PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME
YORK STREET AREA, CAMBRIDGE

Main objections raised through statutory publication, with officer responses. This covers general objections raised by residents in many of the streets in the proposed RPS zone followed by specific issues raised in certain streets. Main supportive comments can also be found at the end of this document.

No.	Issue Raised	Officer Response
	General objections raised across the RPS zone	
1	Loss of parking capacity. Concerns around the overall loss of parking spaces in the area and as a consequence the RPS will not improve the situation for residents.	RPSs normally result in a loss of parking spaces. This is because the Council must indicate what lengths of road can safely be used for parking and those that cannot, such as near junctions. At present, drivers can use their own judgement and discretion about their choice of parking space. Those types of uncontrolled parking practices are not acceptable with a Council-promoted scheme that seeks to better manage on-street parking. The Council has an agreed parking policy which stipulates that a road must be at least 6.7 metres wide to accommodate double-sided parking. That does not exist in some streets. However, the expectation is that the removal of non-resident parking will free-up space for residents and their visitors.
2	Cost of permits. Concerns about permit costs, particularly in the current economic climate, when it is difficult for some residents to see how an RPS will actually improve parking for them.	There is a significant cost involved in setting up, managing and enforcing RPSs. Residents benefit from the expected increase in availability of parking for them and their visitors. The cost must be borne locally, rather than being funded from general council tax-payers. Experience of introducing similar schemes elsewhere is that they are successful in improving the parking situation for local people.
3	RPS operational days and times. These are too long and not aligned with nearby RPSs, particularly Petersfield RPS (Mon-Sat 9am-5pm). Extending the hours to 8pm will negatively	The operational hours of 9am to 8am on all days has come about due to discussions and considerations around what would be required to tackle the underlying issues of non-resident parking. RPSs are increasingly required

	impact visitors, including to public houses.	to operate 7 days a week as business activity and traffic flows on a Sunday are similar to other days of the week. Shorter hours would increase opportunities for non-residents to park in the area. It is accepted that by including evenings and weekends there will be a greater need for visitors to display permits.
4	Inadequate consultation and feedback. Consultation with residents has been inadequate and there has been no proper feedback on the earlier consultation. Insufficient detail has been provided to enable residents to make an informed judgement about the scheme.	There have been several opportunities for residents to submit feedback on the scheme. The Council published a drawing which showed the position of permit holder parking bays and how many spaces would be available in each street. The Council is unable to provide a figure on how many vehicles are owned by all households in the area and what the parking demand might be during the RPSs operational hours.
	Ainsworth Street	
1	Loss of parking capacity. The proposed scheme will result in the loss of a considerable number of parking spaces in Ainsworth Street due to the scheme only allowing for single-sided parking.	The proposal to allow only single-sided parking was based on the Council's policy which stipulates a minimum road width that is sufficient for double-sided parking, which in turn was based on discussions with the emergency services about accessibility. The Council is aware of difficulties that the fire service has experienced in reaching homes in Ainsworth Street due to the current parking.
3	Road safety concerns. The scheme will have road safety implications as the removal of double-sided parking will allow for higher traffic speeds for cars, powered two-wheelers, deliveries, etc.	It is accepted that traffic speeds could increase as a result of the removal of double-sided parking and the road appearing wider to drivers. However, the removal of double-sided parking will allow for more space for some users, such as cyclists. There are safety implications currently due to having a very narrow traffic lane between double-sided parking with restricted visibility and lack of clearance from parked cars.
4	Alternative types of parking restriction. Other forms of parking management, such as a permit parking area (PPA) or	A PPA involves installing upright entry signs stating that parking is for permit holders only. They are normally used in single streets or small networks of streets, or in conservation areas where signs and lines would be visually

	single yellow lines have not been properly considered.	intrusive. The main issue in the York Street area is that it would still allow for double-sided parking in Ainsworth Street and other roads, which the Council considers inappropriate due to road widths. A PPA would also allow footway parking, which the Council wants to discourage. Single yellow lines are more commonly used in roads where most properties have off-road parking. They would not work in roads such as those in the York Street are where most residents need to park on-street.
6	Visitor and non-resident parking. Negative impact on visitor, tradespersons and business parking activities.	A range of permit types will be available for non-residents. One of the objectives of RPSs is to discourage drivers traveling into the city. Charging drivers to park on-street may encourage some to use more sustainable modes of travel.
7	Concerns about personal safety. People may have to park in streets further away from home and walk home during the hours of darkness.	The removal of double-sided parking in Ainsworth Street could result in some residents having to park further away from home. However, RPSs remove non-resident parking and give priority to residents, so may increase parking availability.
	Fairsford Place	
1	Volume of parking. If Fairsford Place is part of the much larger York Street area zone it will be inundated with parked cars owned by those living in adjacent streets that do not have adequate space in their own street.	Residents parking schemes usually cover a number of streets forming a defined zone. This is to ensure that there are options available should a parking space be unavailable in a resident's own street. Due to the nature of Fairsford Place and its "intimate" nature, it is unlikely that residents of other streets would park there, except as a last resort. At present, there is nothing to stop residents of Abbey Walk and other nearby streets parking in Fairsford Place. However, it is accepted that some of the current parking in Abbey Walk would be removed as part of the proposed RPS, which may result in migration to other streets.
2	Road layout. Due to the road layout of Fairsford Place, i.e. the shared space layout, which blurs the boundaries between	It is acknowledged that the road layout and nature of Fairsford Place is very different to other streets in the area. The

