals.

Regards,

As a __ resident, the proposed Ascham parking scheme and the removal of parking bays on Milton road will have a MAJOR impact.

George Street has parking on only one side of the street, parking has always been an issue. We absolutely rely on the parking bays on Milton Road north side, there is not enough parking in George Street for residents. When parking bays on Milton Road are full, our only option is to park in Ascham Road or Gurney Way.

I can see no justifiable reason to remove the parking bays on Milton Road. And the proposed 09.00-15.00, Monday-Friday Ascham road parking scheme will force residents to drive to work, or move their cars elsewhere if parked overnight, causing more (needless) traffic congestion.

- It is vital that the Milton road, north side parking bays be retained.
- It seems the needs of parking in our area have been ignored, and previous objections appear to have been ignored.
- Shortage of parking will result in more congestion as residents search for an opportunity to park (further and further away from their houses, causing more congestion and parking issues in other areas).

I hope these comments will be taken seriously. We seriously face the issue of having nowhere to park if these proposals are enforced. Parking is always going to be an issue in our area, but currently it works!

I object to this proposal. We need as many parking places as possible in George Street not less from the removal of Milton Road bays.

Dear Sir / Madam,

Regarding the proposal for the Ascham Road parking scheme (TRO PRO481), I would like to register an objection.

This objection is based on the following points:

(1) Adding another adjacent resident parking zone to the section between Milton Road, Chesterton Road and Elisabeth Way without having solved the problems here will increase parking pressure on this area. We already experience considerably difficulty in the daytime with temporary parking in this area for contractors etc. Any further pressure will make life a lot more difficult. We have, in the past, had appointments cancelled and experienced reluctance on the part of trades-people to even consider carrying out work for us due to the difficulty in reliably finding places to park, anything that worsens this situation is very regrettable.

(2) A decrease in available parking spaces will increase the number of vehicles circulating the one-way system attempting to find parking spaces, thus increasing traffic on extremely narrow streets with it's associated danger to pedestrians, cyclists, parked cars etc. and increasing pollution on these residential streets. In particular these streets are currently very suitable for less brave cyclists (in particular children) to navigate, increased traffic caused by this effect would make them less suitable for this purpose and might even cause increased traffic itself.

(3) Prior consultations seem to have been targeted at far too narrow a selection of affected parties, not taking into account the effects on surrounding areas such as ours (see above for some examples of these effects).

At the very least I would strongly urge that any introduction of this scheme is delayed until proper consideration has been made as to what to do about the area between Elisabeth Way, Chesterton Road and Milton Road.

Many thanks,

Dear Sir

I am a resident of ___ and thus much concerned at the proposed scheme of Residents Parking for the area Ascham Road area and exclusion of parking on the Milton Road without consideration of its impact on the Triangle.

Firstly I welcome Residents parking for Ascham Road. It is the immediate access to Milton Road School and as such travelled by many parents and small children at the peak parking time in the morning when any road user, adult or child is vulnerable to traffic.

However the impact of the scheme during the day is going to put greater pressure on Chesterton Hall Crescent as a source of parking but which suffers equal risk at school time.

I don't see how Ascham Road etc. can be given precedence over the Triangle as a means of solving the parking issues in the area. They have to be looked at as a whole. We have been meeting to resolve the Triangle issues but so far without success. Our problems can only be made greater by the imposition of the Ascham Road etc. scheme.

As a resident of ___ I am alarmed at what goes on in the street with competing parkers jostling with cycling parents and children making their way to school and very much fear for a tragedy soon.

I repeat that the whole problem needs to be considered as a whole and would ask the County Council not to implement anything for Ascham Road etc. without considering all the other issues as well..

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in relation to the proposed changes to Ascham road parking (reference: Ascham TRO PR0481) and the concerns I have regarding the lack of due process and thought when considering the impact that restricting parking on this road will have to residents of the surrounding streets.

As a resident of [REDACTED], which as you are aware, does not have sufficient parking for the number of houses, we frequently have to park in surrounding streets. Even Springfield Road, in its tiny capacity, is often used by commuters, therefore reducing even further the ability to park anywhere near our house. To restrict parking on Ascham Road and Gurney Way, which are wide streets, without the same demands on parking, will only exacerbate the issues on Springfield Road and Herbert Street. County Policy states that a new scheme should not adversely affect the surrounding streets. I am not sure how this doesn't apply here? Meanwhile, the Council have given the go ahead for the development of Whichcote House on Springfield Road, with only 6 parking spaces for 11 flats, which again clearly doesn't take into account the already strained parking situation.

I am also confused as to why resident feedback was not duly considered in the last consultation stage? Clearly more consideration needs to be given to all of these streets and hope will be in due course. I hope that the Ascham plans could be delayed until a wider plan has been formulated for the area.

Kind regards,

Most of the current difficulties for residents trying to find parking space have arisen because Milton Rd has been re-invented as a major highway. The knock-on consequences for existing residents have not been given adequate priority.

The "De Freville" residents parking scheme has created problems for areas outside that boundary. Drivers are keen to park on streets where they don't currently have to pay and that increases traffic flow and parking problems.

I live in ___ which is a no through road. Traffic entering (often looking for free parking) has to come back down the road to get out. Parking is difficult for many of my neighbours because there are often no spaces available.

Apparently it has not been possible to provide a Resident's Parking scheme in the "Elizabeth" area. Some sort of resolution is needed before other local areas are allocated residents parking.

Many houses in the "Ascham" area have parking space on their properties. Why are they to be given priority for residents parking over those living in older properties which often do not have any associated parking?

Please go back to first principles and redesign the proposals for residents parking for ALL the communities affected, link them up and start them all together at the same time to avoid more parking chaos.

FAO: Policy and Regulation, Cambridgeshire County Council

Ascham Rd parking scheme - TRO PR0481

As a resident of __, in the 'Chesterton Triangle', I strongly object to the proposed Ascham Road residential parking scheme for a number of reasons.

