

Appendix 4:

No	Point made	Officer response
Points made in objection to the scheme.		
1	<p>The proposals will only move the caravans further along Riverside, in front of our windows.</p>	<p>There is a risk of displacement parking, however, these other areas do not afford the same levels of privacy.</p> <p>If the proposals are implemented and displacement parking ends up being a concern, additional measures can be sought through a future scheme.</p> <p>Regardless of this concern, the proposals seek to improve visibility in the area, which should be prioritised to protect all manner of road users.</p>
2	<p>The proposals will result in referral parking onto nearby roads, which already experience similar problems. The ability for residents of Oyster Row and Stanley Road to park will be detrimentally affected and so too will pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p> <p>Oyster Row has the same issue with motorhome / general overnight parking, which is arguably more dangerous with two-way traffic travelling to and from Newmarket Road, Mercer's Row industrial estate and Murdoch House. Visibility, particularly on the corner of Oyster Row and at its junction with Stanley Road, is extremely poor due to parked vehicles, resulting in frequent near misses between cars and pedestrians / cyclists.</p> <p>Caravans and large vans parked opposite each other on Stanley Road prevent other large vehicles e.g. emergency vehicles or removal vans etc, from accessing Riverside. Vans often park opposite the access to Riverside House's carpark, making it difficult to access/exit, and this will only worsen if parking provisions are reduced.</p>	<p>As above (response to No. 1).</p>

	Residents of Newmarket Road also have to park on Stanley Road as they cannot park on the road outside their properties.	
3	Although visibility at the junction of Riverside and Stanley Road will be improved, this will not be by much as parking is already restricted here.	Whilst there are existing double yellow lines on the junction, visibility is still impaired by parked vehicles. The proposed lining would ensure clear visibility all the way up to the entrance to Stourbridge Common.
4	The proposed restrictions at the entrance to Stourbridge Common will restrict access for recreation, particularly on a Saturday.	It is accepted that some visitors use the existing parking provisions for this purpose, and that they would need to seek alternative parking provisions, but the proposals seek to; address the concern of camping in the area and the associated refuse it produces, to the benefit of both residents and those visiting; along with improve visibility, to the benefit of all road users.
5	This area provides much needed capacity for visitors to the housing area as well as anyone wishing to visit the park and or walk along the opposite bank. There is ample width for cyclists to pass on the cycleway without adding additional constraints that would hinder local people from receiving visitors or from those with more restricted mobility from accessing the river scape and parks.	It is accepted that this area can serve as a parking place for visitors, however, long term parking of campervans and some associated antisocial behaviour has led the Council to needing to address the issue. The proposals also seek to improve visibility, to the benefit of all road users. The proposals have been discussed at length and were seen, on balance, to be the most appropriate means of addressing the issue. Note, blue badge holders will be able park in the area for up to 3 hours.
6	Parking at the entrance to Stourbridge Common does not pose a threat to pedestrian or cycling traffic safety. Vehicles parked around the area in question do not block the entrance to the common and allow plenty of visibility for through traffic to move freely.	Vehicles – often high sided camper vans – currently park perpendicular to the northwest kerb where visibility is often obscured by adjacent vehicles. Vehicles parked opposite, along the southeastern kerb, restrict visibility at the junction with Stanley Road, increasing the risk of conflict between road users.
7	Removal of even more parking from Cambridge is just increasing isolation for many who can't use other modes of transportation. There are other ways to improve this space but further restrictions on vehicles are not something I can support.	The proposals seek to address the issue of campervan parking and the ensuing issue of refuse and human waste disposal. It is accepted that the loss of on street parking is not ideal but there are limitations on alternative measures that would achieve the same desired effect. Note, those in the immediate vicinity, likely to be directly affected, were

