

28 September 2018

Re: PR0480

Graham Hughes, Executive Director, Place and Economy,
c/o Policy and Regulation,
Vantage House,
Washingley Road,
Huntingdon PE29 6SR

Dear Sir,

I would like to object to the above TRO proposal (PR0480) in its current state. The grounds for this objection are as follows:

I believe this parking scheme will increase road danger in the immediate area of Bateson Road.

- There is not currently any visible problem with non-resident parking on Bateson Road (see "Cambridge On-Street Residential Parking Study" by Cambridgeshire County Council 2017 for evidence).
- This scheme will push those non-resident commuters who do currently use Bateson Road for parking to instead park on Stretten Avenue (which does not yet have a proposed parking restriction TRO), where parking on a narrow heavily-used through-route exacerbates what is already an unpleasantly confrontational and dangerous road for cyclists and pedestrians and is frequently noticeably heavy with air pollution at rush hour.
- A residents parking scheme should not be implemented for Bateson Road before measures are taken to improve Stretten Avenue, ideally including preventing motorised through-traffic from using it as a rat run across North Cambridge.

There is zero cycle parking provision in this proposed scheme, but there should be:

- Public cycle parking was introduced in Romsey in recent years with great success.
- Public cycle parking would offer an alternative to those who would otherwise drive into the area for social and business purposes, reducing road danger and improving air quality for all.

The scheme specifically does not address the through-traffic problems which are the actual cause of road danger and pollution in the area.

- Stretten Avenue should not be a through route from Gilbert Road to Victoria Avenue. Neither should Bateson Road and Garden Walk.
- Removing through traffic would make the roads safer both by reducing the number of dangerous encounters between road users, but also reduce speeds through the relative pressure on antisocial drivers to behave around their own neighbours.

The additional signage is ugly and obstructive on the pavements. Our pavements and our urban landscape are precious resources which should not be sacrificed at the alter of the car. Cambridge already has an abundance of signposts, and a shortage of lighting.

- Sets of PPA entry/exit signs for Bateson Road and Garden Walk should ideally be used, as has been proposed for the part the road which surrounds the Bateson Road Play Area, as well as other streets in the scheme.
- The proposed plans place a sign directly in front of my living room window. (_ _ _ _) Signs should at the very least be aligned to plot boundaries to minimise obstruction or mounted on other street furniture such as lamp posts and telephone poles.

There are no loading bays in the proposed design. They should be included.

- Without loading bays deliveries will invariably frequently be made in an antisocial fashion by car, van, and truck drivers who will drive onto pavements risking pedestrian and cyclists in doing so, and parking wardens will be less than willing to deal with such issues.
- Please provide regular loading bays for supermarket and shopping deliveries, which are a fact of modern life.
- This would also allow better enforcement by closing loopholes used to park antisocially while claiming an exemption for loading.

The proposed design is for a handful of parking spaces, yet the "Cambridge On-Street Residential Parking Study" by Cambridgeshire County Council 2017 claims the street has 44 spaces.

- Despite this some of the proposed spaces are on top of missing wooden street features which previously protected pavements from encroachment by drivers.
- The wooden posts in the area should be reinstated where they have rotted away and/or been removed. This is especially true at the Stretten Avenue end of Bateson Road where some drivers use the pavement to circumvent the traffic calming features at the junction.

There is no plan for city-wide congestion charging or road charging.

- In an ideal situation, drivers would be charged for road use, with surge charging allowing for additional loading to discourage car use on smaller residential roads, and penalise use during poor air quality incidents.

Please reconsider this scheme. The priority for the area should be put on making the streets and air safer through removing through traffic, and the city-wide priority should be to discourage driving across the city. Parking restrictions should be used in tandem with the kind of restrictions which are already so successful at reducing traffic in the Romsey and Petersfield areas.

I would propose as a priority partially closing the Stretten Avenue / Akeman Street / Bateson Road crossroads as was done with Hobard Road / Suez Road in Coleridge. Thus southern Stretten Avenue, Bateson Road and Garden walk would be an effective cul-de-sac off Victoria Road, and Akeman Street and northern Stretten Avenue would no longer be rat runs between Histon Road and Victoria Road. I would absolutely welcome such resident parking restrictions as a part of such a larger scheme to reduce danger on Stretten Avenue and perhaps even further afield (Carlton Way, Mere Way, etc.) by removing inappropriate through-traffic, and doubly so if the scheme also included good public on-street cycle parking provision and appropriate bays for deliveries and taxi pick-ups.