This piecemeal approach to parking issues on a 'few-streets-at-a-time' basis is just pushing problems to neighbouring streets that fall outside the declared residential parking zones. It is very unfair that problems for some residents are prioritised while inevitably creating increased problems for neighbours outside the residential parking zones.

I also understand that in the previous consultation round, objections from neighbours outside the proposed Ascham Road scheme were simply ignored. That cannot be good governance, particularly when a proposal is going to create problems outside the immediate zone under scrutiny.

The De Freville area scheme should be reviewed before further residential parking schemes are ushered in. The De Freville scheme has pushed car parking into Hawthorn Way for example, with some very poor behaviour in evidence (parking on pavements and in narrow areas at the junction with Chestnut Grove). Yet, during the day, there are lots of empty parking spaces on de Freville and Aylestone for example. This is very inefficient in terms of space utilisation and very unfair to those areas that are taking the hit of extra cars. The Ascham scheme will compound this sort of problem for the 'Chesterton triangle' area.

Given the shift in parking patterns witnessed with the introduction of the De Freville scheme, it must be obvious that the Ascham scheme will create further problems. In Hawthorn Way and Chestnut Grove it seems likely that:

- more cars will enter these streets looking for parking causing more congestion (both streets are cul-de-sacs);
- residents and non-residents alike will spend longer times driving their cars looking for spaces wasting time and adding to air pollution;
- more gardens will be paved over as residents seek to reserve parking spaces for themselves, further reducing the number of street parking spaces, deteriorating the visual and environmental amenity of the streetscape, and potentially increasing run-off into drains during rainfall.

The removal of around 20 spaces on the north side of Milton Road seems needless at this point. This will further affect the availability of parking spaces for residents outside of the proposed scheme (e.g. south side of Milton Road, Chesterton Hall Crescent), yet the Chesterton Triangle is still without the prospect of a workable parking scheme.

Yours faithfully,

I am writing to object to order PR0481 on the grounds that as a resident I will no longer be able to park my car near where I live or have friends/family come to visit when I am at home for the day.

With the proposal to remove the parking bays along Milton Road and Milton Road 'even' numbers not being eligible to purchase parking permits I will not be able to park my car anywhere near where I live. I do not use it for commuting and so it's left parked in the bays on Milton Road (by the care home) or down Asham Road during the day and is only used in the evenings and at weekends. The claims that this order is 'to tackle issues associated with all day non-resident parking that denies parking spaces for residents and their visitors' has clearly not taken into account the residents who park there and I will be penalised.

I can see no reference for provision of parking for residents who live in the 'even' numbers on Milton Road, why is this not being considered as part of this proposal?

The majority of addresses which would be eligible have driveways and/or garages and therefore already guaranteed parking i.e. Asham Road, Gilbert Road and Milton Road 'odd' numbers. The priority for these types of schemes should be to residents who don't have the option to park on their property.

The scheme also doesn't seem feasible for each eligible household to purchase up to 3 permits as there will not be the number of parking spaces to support this. There needs to be a realistic cap on the number of parking permits which matches the number of spaces available. Those without existing parking on their properties should be given priority and then following this, and only if there is space available, residents with driveways should get the opportunity to pay for additional parking.

Regards

The above scheme is flawed particularly in its timing. No progress has been made to the parking problems in Elizabeth, that is the triangle between Milton Road and Chesterton Rd which includes Herbert St. This will be caught as a free parking area between DeFreville and Ascham resulting in increased pressure from commuter and long term holiday parking. Parking will be displaced from Ascham. Residents will need to drive around to park, especially if the parking on Milton Rd is removed. Elizabeth should be addressed first in any cohesive approach to residents parking. It is our misfortune that we are on the too difficult pile. It would make sense if it was joined with Ascham. It does not make sense for parking zones to be determined by council wards.

Subject: Ascham TRO PR0481

Dear Sirs,

As residents in the area that will be significantly affected by the proposed changes, we wish to lodge our objections on the following grounds:

1. The Ascham Road proposal is being steam-rolled through without consideration of its effects on the Chesterton Triangle, which should have at least equal if not higher priority, being closer to the City Centre
2. There seems to be no reason at this time to remove the 20+ bays on the North side of Milton Road. The loss of these bays will significantly increase the parking difficulties of residents of the Chesterton Triangle. They should be retained at least until the Chesterton Triangle issues are resolved.
3. Local objections at the previous consultation stage were binned, even though they would have changed the result.

Yours sincerely

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of _____ (____), which is adjacent to the proposed Ascham residents' parking scheme, and I am objecting to that scheme being implemented on the following grounds: a) unfairness of the process, b) the timing and the needless removal of spaces now, c) the impact for residents of _____.

Since the introduction of residential parking in the De Freville Avenue and Victoria Road areas of Chesterton, residential parking in _____ has become an increasingly desperate problem. With the removal of pavement parking on Milton Rd and the increasing building developments without appropriate parking in our neighbourhood, this problem will only get significantly worse and not better.

I would like to highlight the following points:

- Lack of availability of parking for residents of _____. There is no question that this is a real problem, especially during weekdays and on Saturdays. Commuter traffic in particular is a key issue here. Non resident commuter drivers are literally waiting for residents to leave to work in order to park their cars. Neighbours have experienced repeated blocking of driveways and garage entrances, sometimes for many days. Cars are also left parked on our street for weeks as non-residents use the _ for free holiday parking. Parking of work vans of tradesmen not working on homes in our street has become usual practice.
- Safety. In addition to children residents, the _ is a main route for school children attending four institutions, including Milton Road Primary School and Chesterton Community College. School children on foot and on bicycles use the road at the beginning of the day just when the increasingly faster traffic caused by people cruising the streets looking for parking is at a peak. Please remember that many of these children are very young. The _ is also a recommended Council cycle route for adults commuting to work. It is clear that lack of residential parking on our street is having an increasingly adverse effect on the safety of pedestrian and cycling children and adults;
- Damage to resident cars. Many residents have experienced their cars damaged by non-residents parking their cars into or out of tight available car park spaces. Unfortunately, it is also common practice for non resident drivers to drive off without consideration of the damage they have incurred. Many residents of _____ objected to the scheme at the consultation stage, as did many of our neighbouring streets, due to the impact of that scheme going ahead without a workable scheme for our area. We feel that our objections were ignored and the scheme should not be allowed to progress until an overall plan is in place.