		informed of the proposals and no such concerns of isolation were received.
8	All nearby roads were considered collectively when the resident's parking scheme was discussed so how can they be separated now with no consideration of the impact on the adjoining streets?	A resident's parking scheme directly affects all included roads whereas these proposals mainly affect Riverside. The effect on adjoining roads was taken into consideration through the design process though it was deemed that the impact would likely be minimal.
9	<p>The enforced removal of caravans and campervans is discriminatory against people with different lifestyles and those of lower income. The character of this area is inclusive and has long included a mix of house boats and caravans, this should be celebrated as a sustainable affordable way to live, not targeted.</p> <p>Alternative parking should be provided to those that would otherwise be left homeless, along with those residing on the boats on the allocated moorings.</p> <p>The proposals go directly against the Council's policy of inclusiveness and welcoming diversity.</p>	<p>Though parking on the public highway is permitted, there is no right or priority. The removal of parking from this area affects all in the same manner and does not remove the ability to park elsewhere.</p> <p>There is no requirement to provide alternative parking provisions and removing motorhome parking in this area will not render such individuals homeless.</p> <p>The problem with long term parking of caravans on public roads is that it's not set up for such a purpose and thus refuse / waste disposal is a concern.</p> <p>The Council's enforcement officer, who has had many dealings with the area over the years, has been in contact with those that currently park large vehicles/campervans in the area. They report that there are currently no travellers or needy people there at the moment and that those that are there are camping in the location because it is cheap, or that the vehicle is being used for storage. The officer has been provided with a consultation pack that can be given to any new arrivals, to make sure they are away of the proposals.</p> <p>It should be noted that the majority of people that stated the caravans enhance the character of the street, are not local residents i.e. residents of Riverside or adjoining streets.</p>
10	This is one of the few places my visitors can park for free.	<p>Parking is permitted on the single yellow lines from 7pm to 7am and unrestricted parking is available on the southeastern side of Riverside (between Bartholomew's Court and Stanley Road) / on neighbouring streets.</p> <p>The proposals seek to address the issue of campervan parking, the associated issue of refuse and human waste disposal and safety</p>

		concerns born of parked vehicles restricting visibility of and for road users. It is accepted that the loss of on street parking is not ideal but there are limitations on alternative measures that would achieve the same desired effect.
11	I rely on this area to park my car as I work 11-hour days and cannot afford the parking charges to pay and display. If this parking provision is removed, I'm not sure where I would park.	As above (response to No.10).
12	The proposals will hinder carers in their ability to park close to their clients, delaying and or preventing care from being given.	As above (response to No.10).
13	I rely on this area to park my car as I cannot afford the parking charges to pay and display.	As above (response to No.10).
14	Dangerous incidents in this location are the result drivers in a hurry e.g. delivery drivers, not looking before making a U-turn. Removing parking does more harm than good as an apparently wide road will make drivers less careful.	Noted, though a wider road does afford greater space, and thus visibility, for all road users. Certainly, as far as U-turns are concerned, a wider carriageway ensures drivers can undertake more of the turn in a forward gear, reducing the amount/length of reversing manoeuvres where visibility is most limited.
15	The road is always clear, and passage is never restricted, despite the fact that the area is not a through route for motor vehicles.	<p>Passage along the road may be maintained, however, visibility is restricted by parked vehicles. The proposals look to address this safety concern.</p> <p>Note, although not a through route for motorised vehicles, the access to Stourbridge Common experiences high levels of cyclist and pedestrian traffic.</p>
16	Where else can people with an alternative lifestyle park by the river and enjoy?	<p>There is no legal requirement to provide such parking provisions.</p> <p>There is however the requirement to ensure the safe and an expeditious use of the public highway, which parking in this location has a direct effect on.</p>
17	I could support the proposal if suitable alternative parking arrangements were	Though parking on the public highway is permitted, there is no right or priority. The