I believe that as part of a more concerted effort this TRO in a revised form could deliver the excellent living environment we should aspire to in our city, but in its current form falls far short of that and will worsen living in the area in multiple ways, some minor and some significant.

Yours Sincerely,

Dear Sir,

RE VICTORIA AREA RESIDENTS' PARKING - BATESON ROAD UPDATE

I strongly disagree with the proposal of Resident Permit Holders Parking.

I would like to express my concerns regarding the Resident Permit Holders parking for Bateson Road, Cambridge.

I would like to express my anger and concerns over this proposal.

Firstly, I am an elderly lady in my [REDACTED].

I rely on my family to come regularly during the week and at weekends to help me.

I am angry and very concerned about them being unable to deal with my well being and helping me the daily routines due to the Resident Parking Permit Holders Scheme you are proposing. They will have difficulty parking and may even be unable to find a parking space to enable them to get to my home. I am not the only elderly resident in Bateson Road who may also experience the same issues.

Secondly, this proposal issue of parking permits for Monday - Sunday inclusive is making it impossible for my family members to visit me.

It would probably be made much easier if the proposal did not include Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays enabling them to visit without the parking permit problems.

My family help me regularly and I am extremely worried that I won't be getting the help or contact that I need with them.

I would appreciate a reply to this email and that you would re-consider this proposal to help myself and others to stay safe in our own homes with regular contact from all our families that we have and rely on.

Yours faithfully,

Good afternoon,

Reference the proposed consultation for resident parking in the Victoria Road area (see above reference), I would like to comment on the proposal with regards to the proposed enforcement times.

The proposed times are for Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm.

I can see why these times have been proposed due to discouraging commuters, but I believe that given the location of Corona Road specifically, these hours should be extended to Sunday and also extended to 8pm given the number of public houses and restaurants in the area of which consumers could potentially use resident spaces after 5pm on Mon-Sat and all day on Sunday!

I do hope this objection will be given serious consideration.

Kinda Regards

I would like to comment on the proposed residents parking scheme for Garden Walk Cambridge which is part of PRO480.

I generally support the scheme with the exception of the proposed car parking space outside 28/30 Garden Walk. I live in [REDACTED].

The proposed parking space is opposite the dropped kerb of the driveway leading to the garages owned by [REDACTED]. Vehicles coming down Garden Walk to Victoria Road have to change from the left to the right hand side of the road opposite no.29 [REDACTED]. Even with only one car parked across the road outside nos. 28/30 wider longer vehicles(bin vans, wide bodied MPV taxis, supermarket delivery vans, builders lorries etc) have to mount the pavement to get round the parked car in order to change lanes. The result is that the kerb stones of the dropped kerb have become loose and uneven from the weight put upon them and the pavement of the dropped kerb has become so deeply rutted that it is impossible to walk evenly along it. The weight of these heavy vehicles has been such that it has caused movement of the pavement outside my property which has weakened my front garden wall [REDACTED]. The pavement outside no.30 [REDACTED] has also been damaged by such vehicles driving along it before returning to the road. The paving blocks are becoming uneven and sinking below the level of the kerb stones.

I have not yet reported the damage to the pavement or [REDACTED] because repairing either will be futile unless the root cause of the damage is removed, that is, having a car parked opposite forcing vehicles to mount the pavement to get round it. Unless such car parking is stopped any repair of the pavement will be a waste of public money because it will only have to be repeated after a time.

It has been suggested that having a car parked outside 28/30 is a speed inhibiting measure. This is not so. My neighbours and I have all observed cars driving down Garden Walk at speeds obviously in excess of 20 mph which have swerved round the parked car with no noticeable diminution of speed. Speeding drivers can only be inhibited by a physical impediment such as speed bumps or cushions. They may be an expensive solution but if the council is serious about reducing speeding down Garden Walk, especially to protect cyclists for whom it is a two way road, then speed bumps are the only effective solution.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We were unable to access the above proposal on your website as the scheme number was nowhere to be found. Would you kindly forward the relevant information, as we are keen to see if this proposal will inhibit our driveway in any way.