With best wishes,

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of ___ ___, which is adjacent to the proposed Ascham residents' parking scheme. I am objecting to that scheme being implemented on several grounds:

1) This has been an unfair process- the residents of ___ __ have been lobbying for residents only parking for many many years. Our area was supposed to be a higher priority than Ascham for a residents only parking scheme. Our initial proposed scheme was so poorly thought through that there were objections. Our objections have been ignored, however, and now Ascham has gone ahead of us. The scheme should not be allowed to progress until an overall scheme is in place, finding a workable scheme for our area.

2) This will only make traffic worse, as well as parking. With subsequent parking shortages caused from this plan, I will be forced to circle the area for a space to park. County policy says that design of resident zones must avoid cars relocating nearby. This plan obviously fails on this account. Given that ___ __ is a popular cycle path for many people, as well as a major route for 4 local schools with children walking and cycling to school, increased traffic is clearly a danger and a safety issue for local residents.

3) Removal of Milton Road (North Side) parking bays will cause a further shortage in our area (called Chesterton Triangle) and will further decrease available parking for residents in their own neighbourhood. These spaces do not need to be removed at this time and should be delayed as long as possible until a workable scheme for our area is found, especially since those spaces are used by our residents.

I strongly object to the Ascham scheme and would suggest that it is best deferred until the whole area can be considered at the same time, taking into account the growing pressure on local residents for parking and stress of neighbourhood traffic. We need to remember that these are residential roads, with people of all ages walking, cycling, going to school- in general, a community. Careless planning that does not consider the effect on the amenity of the area will have huge consequences. Please consider a scheme for the whole area that allows local residents- the community of Cambridge- to park near their homes and solve an escalating problem in our area of commuters, traffic, parking shortages and reduced safety.

Regards

As a resident of ___ __ for over ___ years, I am contacting to object to the implementation of the Ascham TRO.

I am objecting on the following grounds.

1. Over the past few years, residents have repeatedly asked the local councils (Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council) for help in improving the parking situation in Herbert Street, and have done everything we could to assist by completing surveys of need etc, but each time new parking restrictions have been introduced in the area, the situation has worsened in Herbert Street and Springfield Road. It is therefore unfair that the current proposals for improvement relate to other roads, leaving Herbert Street and Springfield Road with an even more dire situation if the parking on Ascham Road and Gurney Way becomes a Residents parking zone. When I read the County Council's own policy document two or three years ago, it said that in introducing new regulations for parking, consideration should be given to the impact on surrounding areas.

2. If parking spaces are also removed from Milton Road, this will exacerbate the situation further, and may cause more cars driving round to find parking spaces. Quite recently, I covered over a mile circling round the area to find a space, finally locating the last space on the corner of Milton Road and Elizabeth Way, as another car moved out, and then had to walk back to my home in [REDACTED]. This is a problem - I am in my [REDACTED] and live on my own, and cannot walk long distances but am not entitled to any parking concessions because I'm not sufficiently disabled. Also, on returning from holiday this summer , at 7pm, my friend (also [REDACTED]) and I had to wait in the car for half an hour until a space became available so that we could unload luggage.

3. It is not necessary to remove spaces at this point . It would be common sense to wait until a workable plan to resolve the problems in Herbert Street and Springfield Road could be put in place.

Dear Council

I am part of a group of concerned residents from the Milton Road area emailing to request that you do not go ahead with the planned parking changes along and around Milton Road.

We actually live on Milton Road and the council seems at every stage to have forgotten that it is a residential road with people in their homes, many with children and elderly people. We now learn - after having the new apartment building forced upon us despite numerous objections the horrendous, unforgivable delays in the building of the latest eyesore on Milton Road, the aparthotel - that we are going to lose parking spaces. What can be the possible justification for this? On many days we cannot park near our house and have to park a long way down Hurst Park Avenue and to learn that this will be made worse is simply unbelievable.

How are we to get our shopping into the house, get small children across the road on such a busy street? We are supposed to walk from god knows wherever we have parked our cars in the dark and cold with the winter fast approaching. We pay huge amounts of money for our houses, council tax burdens are high and we deserve to be able to park our cars outside our own houses. This is all part of a scheme that may or may not come to fruition or may end up like the aparthotel and you'll remove parking spaces and then leave us, the residents who you represent, for years and years to rot whilst you do nothing to actually improve the area.

Dear Madam, Sir,

As a resident of ___ who is affected by the great pressure on parking for residents in my and the surrounding streets that make up what has been designated the Chesterton Triangle, I wish to object to Ascham Parking TRO. Each street in the so-called Triangle has severe parking problems for residents although aspects of the difficulties vary from street to street. In my street the parking problems arise mainly from commuter parking, cars from neighbouring Herbert Street, George Street and Springfield Road being parked in it because their owners cannot find spaces in their own street, and car owners who are eligible to park in the De Freville residents parking zone but opt instead to park for free in Chesterton Hall Crescent. Despite having varying and often conflicting parking issues, our streets have been treated as one zone for the purpose of setting up a residents parking scheme and every discussion and meeting residents and councillors have only reinforces the unworkability of the scheme we have been potentially offered.

Despite this serious local parking problem affecting a large number of residents, Ascham Road and Gurney Way are being offered their own residents parking scheme. This is premature for several reasons and should not be permitted to go ahead.

- It will exacerbate the existing problem in the Chesterton Triangle and cause residents returning in their cars after working hours even greater difficulty finding somewhere to park when they can no longer park in Ascham Road or Gurney Way, streets which in the evening and early morning habitually have plenty of spare parking capacity. This will add to the local traffic problem and contribute to pollution as well as aggravating difficulties for Chesterton Triangle residents as they attempt to park near their own homes.