	made to accommodate the vehicles that have parked on this road for several decades.	removal of vehicles from this area would improve visibility and thus safety in this location.
18	The presence of caravans and motorhomes has always made me feel safer when walking past, knowing that there are residents there.	Noted, however, in the absence of any motorhomes, those residing in the adjacent properties should also satisfy this concern. The improved visibility through the lack of high sided vehicles parked perpendicular and parallel to the carriageway should also help in this regard.
19	This will make parking difficult for disabled residents that need to park close to their properties.	Blue badge holders can apply for the install of a disabled bay near their property. These can be applied for at: Apply for a disabled parking bay - Cambridgeshire County Council
20	The open space afforded by the proposed restrictions will result in vehicles speeding up as they head towards St Bartholomew's Court.	Should vehicle speeds increase as a result of implementing the proposed parking restrictions, traffic calming can be investigated. Given the residential nature of the area and the high levels of pedestrian / cyclist traffic though, this is unlikely to be an issue.
21	Without parked vehicles, pedestrians will likely walk along the railing to enjoy the view. As there is no footpath, this will lead to potential conflicts with vehicles. Incidents already happen further down Riverside where cars are confronted with pedestrians in the road, often distracted by activity on the water/stopping to take photos.	Noted, however, the onus is on drivers to look out for more the vulnerable road users (cyclists and pedestrians) and given it is not a through road, there is little need for drivers to travel along at great speed. Note, there are no laws prohibiting pedestrians from walking along the side of the road and given the proximity to Stourbridge Common, the pedestrianised area adjacent to the Equilano Bridge and the presence of the river itself, this kind of behaviour is to be expected / should be accounted for by drivers.
Points made in support of the scheme.		
1	Permanently parked vans (campervans) near Stourbridge Common makes vehicular access challenging and presents a visibility issue for people coming into and out of Stanley Road – increasing the likelihood of accidents occurring.	Noted.
2	When cycling through the cattle grid, there is often the added obstacle of caravan tow	Noted.

	<p>hooks and other large vehicles, which is especially hazardous when dark. There is then the concern of vehicles exiting Stanley Road as they are often unable to see past the parked cars.</p> <p>The access to Stourbridge Common is very active and the volume of cyclist / pedestrian traffic is projected to increase significantly when three Greenways converge on Riverside at this point.</p>	<p>This scheme will enhance the Greenways project which is proposing Riverside becoming a 'quiet street' keeping the entrance to Stourbridge Common clear will improve visibility and therefore safety.</p>
3	<p>The unrestricted parking on Riverside is well known by the campervan international community and now features on several websites. The larger campervans are so long that they impede access for bin collections and likely present access concerns for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The people who live in the campervans have no access to mains electricity or waste disposal and so two situations occur. Firstly, they run loud generators at all hours of the day and secondly, they use the river and children's playground for waste disposal and defecation. The environmental agency has been notified of this several times when it has been seen.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
4	<p>There are ample private parking provisions for Riverside property owners who are directly affected by these restrictions. There are only 5 properties that do not have access to private parking provisions though a significant length of Riverside will not have any restrictions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
5	<p>Parked campervans destroy the beauty of the river itself, with views of the river and the fields nearby being replaced by rows of vans.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
6	<p>There is only the one, narrow, footway so many people currently walk along the riverbank side of Riverside – often the only option for those with pushchairs or mobility vehicles. Where vehicles also park on that</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	side of Riverside these pedestrians are forced into the path of bicycle and e-scooter traffic, often moving very fast. The proposal will reduce this conflict.	
7	Measures to improve the safety of all road users will improve the overall welfare of society and encourage more people to take up active travel.	Noted.
8	The restrictions as proposed were previously in place for nearly 3 months in 2019/2020 when Riverside was being resurfaced, with fencing stopping parking. Access to the park was better and residents had no issues.	Noted, though traffic levels and the circumstances of residents has likely changed since then.
9	Not having this ordinance in place makes these homes less liveable and goes against precedent set on other sections of this road. If it works further west along the Cam, then all the more necessity for it near one of the area's most popular pedestrian access points.	Noted.
10	Many children travel through this area to access the nearby green space. The safety of these more vulnerable road users should be prioritised.	Noted.
11	The disposal of waste in residents' bins (when left out for collection), has led to situations where collection of said bins has been refused e.g. disposal of non-biodegradable waste in green bins.	Noted.