We strongly object to the proposal for residents' parking in Garden Walk for the following reasons:

1. In [redacted] years of residency there, we or our visitors have never had a problem finding a parking space.
2. The road is too narrow to support such a scheme, as those of us with driveways will no doubt have difficulty in accessing them.
3. The proposed restrictions will allow for even fewer of the residents and visitors to park their cars, thus setting neighbour against neighbour.
4. A number of houses in Garden Walk are undergoing major renovation and rebuilding, which means that the street is currently full of builders' lorries etc; this situation is due to continue for some time, therefore you would be ill advised to impose any parking restrictions now or in the near future.
5. The lack of parking spaces will merely encourage the residents to park their cars in Stretton Avenue, St Luke's Church Car Park and surrounding areas, creating more problems than solving them.
6. The Residents Association has been putting pressure on those of us who don't wish to have these restrictions; their bullying tactics and letters suggesting that there will be more parking than your plans have allowed for have given a distorted view of these proposed restrictions.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Mr Hughes

As a resident of __ since ____, I would like to express my support for the proposed on-street parking controls in the Victoria Road area of Cambridge, as advertised in the Public Notice with reference PR0480.

The demand for parking in the area currently exceeds supply due in large part to commuters and shoppers using these streets as free parking. The proposed parking controls should help this situation, improving parking amenity for residents, and reducing general traffic and congestion in the city.

I recognise that, as well as reducing parking demand, the proposed scheme will reduce total parking capacity. There is therefore the possibility that the reduction in capacity exceeds the reduction in demand and this could be considered grounds on which to object to the proposed scheme. However, the Victoria Road area is one of many areas of proposed parking controls, and in the event that adjacent areas (Ascham, Stretton, Elizabeth) proceed with controls (which they seem to be doing), the demand for parking in the Victoria area will be dramatically increased and thus further exacerbate the current situation. The Victoria area therefore needs these controls even if they mean a net increase in parking pressure because this is very likely to be less of an increase in pressure than if the Victoria area becomes an island of unrestricted free parking surrounded by controlled areas.

The proposed new double yellow restriction zones on Primrose Street and Green's Street will unfortunately dramatically reduce parking capacity on these streets but are surely essential for emergency vehicle access, and should be introduced on safety grounds whether or not the rest of the proposed parking controls are introduced.

Parking pressure is higher during University term time despite University regulations prohibiting students from keeping a car within 10 miles of Great St Mary's Church. I appreciate it is not the council's responsibility to enforce university regulations but I hope the proposed parking controls will also deter student parking. I also encourage the council to discuss enforcement options with the University as this will also help with Cambridge congestion and parking pressure in general.

I anticipate some residents will object to the proposal on the basis that existing traffic control orders (no motorised vehicles except for access) should be sufficient if only they were enforced. However, such enforcement seems impossible in practice, especially on a through street like Garden Walk where cars would have to be detected as entering and exiting without stopping, or parking and occupants leaving on foot. These access-only signs are a mild deterrent at best and Garden Walk has parking problems despite them.

Yours sincerely

Dear Policy and Regulation Team,

This is not an objection. I am writing to thank you for proposing this excellent residents parking scheme, which apart from the obvious benefits for residents, will also help to discourage the huge amount of private vehicles coming into the City and causing air pollution, health issues and congestion daily, all because the drivers think they will get a free parking space.

I live on Garden Walk and we have had years of increasing numbers of commuters and shoppers parking on the street, with all the attendant difficulties for residents finding a space to park on the street at all, never mind anywhere near their homes. The amount of vehicles coming down the street seeking a parking space has meant increased traffic down what is actually an Access Only road, and on our narrow street this has led to higher risks for pedestrians of all ages, especially given the very narrow and uneven pavements. As [REDACTED], I have been involved in the campaigning [REDACTED] has done over recent years for residents parking, and environmental improvements and emphasise here that the members of the [REDACTED] are collectively pleased with your proposal.

As an aside, it would also be helpful if the Access Only TRO is enforced, to discourage drivers from cutting through to Victoria Road.

Regards, __ (resident at __ __ __, and __ of __ __ __).