- Local residents will shortly lose more than 20 parking spaces on the north side of Milton Road as a consequence of a parking zone boundary being instated along Milton Road. It is difficult to see who will benefit from the loss of these vital spaces which are largely used by residents of the Chesterton Triangle; residents of the proposed Ascham Road zone being already well supplied with driveways on which many can already park their cars. This situation, where residents under pressure are actually deprived of existing parking spaces, will only get worse when the City Deal comes into effect.

- It is vital that the necessary time and consideration be given to imaginative and flexible solutions to the parking pressure that already exists in the Chesterton Triangle BEFORE a residents parking scheme is passed for Ascham Road and Gurney Road, instead of letting the parking and traffic situation get even worse, as it undoubtedly will, and leaving an even greater, perhaps insoluble, problem to be dealt with retrospectively.

These are my objections to the Ascham Parking TRO and I trust that they will receive your best attention.

Yours faithfully,

NO! this will result in more parking in already congested ___.

27th September 2018

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the implementation of the Ascham area TRO. It appears to me that the removal of 20 parking spaces without any replacement is going to a disaster for my road. We already have to suffer a daily ingress of commuters. If you force an additional 20 residents to use long term parking in surrounding streets you will exacerbate an already fraught situation. In your terminology I believe this would be classified as damaging the amenity of streets. Clearly an area wide solution is required. The Ascham scheme should be delayed.

Yours faithfully,

I write as though from my home address ____ _.

There is an inherent difficulty in piecemeal attempts to restrict parking. Those who are restricted just move to an adjacent area which for commuter parkers will be in this case nearer the city centre.

There needs to be a proper plan for the whole area which is implemented wholesale at one time. Anything else just moves the problem from place to place.

Regards

Hi,

I'm writing to voice my concerns regarding removal of the parking spaces on the north side of Milton Road. I live on ___, and losing parking spaces in the area will lead to congestion on Springfield, and Herbert St., which shouldn't come as a surprise. I can't see how removing the parking spaces will help anybody.

Regards,

I write in objection to the proposed new parking arrangements around Milton Road, impacting Ascham Road and Gurney Way. There are a number of problems but the main one for us is that reducing available parking space overall will push even more cars to park on nearby streets and that is a major problem.

We recently moved to ___ and the parking situation here is unbelievably bad. If you have any workmen or large deliveries it is very stressful trying to ensure that they have space to park as close to your house as possible - which is usually essential given the equipment involved. Commuters hover in the morning to bag the next space that becomes free and can be very aggressive as I've witnessed several times. It is best to avoid leaving in your car at all (good in some ways I suppose but often not possible).

I know that other streets close by experience the same problem. Please do not go ahead with these plans. I cannot see any advantage in them - if there is any at all it is far outweighed by the negative impact it will have elsewhere.

Kind regards,

I am writing to raise an objection to the proposed changes in parking, under the scheme Ascham TRO PR0481

This will have a major effect on the difficulty of parking in George Street.

During the ___ years I have lived in this street, there have always been too few spaces for the residents in the street itself. Initially, it was no problem finding somewhere convenient nearby, but the alternatives are being withdrawn, first in the de Freville area, now with new proposals.

Since the de Freville area was made inaccessible, I sometimes have to park some distance from George Street. On _ occasions, my car has been vandalised, at substantial personal cost (>£___ each time).

Reducing parking in neighbouring areas is entirely unnecessary and seems to be just a money-making exercise for the council.

For 4 years, it was easy to find a space in De Freville avenue and most of the time, I found exactly the same space. So any suggestion that de Freville was suffering from an excess of cars is not true; on the other hand, now there are several 'pay' spaces that are generally empty much of the time. So actually, I can't park there but the council doesn't make much income anyway.

Where do you actually think I will park my car if these restricted schemes continue? Up a tree? On a roof?

PLEASE halt this proposal and listen carefully to the views of residents who deserve more respect for their local needs. Thank you.

I am writing to object most emphatically to the Ascham Road TRO.

I am a resident of ___.

Herbert Street already suffers from severely inadequate parking space, and residents like me regularly have to make use of whatever parking spaces we can find in Milton Road and neighbouring streets such as Ascham Road. The proposed removal of twenty spaces from Milton Road would have an immediate and severely detrimental effect on the parking availability in Herbert St, and closing off the neighbouring streets with a residents' parking scheme would exacerbate the problem to the point of forcing Herbert St residents to park sometimes half a mile from their homes. The proposed TRO is thus short-sighted, ill-thought, and totally fails to represent the interests of the residents of Herbert St, Springfield Road and Milton Road.

If councillors cannot be bothered to work out a fair and intelligent solution to the area's parking problems, they ought to take advantage of the strenuous efforts of those residents who are trying to avoid the catastrophe being pushed onto us by those councillors. This TRO is a simplistic piece of bureaucracy which will create more problems than it solves. It must be reconsidered.

Yours,

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

We have been residents of ___ for the past thirty years and write to express our objections to the proposed scheme for Ascham Road in the strongest possible terms.

The parking situation in the area has got progressively worse over the years; many new residents have more than one car and there has been a noticeable increase in 'commuter parking'. With the loss of parking provision on the north side of Milton Road and the introduction of a residents' parking scheme for Ascham Road, the effect on the Crescent will be catastrophic. It seems that the authorities proposing Ascham PRO481 are ignoring the consequences and offer no solution. Where is it proposed that these displaced cars will park? _ already has an overwhelming parking problem and cannot absorb extra traffic.

It is to be hoped that a comprehensive and realistic solution will be found, otherwise the quality of life for all residents will be seriously affected for the worse.

RE: Proposed TRO (Reference Number PR0481)

Dear Sir / Madam,

I wish to object strongly to the above proposal for a Residents Parking Scheme in the Ascham Road area.

As a resident of __, Gurney Way and Ascham Road provide the only invaluable spill-over parking spaces available in the area for residents of Springfield Road, for whom there is at present inadequate parking provision provided by Cambridgeshire County Council.