Proposed additions / amendment to the proposals.

1	The only acceptable solution is paid parking, limiting overnight parking, or residents parking permits, otherwise leave the situation as is.	There are limitations on where the requisite pay and display machines can be positioned and carriageway space would likely have to be sacrificed for this purpose. Certainly, the associated budget is insufficient to support such a request and such a proposal would result in a high number of vehicle turning manoeuvres in close proximity to the busy Stourbridge Common access. A residents parking scheme can be investigated; however, the process takes time and requires a majority buy in from other
---	--	--

		residents in the area – note, such a scheme would need to be of sufficient size to be self-sufficient (in terms of operational costs) without the parking permits being prohibitively expensive.
2	<p>Extending the existing double yellow lines up to the entrance to Stourbridge common and installing give way markings / signs at the junction with Stanley Road would be safer than the proposal – many assume they have priority without giving much thought to traffic coming from Stourbridge Common.</p> <p>Note, it is not just cars vs cyclists, there have been collisions between cyclists with each assuming they have priority over the other.</p>	<p>Officers will look to install give-way markings.</p> <p>Accepted, though this would not address the concern of camping in the area and the associated sanitation concern would remain. It would also not address the safety concern of large vehicles (of varying sizes) parking perpendicular to the kerb.</p>
3	<p>Parking restrictions are required around entrance to Waterview. Vehicles often park too close to the access, limiting visibility and access for residents.</p>	<p>Accepted, though this will need to be investigated as part of a separate scheme, as the allocated budget is insufficient to account for such additions.</p> <p>Note the install double yellow lines either side of the entrance would further reduce the available on street parking provisions.</p> <p>As an alternative, an access protection marking (APM) could be installed to highlight the extent of the dropped kerb access.</p>
4	<p>If concern is about self-contained vehicles parking in the area for long periods, a number of spaces could be made into short-term “aire” parking with the assistance of CAMpRA [campra.org.uk]. Such a facility would bring extra income to the Council and local businesses; a valuable resource extending a welcome to visitors who otherwise do not bother to visit Cambridge because the available caravan sites are too far out of the city for motor-home tourists.</p>	<p>This could be investigated, though only through consultation with residents that live on Riverside itself.</p> <p>Note, the creation of such short-term parking spaces for campervans etc does little to benefit local residents though and does not address the concern of refuse and human waste generated from campervans using the area.</p>
5	<p>Could you consider extending the double yellow lines onto Stanley Road, Oyster Drive and Garlic Row. These roads are dangerous with parking on both sides of the road.</p>	<p>This will need to be investigated as part of a separate scheme, as the allocated budget is insufficient to account for such additions.</p>