Thank you __ – hopefully it will get the approval of Committee in October. I hope to attend the meeting or, if I can't as work commitments, another [REDACTED] will hopefully be present. Many thanks,
Hi __,

Ok, thanks for letting me know. The earliest I can have confirmation of whether the 23rd is going ahead or not and, if not, the deferred date, the better. Many thanks,

Residents Parking Scheme Garden Walk

Residents voted by a small majority to have a Residents' Parking Scheme

There are several reasons why we are not in favour of this.

1) The Access Only restriction will be removed.

If that had been enforceable then the position today would be quite different.

It was ignored by most with taxis not stopping to pick up passengers but going straight through.

It was used to avoid Stretten Avenue by many. This will now continue as before.

2) What are the plans for Stretten Avenue?

It has recently become congested as far out as Gilbert Road.

The proposed residents' scheme will worsen this situation and access will become increasingly difficult.

3) Parking for workers and guests.

For any trades people coming to work here it will be necessary to buy a parking voucher.

This is not good. Ditto guests.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

Hello,

I am writing in response to the call for consultation regarding the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme in the Victoria Road Area, Cambridge (PR0480).

I am a resident of __, which is scheduled to become part of the proposed scheme. Though I am not opposed to the idea of residents' parking in principle in this area, I strongly object to the proposal as it stands. This is because it has been tied to the introduction of double-yellow lines on most of Green's Road. Combined with a similar change on the next street along, this would make it near impossible for us to park within 200m of our house. We have two young children, and often have to make shuttle runs to the car to load things up, even for regular trips. For longer periods away, with heavy luggage to load/unload, the proposed changes would be a very significant inconvenience. And we're being asked to pay £62 for the privilege!

Quite apart from this personal inconvenience, I am concerned that the shortage of parking spaces on our street will create unnecessary friction within our friendly community.

It seems from your consultation document (dated 3rd Sept) that support for the scheme is marginal at best, among those that chose to respond. I am sure that you have read the verbal responses that I and others provided for you in the original request for feedback, and so will be aware that this is in large part because of the tie-in with an overall reduction in spaces.

Instead of proceeding with so divisive a proposal, I strongly urge you to reform the scheme in a way that will achieve proper consensus among the proposed participants. What is most frustrating for me as a resident is that this would be so simple to do. A permit scheme without a reduction in the total number of spaces in the area would resolve the greatest sticking point at a stroke. I am sure that some common sense flexibility on this matter will prevent further difficulties and challenges to the scheme down the line. If this really cannot be done, I would urge you not to implement a proposal that has only wafer-thin support - particularly given that families such as mine will bear a disproportionate burden.

I look forward to your response, and hope that this issue can be resolved in the interests of all.

Best wishes,

I live in __ and can only see 3 proposed bays for vehicle parking in Green's Road in your plans (we were originally told it would be around seven. In the entire Victoria scheme I can only count around 47 bays although I can't see any proposed bays in Victoria Park so I guess everybody has to squeeze in there. If this is correct you are going to be creating an awful problem for the local councillors and residents and chaos.

What is meant to happen when tradesman need to park to do work at peoples houses?

I object to the scheme as it is proposed.

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed residents' permit parking scheme in the Victoria Road area of town. I understand that the proposed scheme was supported by only a narrow majority (53% of respondents) during the recent consultation.

I am a resident of __, and am concerned that creating marked bays -- as per the proposal -- will reduce the capacity for parking in Corona Road by around 20%. Moreover, I note that the proposed scheme will introduce double yellow lines along the length of the neighbouring Greens Road. This means that many of the cars that currently park there will be forced to park in Corona Road, therefore denying space to Corona Road residents and their visitors.

I concede that there are issues with non-resident parking in this part of town, but there are already 'access only' controls on most of the roads which fall under the proposed scheme. I believe it would be more prudent to properly police the existing controls, rather than introducing a permit parking scheme. The scheme is not guaranteed to solve the parking problems, and the cost of permits is an unnecessary additional expense for local residents and their visitors.