In the evenings there are always many spaces available in Gurney Way and Ascham Road proving that the residents of this area have adequate parking provision already. If the intention of this proposal is to prevent drivers from other areas parking in this area during the day, then fine, but only if the definition of 'residents' for parking purposes in this area includes those residents in Springfield Road too. Otherwise, should the scheme go ahead, then:

1). There will be nowhere for many Springfield Road residents to park in their local area; and 2). Much of Gurney Way and Ascham Road will be empty between 09:00 and 15:00 when the parking restriction is in force.

The latter outcome suggests a woeful use of a much needed resource, and, since there is no forthcoming parking alternative for Springfield Road residents, I hope Cambridgeshire County Council either stops this proposed change, or includes Springfield Road residents in the catchment of the Ascham Road area.

Yours Sincerely,

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed Ascham Road residents parking scheme (Ascham TRO PR0481).

The spaces that will be removed on Milton Road as part of the proposed scheme are currently frequently in use by Herbert Street residents who find it difficult to find parking in our own road because a) we have been left as one of the very last roads in the area where non- residents can park and b) we are the closest non-resident parking street to the shops and amenities non-residents are parking in order to use. Herbert Street is in fact the closest free street to park in for customers and store holders on Chesterton Road at one end and Milton Road at the other end so carries a double burden.

Milton Road shop owners and customers also make use of the Milton Road spaces. Their removal would therefore impact customers and shop owners on Milton Road and place further pressure on Herbert Street from non-resident parkers whilst simulatenously reducing parking options for residents of Herbert Street. I believe residents parking zones can work but only if they are large enough. Proceeding with the Ascham Road scheme including removal of Milton Road spaces is not in the interests of the local community and proceeding with the scheme without simultaneously finding a viable solution for shop owners and customers on Milton Road and for the residents of Herbert Street and the surrounding area is simply going to displace a large volume of parkers into an area that is already struggling with excess non-residents parking. Having a lot of isolated schemes without addressing the cumulative impact on adjacent streets without a scheme is shortsighted and will certainly make the situation worse for the majority of the local community.

The Herbert Street situation could have been resolved earlier had a viable scheme been devised for this area at an earlier stage. Sadly the proposal presented to Herbert Street residents solved none of the problems residents were facing and was totally unworkable. In reality it wasted valuable time during which time options for a viable scheme encompassing a larger more workable area have been lost. I find this an incredibly unfair process. I already struggle to park on Herbert Street and if I have to park several streets away, as a [REDACTED] I am faced with the prospect of trying to carry 12 bags of shopping from my weekly shop back to my house with [REDACTED] in tow whose hands I need to hold on the way and who can't be left in either the house or the car on their own. The impact of the parking situation is very real to me and I hope you will consider devising a practical solution that takes an overview of the whole area rather than slicing it up into isolated schemes each of which makes the situation worse for the remaining open parking streets.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Council Members,

I'm writing to object to the Ascham TRO PR0481.

Packaging up parking zones in this arbitrary manner without an overall plan is unreasonable.

Have a local residential zone for Ascham is not unreasonable in itself, but it's the effect on neighbouring street when a sensible, realistic solution has not been found for them. If the decision can be postponed until a practical solution for the wider area is found, this would be much more acceptable.

With the effect of commuters parking in the street and the planning permission for multi-occupancy building conversion and garage conversion, residents of Herbert Street regularly have to park on Milton Road and Ascham Road, or Gurney Way. This can be quite an issue with __, a _ and bags full of shopping.

The removal of parking from Milton Road serves no purpose, but compounds the problems for Herbert Street residents.

Please can you postpone this decision, otherwise our standard of living and the benefits of our home will be inexorably eroded.

Yours sincerely,

Ascham TRO PR0481

I am a resident of __. I do not have a car so I have no skin in this game. All the same, I wish to object to this proposal which seems a matter of obduracy over utility, and which so far has proceeded with an inexplicable democratic deficit in which the previous batch of objections submitted (fifty or more, I gather) were simply and confessedly binned after scheduling changes which seemed cavalier, inequitable and outwith the intentions of the relevant legislation.

(In my own experience, even Islington Council have done better than that.)

So my first objection to the proposal is on the grounds of inequitable procedural irregularities. Had the schedule not been altered, and had residents' objections not been disposed of, the result would have been different. In effect, the Council's conduct in this matter was undemocratic and illegitimate as it prevented opposing voices from being heard as the law allows and demands.

My second objection to the proposal is that it serves no purpose and addresses no wrongs. Parking in the area is of course at a premium but it causes few, if any, serious difficulties. The changes proposed will worsen, not improve, the situation. The removal of a significant proportion of parking facilities will lead to increased congestion at already congested times of day, as residents drive (slowly, of course) round and round looking for somewhere to park. The idea which possibly underlies the proposal – that if parking is made more difficult or indeed impossible, then a Damascene conversion will happen and residents will rid themselves of their cars and take to cycling. There is little evidence that this is the case. The DoT National Travel Survey (2017) suggests that motorists spend up to 8 minutes per journey looking for a parking space. It is not difficult to extrapolate the effects of this.

I further object to the proposal on the grounds that it is an improper use of public funds, which could better be used in improving the lamentable condition of the roads and pavements in the area concerned.

I further object to the proposal's unjustified favouring of marked parking bays, which (as opposed to unmarked residents' parking zones) serve no purpose other than to further reduce the availability of parking. Two Fiat 500s or three Smart cars can fit in the space that a Transit-sized bay will mandate as being only occupiable by one vehicle.

I further object to the proposal's insistence on the premature, at best, removal of the Milton Road parking bays which is not currently necessary and which could provide a holding solution while an effective long-term solution is found. Again, this seems a pointless waste of limited resources, again, at the expense of residents and against common sense and the residents' wishes.

I further object to the proposal's incoherence in the matter of (a) single-sided parking: recycling trucks and ambulances etc. can navigate even Herbert Street and (b) access considerations; most noticeably in Herbert Street at the junction with Chesterton road, which could easily be solved by the introduction of lockable bollards.