6	<p>If the single yellow line restriction was 8am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm you would prevent commuter parking whilst also allowing dog walkers etc visiting access.</p>	<p>Timing changes would require further consultation.</p>
7	<p>The marking of parallel parking bays on the river side would prevent the parking of large, converted campers and would stop people parking at right angles to the kerb. This would also maintain parking for residents and visitors.</p> <p>Compliment with signs prohibiting overnight sleeping in vehicles along Riverside would also help.</p> <p>Please maintain parking either side of Riverside, south of its junction with Stanley Road.</p>	<p>Whilst this would reduce the carriageway obstruction, most vehicles adapted for camping would likely still be able to fit within these bays and so the associated sanitation concern would remain.</p> <p>Short of restricting overnight parking, there are limitations as to what else can be done to prevent camping on the public highway – sleeping in vehicles cannot specifically be prevented and enforcement of any late-night restrictions would be reliant upon police enforcement, which they cannot be expected to provide.</p>
8	<p>In my opinion the single yellow lines in the area should be replaced with double yellow lines and a footway should be constructed to allow pedestrians to walk along the river.</p>	<p>Whilst advantageous to pedestrians, such a proposal has considerable cost implications (far outweighing the allocated budget for this scheme) and would be detrimental to residents that rely upon this area for overnight parking.</p>
9	<p>Why are you allowing parking after 7pm, when it's likely to be dark and hence more dangerous? It's bad at present, hence this order, but if you're going to restrict parking on safety grounds do it 24h. Any other rules will be ignored and abused because there will be little enforcement (like in the rest of Cambridge). Double yellow lines will also do more to preserve safety on Sundays.</p>	<p>There is a balance to be had to ensure adequate overnight parking provisions for nearby residents. Certainly, parking on the single yellow lines restricts the overall road width, but there is typically good forward visibility in this location and parking is permitted outside peak travel times.</p>
10	<p>The gate to Stourbridge Common needs redesigning to have a pass-through for bicycles in each direction, similar to the one under the Elizabeth Way Bridge. This would improve the general flow of bicycles along this route.</p> <p>It also requires the provision of pedestrian accesses on both sides of the cycle access, so that pedestrians walking along</p>	<p>GCP (Greater Cambridge Partnership) have advised that the Bottisham Greenway scheme has made provisions to improve the flow at the access to Stourbridge Common.</p> <p>The design stipulates a widening of both the existing pedestrian access/egress point and the cyclists/mobility access – providing a more intuitive access arrangement than present.</p>

	the riverfront are not forced across the path of cyclists and or e-scooters.	
Other pertinent comments.		
1	<p>In the summer most of the parking issues are from overnight camper vans that appear from all over the UK and from Europe, our road is in fact listed as an area that encourages the use for 'wild camping ' at no cost, located near the centre of town. Many of these recreational vehicles are the size of a delivery lorry and they stay for days, it has been an ongoing problem that we have had no assistance with resolving despite bringing it to the attention of councillors in the past.</p> <p>The safety of cyclists is compromised by their large vehicles, often parked at right angles to the road itself.</p> <p>We have witnessed 'campers' setting up roadside kitchens, using the roadside as a toilet, discarding waste into the river and leaving bags of waste after departing, they do not contribute to the Cambridge economy, many come fully equipped with all the food, drink and fuel required for their stay.</p>	<p>These comments were provided as part of objection, hence not including them in the supportive comments section. They have been noted here as they provide points which help to explain why the parking restrictions have been sought.</p>
2	<p>As a resident who has witnessed first-hand cycling accidents, car accidents and near misses due to the current parking, this proposal would make a very active junction considerably safer. We have also witnessed camper vans who take advantage of the complete lack of any parking restrictions and reside anywhere from several nights to months on the road. Many of these vans do not have waste facilities and on several occasions, we have found people using the children's play area as their toilet, sometimes even in broad daylight. We have also seen waste being thrown out into the river or simply left in the road after they leave. We have also had to call the police for suspected drug use/dealing, noise concerns during late hours and even a bonfire which was lit on the road – all from campervan users.</p>	<p>These comments were made in support of the proposals. The salient points have been raised by residents, but the complete response has been noted here as it provides a clear picture of the issue at hand.</p>

<p>I have submitted some photographs and video, which illustrate the dangerously overcrowding the current parking situation allows as well as the lack of respect often shown by the campervans for maintaining/observing the safe passage of cars and cyclists.</p> <p>One photo in particular (not included in the report for anonymity reasons) (taken in the evening with a bike on the ground) was from when a cyclist flipped over their handlebars because a campervan's towbar was much too far out into the road. The lady was able to walk away, and the police were called (30 October 2023). Another shows a van which completely blocked the park entrance for several hours while they set up an outdoor kitchen.</p> <p>I appreciate that there will be some people who strongly oppose this proposal due to the desire to preserve the ease of being able to park at any time or concerns over how this will push parking traffic to other parts of the surrounding areas but I sincerely hope the safety of the residence and visitors will supersede this and this parking proposal can be a critical step in ensuring this special part of Cambridge remains safe and sanitary.</p>	
--	--