From the residents of No. _____

Reference Number PR0480

To whom it may concern,

The proposed reduction of parking for the Victoria Road area (which includes Green's Road) makes little sense in that such changes will immediately heap up a multitude of parking problems for the future. You have proposed that the parking spaces in Green's Road be reduced to three places while at the same time reducing parking spaces in the nearby roads to a minimal few, thus making parking in the Victoria Road area almost impossible for a sizable number of local residents. There are more than fifteen car owners in this road alone.

I have lived in Green's Road for nearly [REDACTED] years, during which time there have been no problems with parking or access. Why is it that the situation suddenly changes after all these years – and in such a radical way? There are residents here who need cars for their work place a long distance away, there is a doctor who needs the use of her car on a professional basis, there is a care worker who works irregular hours around the city as well as older people and families with children who would find it very difficult to manage without a car.

Are you really expecting a large number of residents to sell their vehicles and survive on public transport?

Looking further into the future, for those who may well need to sell their property, the value of houses in this area will doubtless fall considerably due to the lack of available parking spaces in the locality.

SUGGESTION

As regards the original reason given to us for the restriction of parking spaces in Green's Road, there are actually only two places that fail to fulfil the required width stipulation for vehicle access. If this short section were to be provided with double yellow lines, surely that would negate the need for further removal of spaces? Dear sirs,

With reference to the notice regarding the implement of the Residents Parking Scheme in the Victoria area, while in principle I have no objection to the concept, I fail to see how tradesmen are meant to cope with the restrictions for instance in Green's Road. We recently [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Where are they supposed to leave their vehicles while they work?

Sincerely

RE: Victoria Road Parking Scheme. REF: PRO480.

I am a resident of __, __, __ and am writing to express my strong opposition to the Council's proposed Residents' Parking Scheme. By way of brief overview my objections are based on procedural, economic, safety and regulatory grounds.

As you will be aware the Council's justification for removing the majority of parking from Green's Road and replacing it with double yellow lines is that they deem the road too narrow for emergency vehicles. Whilst not denying that Green's Road is narrow, the legislation that the Council are using to justify their decision does not apply to existing dwellings. Instead it applies exclusively to new developments. Without wishing to sound obtuse, adopting the Council's interpretation of the regulations and applying this to similar building / constructions codes would result in the majority of buildings in Cambridge, including some of the council's own premises, needing substantial alteration to bring them into line with the latest codes and requirements. It is concerning that those tasked with implementing and enforcing the regulations do not fully understand them.

Further having spoken to local emergency crews, both fire and ambulance, my understanding is that the short length of Green's Road means that there are limited access issues as: (i) emergency vehicles can ordinarily get down the road; and (ii) if they cannot they are able to reach the end of the road quickly and easily on foot (parking at the top of the street which is wider) and using fire hydrants and trolleys respectively. Accordingly, it does not appear that there is a significant public risk which would override the statutory position that streets and buildings only need to comply with the regulations in place at the time of construction. Again, looking at Cambridge, if you took the Council's purported interpretation of the legislation most of the city (including the colleges) would have to be re-designed.

I am also concerned that the council have not adequately considered the impact that removing the parking from Green's Road and neighbouring streets will have on local residents. It is unquestionable that the removal of parking spaces from Green's Road and the surrounding area will significantly increase the already strong competition for parking spaces. In turn this is likely to lead to people parking in inappropriate and / or dangerous positions which will only exacerbate the problem the Council are looking to avoid and add to Cambridge's already severe traffic problems.

I have previously raised my concerns with the Council, but am yet to receive any meaningful response. Accordingly, I would ask that you reply detailing the Council's position on each of the concerns I raise below prior to introducing the Residents' Parking Scheme:

1. How will elderly and disabled people access their cars if they are unable to park within a short distance of their homes? Has consideration been given to the impact this could have on their physical and emotional wellbeing?
2. How will care agencies and healthcare professionals visit such people if there is no parking on the road and no guarantee of a visitor's permit space nearby?
3. How will tradesmen such as builders and plumbers be able to carry out repair works, plumbing etc if they are unable to site their vehicle on the road they are working on?
4. How will people who work antisocial and irregular hours, such as myself, be able to find a parking space near their homes late at night? Are you satisfied that they should be potentially put at risk walking long distances to their homes from their cars late at night?
5. Has consideration been given to the economic and social consequences of depriving people of easy access to their cars and the impact that the removal of street parking will have on property prices?
6. Has consideration been given to the impact on neighbouring streets if cars are displaced from Greens Road and other nearby streets?
7. Where are people who currently park on the impacted streets supposed to park going forward as there are currently very few available parking spaces in the area? Is alternative parking going to be made available in an equally safe, convenient and lit environment?