I further object to the proposal's favouring time-limited general use of residents' parking zones. This invariably leads to a free-for-all at both ends of the restricted hours as cars rush to move away when the overnight liberty ends, and rush to find somewhere to park when it begins, inconveniencing residents and visitors alike.

Finally I object on the basis of a general incoherence. To be removing a substantial proportion of existing residents' parking at a time when planning permission is being happily accorded to residential development which will unquestionably increase the number of local cars belonging to new residents, heedless of the Council's laudable belief that everything would be better if only people would go by bike, does not really make sense.

It would appear that this has become a party political matter. Over the last two-and-a-bit years, I suspect we have all become wary of and exhausted by questions which could be resolved with a little clear thinking and good will, having become an unedifying party political battleground. This would be one area where reason and utilitarianism could usefully supplant a pointlessly party-line process, and I hope the committee will vote on the basis of common sense, utility, and, of course, the clear inequity of the discarding of residents' express concerns in the previous consultation.

Dear All,

I am writing to strongly object to the unfairness of the removal of publicly available, free parking spaces around Ascham Road, Gurney Way and the North side of Milton Road.

The removal of these spaces is absolutely needless.

We have increasingly seen spaces removed from us in the neighborhood for absolutely no good reason.

The 'resident only' parking spaces still go empty, whilst the rest of us that need the spaces are unable to park within comfortable walking distance of our homes.

Furthermore, the process for moving forward for this is highly undemocratic. Our objections at the consultation stage were disregarded, not listened to. These objections would have changed the result.

Instead, the council and the councillors have decided not to listen to the people who have elected them, to represent them. Is it not your public duty to listen to the electorate and to stand up for what is important to them?

Finally, I believe the councillors and staff at policy and regulation should publically disclose whether they park within walking distance of their homes. How would you feel if you had no options available on your street or nearby to park?

Is the priority to listen to residents or to raise more funds for the council (through parking)? Many of these spaces, for example, on De Freville Ave. go unused. Residents still mostly get to park in front of or near to their homes on their own street.

So justify the need to remove these spaces. Be accountable to your electorate.

Can the council disclose how much money is raised through parking meters in this neighborhood (streets cited above)?

I sincerely hope that you appreciate the needless frustration, stress and increased traffic caused to residents in this neighborhood.

Regards

Dear sir / madam,

As residents of ___ my husband and I are writing to you in order to strongly object to the Ascham area residents parking scheme being brought in whilst we still don't have a viable solution for the parking issues in our, and the direct surrounding streets, referred to in various parking zone plans as either The Chesterton Triangle / Elizabeth area.

Over the last six years local residents have been voicing concerns to the council about the parking issues in these streets, trying to get a residents parking scheme brought in. Our street in particular is used as daytime 'free' parking by both private and commercial vehicles, and also free overnight parking by many other non-residents of the street. This causes many issues for residents primarily in terms of not being able to park in the street themselves, damage being caused to residents' cars by inconsiderate drivers who then simply drive off and the sometimes dangerous / aggressive driving of non-residents who are simply fixated on finding a space and seemingly unconcerned about the street being a cycle route / school cut through / child pedestrian zone. It's surely only a matter of time before a serious incident / accident occurs as a result.

It's simply unacceptable for the Ascham scheme to be brought in whilst we still don't have a viable solution / residents scheme in this area. It would also be very damaging in terms of the amenity of the area due to increased traffic flow / number of vehicles trying to park in the street, and could potentially also result in even more aggressive behaviour from non-residents who are forced to 'fight' even harder for the few spaces available. It really is an unbearable situation as it is and cannot knowingly be allowed to get any worse, bringing in the Ascham scheme at this time would undoubtedly do just that.

Last I heard our scheme had been 'shelved' because no one seemed to be able to find a workable solution. This now seems ludicrous as Ascham seems to have been rushed through without any issues! We've been trying to get a scheme for six years now, without success!!

In summary, we strongly object to the Ascham scheme being brought in, particularly whilst there is no solution for the Chesterton Triangle area.

Yours sincerely,

I am writing to object to the proposed parking scheme centred around Ascham Road in Cambridge. I live in ___ and regularly have to park in the pavement bays on the north side of Milton when there is no space in George Street. The TRO will remove these bays and not provide any replacement, creating more traffic by requiring car owners to drive further afield looking for a space. The 20 pavement spaces on the north side of Milton Road are a vital amenity for local residents, but particularly those from the more densely populated streets south of Milton where there is much less off-street parking.

County policy (section 4.5 of Annex A of the Resident Parking Policy 14/3/17) states that a new scheme should be "Cognisant of new or displaced parking problems.". The Ascham parking scheme does not meet this criteria as will create a new parking problem for residents outside of the zone. This point was made by residents south of Milton Road during the Ascham scheme consultation but appears to have been ignored.

A sensible approach would be to postpone the introduction of the Ascham scheme until a parking solution for the Chesterton Triangle (Elizabeth zone) can be found. Earlier work identified the Chesterton Triangle as higher priority than other nearby areas however the proposed scheme did not meet the needs of local residents and therefore did not go ahead. The County Council should not go ahead with TRO PR0481 and instead focus on finding a workable solution for the Chesterton Triangle area.

Best regards,

28 September 2018

Dear Sirs and Mesdames,

I am writing to you now to register my objection to the proposed removal of the on-street parking bays along the north side of Milton Road.

I have lived at ___ since ___ and have witnessed the gradual reduction of on street parking since then. While I understand and appreciate the County Council's efforts to ease traffic flow through our wonderful city, the current proposals seem unnecessary and wasteful of resources, as well as making my life and that of my family, neighbours, visitors and any tradespeople who need to attend our house, very considerably difficult.

As I understand it, the proposals will remove any on-street parking within a considerable distance available to me, as my house is one of a number on the [REDACTED] that are excluded from the residents' parking scheme that is to be introduced on Gurney Way and Ascham Road which is where I can normally find somewhere to park on the occasions when all of the bays on the north side of Milton Road (which are to be removed) are occupied. We already find that many tradespeople (including gas, electricity and water workers) find it very difficult to park near to our home, with the result that on many occasions essential servicing appointments are broken. Your new proposals will doubtless make this situation worse.