	road and footway, and property doors being close to the road, the additional parking will create difficulties for residents.	road was not designed to cater for large numbers of parked cars.
3	Separate Permit Parking Area (PPA). Residents want a PPA (entry signs with no marked parking spaces) exclusively for Fairsford Place.	It is possible to implement a sperate PPA for Fairsford Place, but residents may well experience problems on those occasions if it was full of parked cars and no spaces were available. Obviously, they would be unable to overspill into other streets in the main York Street RPZ zone.
4	The double yellow lines at the far ends are not required. Residents currently cope without them and manage the situation themselves.	It is usual practice to provide a clear area at the end of no-through roads to allow space for vehicles to turn around. However, it is less critical in a short cul-de-sac that caters for very little non-resident traffic movements.
	York Terrace	
1	No justification for an RPS. There is no need for permit parking as residents are able to find parking, it will result in fewer spaces being available and residents do not want to pay for parking.	With area-wide parking schemes, there will be individual roads where residents suffer less with non-resident parking and see little or no justification for RPSs. However, if streets, such as York Terrace were omitted from the zone, it is likely that residents of other streets would seek parking there to avoid the cost of buying a permit to park in their own street.
	St. Matthews Gardens	
1	No justification for an RPS. There is no need to include this road in the scheme. Any parking issues being experienced do not warrant such restrictions	If St. Matthew's Gardens was outside of the RPS the available free parking spaces might be taken up by residents of nearby streets to avoid permit costs. If that happened, residents of St Matthews Gardens would have very few on-street parking options available to them.
2	Use and cost of available parking spaces. The currently free on-street parking spaces are used by those who are unable to use the underground car park, tradespersons and visitors. It is unfair and unnecessary to charge for the use of those spaces.	There are approximately 12 on-street parking spaces available and these would become resident permit-holder spaces. If they did not have some form of parking restriction applied to them, they might be used for long-term parking by those living outside of St Matthews Gardens.
	Stone Street	

1	Loss of parking capacity. Concerns around the loss of parking spaces in Stone Street.	At present cars are frequently parked on both sides of Stone Street, partly on the footways. This creates an obstruction for pedestrians, plus wheelchair and pushchairs users. The proposed scheme seeks to maximise the available kerb-space, bearing in mind the Council desire to remove footway parking and the policy on available road width to maintain traffic flow.
2	Bury Court. Space should be made available in the Bury Court car park for residents of Stone Street.	The car park is privately owned, so the Council has no control over it's use. Individual residents are free to approach the landowner (Suffolk Housing Association) with a view to agreeing an arrangement to allow them to park there.
3	Statutory duties and responsibilities. The Council is acting outside of its powers and responsibilities.	The main objective of the RPS is to prioritise parking for residents, many of whom have no off-street parking. A secondary aim is to reduce congestion and improve air quality by discouraging non-residents, such as commuters, from driving into the city in search of free on-street parking. The Council has a duty to ensure the safe movement of all traffic, including pedestrians. The RPS seeks to do that by managing on-street parking in such as way that vehicular traffic and pedestrians are not unduly hindered by parked vehicles. These principles are aligned with the Councils responsibilities and policies. Any decisions made on the RPS will be in accordance with the Council's adopted standing orders and other procedures. Those submitting written representations will have the opportunity to attend and address any public meetings.
	Support	
1	Improved parking availability by removing non-resident parking.	Noted.
2	Enhanced safety, especially for pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted.
3	Less traffic due to people searching for on-street parking spaces.	Noted.

4	Easier access for emergency vehicles.	Noted.
5	Improved quality of life due to spending less time searching for parking.	Noted.
6	Better management of limited parking capacity.	Noted.
7	Reduced vehicle emissions from cars circling around the area in search of parking.	Noted.