As a resident of Green's Road who was subject to the Public Consultation, I do not consider that it was advertised widely enough to create a meaningful vote, a belief supported by the low turnout. The results show 53 % for the scheme and 46% against and 1% undecided. Coincidentally, these are the same figures that the Council published as the result of a similar recent consultation.

Further, I have requested redacted copies of the votes and responses from the consultation in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. However the Council have so far declined access to these without adequate justification. Not only is this potentially a breach of their statutory duty, but the lack of meaningful transparency and engagement arises suspicions as to integrity of the decision making process. This is something that I will be pursuing with the Information Commissioner, the Council's own complaints procedures and local media.

I also wish to bring to your attention that Councillor Claire Richards has previously advised that Green's Road could opt out of the scheme if 95% of residents opposed it. In response I asked for information about where this number has come from, but unfortunately Councillor Richards was unable to provide any justification for the number. This is concerning for several reasons including:

(i) if there is the possibility to opt out of the scheme it suggests that the public safety argument put forward by the Council is a smokescreen (with the obvious conclusion being that this is solely a money generation exercise by the Council at the expense of the people they are supposed to represent);
(ii) given the size of Green's Road population, a single "opt-in" or "no vote" (potentially caused by illness or absence) would make this nominal threshold impossible to reach. Accordingly I would be grateful if you could substantiate where this 95% is stipulated?

I, like most residents in the impacted area, appreciate and recognise the Council's need to generate income and that Residents Parking schemes are one way to do this. However, I question how the Council can objectively justify imposing this scheme at the material expense of residents' emotional, economic and physical wellbeing and needs.

In terms of next steps I would be grateful if you could address the concerns outlined in this letter. Please note that given the strength of opposition against this proposed scheme within Green's Road (and the impact it will have on the residents both physically, emotionally and economically) if I do not receive substantive responses I will be seeking legal advice to ensure that both the letter and spirit of the relevant legislation are being followed. I will also be speaking to the media (both local and national) to ensure that this issue is brought to the wider public attention of Cambridge residents.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

I write further to my email of 14th September, and in response to the open letter from Councillor _ to Green's Road residents.

I believe that the mechanism of the Public Consultation is improper both in its undertaking and transparency. As you state, 83% of Green's Road residents who responded voted against the scheme. It appears that your presentation of the figures is misrepresentative. The Public Consultation was misleading, unclear and did not state that a response was to be considered a 'vote'. Had it done so, the turnout of local residents would certainly have been higher.

I, and the people I have consulted, did not consider the Public Consultation comments section to be a mechanism for voting. Local residents were shocked afterwards to discover that this had been the case. Since the Public Consultation, the content of the proposals has changed. The current Residents' Parking scheme revision reduces parking spaces even further and introduce more double yellow lines. Not only was the vote unclear, but the current proposal has significantly changed, making it unsubstantiated by vote and rendering the previous vote outdated. It makes sense that after seeing the revised proposal, with further reductions in parking provision, that there should be a new consultation and a new vote.

I have communicated with the council throughout the process and have not received satisfactory responses to my questions or to my request for further information.

I have asked several times where the 95% 'opt out' figure comes from, either as a legal requirement or documented council policy. Is this 95% threshold used for any other decision-making processes by the council, or just this one? It is certainly not democratic or representative of local residents' views.

I believe turnout was low due to the poor communication and information provided by the council. Nowhere in the Public Consultation documentation did it state that comments were to be viewed as votes. It also failed to inform Green's Road residents of the 95% majority needed to opt out of the scheme. Had it done so I am sure turnout would have been higher. Given the current parking plans I suspect that many more votes would be returned, and again, call for a new vote on these proposals.

As mentioned in my previous email, a majority which does not allow for absence or illness, is almost impossible to achieve on a street the size of Green's Road. Is this the council's aim?

I would like to be made aware of any Public meetings relating to this scheme. Many Green's Road residents feel strongly about this and are prepared to pursue the flaws in the council's processes.