This will inevitably lead to the need for me to drive further to find parking places. We own just one car, which I need for my work. On the occasions when I work at home, I note that the only times when traffic backs up on the section of Milton Road is for an hour or so each morning or evening during school term time – which suggests that the problem with traffic movement at these times really lie with the unsatisfactory provision of other means of school transport, and suggests that the referred-to proposed bus lanes as a reason for removing the parking spaces will not solve the problem.

Over the past few years this area has seen massive redevelopment (Students' Castle, Manor Care Home, ApartHotel to name just a few). I assume that each of these developments come with a Section 106 agreement which should enable improvement of the surrounding area. To date I have seen no visible evidence of such improvements (indeed it took 4 years to fix some of the serious potholes in the road which were causing damage to my house through excessive shaking caused by heavy vehicles).

I would like to suggest that those involved in these developments (planning authorities as well as developers) should consider offering replacement free parking facilities within easy reach of where I live. Alternatively, a solution as was employed to the west of the Huntingdon Road / Victoria Road junction could be employed, with the creation of proper, safe, parking spaces along the road dedicated for those that live there. There is ample space for this on the north side of Milton Road and there could be easy and safe distinction made between parking areas and areas to be used by pedestrians. I would be happy to meet with relevant officers to explain how this could work.

I was surprised and disappointed that we were not consulted about these proposals and that they had to be brought to my attention by our neighbours, and I therefore further suggest that we should be fully involved in any further consultations involving our stretch of Milton Road. I would be grateful for written acknowledgement of receipt of this objection.

Yours faithfully,

I am writing to object to the proposals for the parking scheme being proposed for Ascham Road/Gurney Way area. I live in [REDACTED] and have done for more than 20 years, each time a new parking initiative comes in it negatively impacts on George Street. It is absolutely obvious that in George Street there cannot be enough parking spaces to accommodate one car from each house. Our only way of parking within 10 or 15 minutes of our homes is to park on the bays on Milton Road or in Ascham Road or Gurney Way where the roads are wide enough for on street parking on both sides and most of them have off street parking facilities.

The way that the parking strategy is being dealt with is clearly flawed by creating a scheme which is focused on small pockets whilst ignoring adjacent areas just puts all the pressure on those remaining areas. I would say that most people in George Street who are fit do use a cycle to go into town and many people do cycle to work but a car is still a necessity. This scheme must be rethought as in its present form it will create real hardship. Previous objections have been ignored and the scheme has continued to be promoted, this cannot be democratic.

Dear Sir,

The proposed residence parking scheme for Ascham Traffic Regulation Order (PR0481) must not go ahead as its implementation will heavily impact upon the lives of the residents in the streets east of Milton Road such as George St, Herbert St, Springfield Rd and Hawthorn Way.

The current scheme proposed is unfair and divisive by attempting to address the parking issues of one group of residents to the detriment of those of others.

The development of this current scheme which will see the removal of much needed parking space for local residence will not work.

I am a resident of George Street and fully understand the need for controls to exclude commuter parking, however I believe the current proposed and existing residents parking schemes are inequitable and that a review to consider their reconfiguration should be urgently undertaken.

I am objecting to the removal of the parking bays on Milton Road. I live in ____, by ____, and we do not have viable parking

scheme in our area.

Removal of the bays is a needless change. They do not need to be taken out until the City Deal work goes ahead, by which time our local parking problems may be resolved. We are regular users of these bays and

I also object to the process whereby we were not consulted at the previous stage.

As a resident of Chesterton Road. I have a car and need this for both familial duties and my work.

The parking situation has become increasingly difficult to the point that it is stressful to go out for fear

of not finding somewhere to park on my return, or of having to drive around so much looking for a place that valuable time is lost and in my case, various appointments not made on time.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached my objection to the above-mentioned Draft Order.
Please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you,

I would like to lodge my objection to the plans to introduce residents parking in the Chesterton triangle as proposed. The plan as proposed will remove 40 places currently used by residents on Springfield Road, Herbert St. and George St. with no accommodation made in any of the surrounding streets. This will apply on a 24hr basis. This is not an acceptable situation for the residents of the streets mentioned. A solution needs to be found, within a much much larger catchment area, that can accommodate the displaced resident's vehicles from these streets. Even in the current situation residents of these streets need at times to park on Milton Rd, Ascham Rd, Gurney Rd, and other streets as there is not at present space for the existing cars. This scheme needs to be totally re-thought or abandoned or chaos will be the result.

Regards

I wish to object to this proposal as it will adversely affect the adjacent streets and roads by causing displaced commuter and other opportunistic parking into the adjoining streets and roads. Also, by removing the on-street parking along the north-west side of Milton Road between Mitcham's Corner and Ascham Road to include that the area in scheme PR0481, there will be a:

- costly waste of resources, in that work altering the pavement area on this section of Milton Road prior to January 2019 will have to take place again within two years as the whole of Milton Road will be remodelled when the planned GCP works take place during 2020
- loss of parking spaces unnecessarily early, given that all on-street parking will be removed during 2020 under the GCP planned proposal.

Kind regards

I object to the proposals in PR0481 on the grounds that they will waste valuable resources, since that part of Milton Road is to be remodelled in 2020 as part of the GCP scheme, and also because no plans are suggested to make good the lost parking spaces.

I am writing to strongly object to the current parking proposals around Herbert Street. I have lived in [REDACTED] and I do not feel that residents are being listened to. Ever since the introduction of parking permits in the de Freville Avenue area the parking in neighbouring streets has just got worse and the current proposals are not going to address the problem but exacerbate it by significantly reducing the number of spaces available. The whole parking issue needs to be revisited rather than continue to fiddle with it in a piecemeal fashion and invariably making things worse. I doubt any of the councillors fully understand the issues as I fail to see how such ill considered solutions would be discussed if they were fully conversant with the existing problems and the chaos that will ensue if these proposals are implemented.

Dear Sirs

I am writing to object to the Ascham Residents Parking Zone PR0481 that I understand is scheduled for implementation January 2019. I object to proposed changes to the current parking allowed on Milton Road in this Zone ahead of the Greater Cambridge Partnership proposals to be carried out in Mid 2020.

I understand that Greater Cambridge Partnership proposals for Milton Road will be no parking on Milton Road and this scheme is planned for mid 2020. It seems a total waste of resources in altering the pavement area twice within two years.

Yours faithfully

To whom it may concern - I would like to register my objection to the parking controls that have been suggested for the Ascham, Gilbert and Victoria Rd areas which will undoubtedly have a completely detrimental affect on the parking for Herbert St, George St and Chesterton Hall Crescent area.

If these plans were to be implemented, it would mean that the latter area would have no access to any overflow parking. With the 20+ parking bays along the North side of Milton Rd also being threatened, there does not seem to be a plausible or workable alternative to replace these spaces any where else.

Chesterton Hall Crescent, George St and Herbert St residents are being squeezed uncompromisingly into not having anywhere to park and nothing sensible appears to be being considered.

I cannot understand why all the neighbouring areas cannot all come to a sensible and reasonable decision, and share a more common and extensive residents' parking area.

I work as a [REDACTED] and often come back late in the evening and then have to leave again early the following morning. Even now I am finding it often impossible to park in my street and if these new proposals are pushed through, where do you suggest I can park when George St is full and so too is Herbert St and CHC late in the evening or when it is dark?

I sincerely hope that you do not allow these proposals of further resident parking controls are allowed to go through, but that something far more sensible and safe is considered as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely

Many thanks for sending this through.

I was perturbed to see on the schedule to the Draft Order that business permits are available. This is the first time I've seen this mentioned and I'd like to understand who can buy business permits, since there are quite a few businesses within the area covered by the PRO some with many staff such as in the Westbrook Centre. Since the objective of the scheme is mainly to reduce commuter parking it could be that the scheme, which reduces the number of spaces available, actually makes things worse if commuters in these businesses park in the area because they can no longer park in neighbouring ones that may have fewer businesses.

Would you be able to tell me what the rules are for business permits, or point me to a document where they are defined please? Presumably schools, libraries etc count as businesses as well as companies & shops?

Hello,

I understand that you requested details of the parking scheme. The relevant documents are attached. Please feel free to submit any comments as local feedback is important. Although the stated deadline was 28th September 2018, we always allow a few extra days for letters in the post, etc.

Regards

I hope you will accept my feedback on this proposal since I was away on business all last week and this has been the first time I have to respond.

I object to the removal of the parking bays on Milton Road proposed within the introduction of residents' parking to Ascham Road as this will have a knock-on effect to neighbouring streets, already plagued by commuter parking.

Regards

Dear Sir or Madam

We are writing to express our concern about the proposed residents' parking scheme in Courtney Way and Metcalf Road.

We are a __ with __ with __ and __. We also employ in excess of __ staff and have daily visits from __, __ and other __ and __ as well as the __ and __ of our __ and __

The majority of our __ are brought into __ by __ or __.

Due to very limited space on the __ many __ park on the roadside when __ and __ from __ (several of whom have __ or are __).

Would parking spaces or permits be made available to the __ to support our __? (Our __ starts at __. __am and finishes at __. __pm).

Thank you

Hello,

I have been working at the Westbrook Centre for a number of years and I was forwarded a copy of the letter regarding the proposed residents permit parking scheme, dated 3rd September, by a member of Westbrook management.

While I have no issue the proposed changes I would like take this opportunity to offer a suggestion that I have been meaning to make for some time.

My suggestion is to install a bollard or two on the pavement near the corner of the Westbrook drive exit (on the right as you drive out). The reason being that even with the current double yellows and marked spaces it's all too often that people, sometimes in large vehicles/vans park right on the corner making visibility while trying to exit to Milton road very poor. Even the first marked space seems a little too close to the corner. Occasionally vehicles are parked half on the road and half on the pavement making it worse, and sometimes it's just because they want to visit the fish and chip shop over the road, so just having double yellows and a sign visible is unlikely to solve the problem.

I have seen and had a fair few near misses with cars and cyclists, especially in the winter months when it's dark, as there is often no choice but to edge out so much you're halfway across the road before you can see what's coming from the right. I find this situation quite dangerous at times so if there are going to be changes around this area I would very much appreciate it if you could take this suggestion into consideration.

Thank you

I am writing to express our strong support for the proposal to remove the parking spaces that are currently marked on the footway along the north-west side of Milton Road between Mitcham's Corner and Ascham Road.

As a business based at the Westbrook Centre we have long held concerns about the safety of the access from Westbrook Drive onto Milton Road – the current parking bays significantly impact on the sight lines at this junction and means that cars exiting the site regularly come in to conflict with traffic heading north up Milton Road. This applies both to cars exiting the Mitcham's Corner system and heading north, who are often not visible to those at the junction, and more concerning the parked cars on the footpath also act to mask cyclists using the on-road cycle path.

We would therefore greatly welcome the footway parking spaces being removed and no waiting restrictions placed on the stretch of road at key hours. This will greatly improve the safety of this stretch of road and address our fears that one of our staff or a member of the public will at some stage be involved in a collision due to the current poor site lines at the junction.

Regards

Dear Cambridgeshire County Council,

THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 23) ORDER 20\$\$

Thank you for your 'e' correspondence in relation to the above named proposal. Please accept this as confirmation and acknowledgement of receipt.

What is intended has been fully examined by the traffic management unit.

With regard to the proposed waiting restrictions, on the assumption the locale falls within a CEA and therefore not subject to police enforcement, on behalf of the Chief Officer, the police have no comment to make.

Yours Sincerely,

Could we get some cycle parking in at the end of Courtney Way where there are railings (see attached) - would prevent people turning round here as the poster on the railings requests and would provide parking for the Castle School 6th form where there doesn't appear to be any visitor parking.

Regards