Whilst I understand that the Council's motivation may seem justifiable, I believe that the negative impact on the existing community and environment will be disastrous.

I would appreciate a response to the issues raised here and in my previous correspondence of 14th September.

Yours sincerely,

Dear __,

It has been almost 3 weeks since my email of 14th September regarding the Victoria Residents' Parking Scheme. I have not yet received a response to my questions, although I am aware of other people who have received responses from your team.

Could you please respond to the questions raised?

Yours sincerely,

Dear Mr __,

Thank you for your email. I was disappointed to see that again you, on behalf of the council, are failing to respond to questions and concerns raised regarding the Victoria Residents' Parking Scheme.

In your initial response to my email of 14th September you stated that you would 'reply in more detail at the end of the Public Consultation period'. Please can you explain why you are now unable or unwilling to do this? As you are aware, a constructive and open dialogue should form the foundations of any consultation process, yet your refusal to provide the requested information seems counter to this. Accordingly, I restate my original request and ask that you provide the information originally requested.

In your most recent email you directed me to a link detailing various permit types, presumably on the basis that these would form part of the council's parking solution. I, like other residents of Greens Road, would be interested to understand your view on the practical value of trade and medical visitors permits if the council's proposals proceed as it unlikely that there will be any spaces for these professionals to park in. Will you allow trades people and medical visitors to park on double yellow lines without the risk of penalty in the area to enable them to attend to their clients and patients? If not then, these permits do not offer any realistic solution (particularly in an area which already has insufficient parking).

I would again ask that you respond to the questions I asked in my email of 14th September, as refusing to do so, again raises concerns about the council's lack of transparency in this consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

Re : Victoria Parking Scheme

REF : PRO480

I wish to register an objection to the Victoria Parking Scheme going ahead.

I live in __ and believe that the decision has been made without taking into account any of the objections put forward by the residents during our consultation.

The scheme will cause problems and hardship to all the residents in the street whether they have a car or not. For car owners it will be a nightmare to find parking nearby due to the reduction of parking spaces in the area. Imagine mothers with babies and toddlers or old people who have mobility issues but do not qualify for disabled permits, having to drive round and round for half an hour looking for a space and finding one 20 minutes' walk from their home. There is also the problem of parking for carers, plumbers, electricians, builders and other visitors who will not be able to park in Green's Road at any time as the 6 spaces will always be full. They too will find themselves driving round in circles, no doubt increasing the level of pollution in the process and perhaps never finding a space at all. What will be the point of visitors permits then? The Scheme is detrimental to all, residents, businesses and environment. I would like Green's Road to be taken out of it.

Dear Sirs

Although I originally supported this scheme I have now changed my mind and wish to object this scheme. Parking will be reduced considerably if this goes ahead in Green's Road. Please put me down as an objector.

Many thanks

I would like to strongly object to this scheme being implemented in Greens Road as working in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I need to be able to access my car quickly and therefore need to be able to park in the road. With the reduced parking proposed this will cause real problems. The parking situation at the moment is really working well and it would be very stressful for residents if this was changed. I therefore would like to register my objection.

REF PR0480

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm sending this email to register my objection to the proposed Victoria Parking Scheme. I am a resident of [REDACTED] and feel the proposed scheme will be damaging to the lives of residents on the street.

The proposed parking spaces are simply inadequate to meet need on Green's Road and in the area, and the displaced cars will have no suitable place nearby to relocate to.

I object to the vote for the scheme on Green's Road being bundled together with other streets; what is suitable for one road is not necessarily in the best interests of all the roads in the area. I also object to there not being a vote on the finalised scheme.

The perceived benefits of introducing the scheme are wholly inadequate to offset the negative aspects. I urge you to reconsider these proposals.

Kind regards,
Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to express my opposition to part of the Victoria Road area parking scheme. I live in Green's Road [REDACTED] and I feel that double yellow lines down the whole road will do nothing to alleviate any perceived parking problems in this road. Only 3 parking spaces for the residents of this road will make parking almost impossible for most of us.

Please reconsider this proposal and leave Green's Road as it is.

Regards

RE: Victoria Parking Scheme

REF: PR0480

We wish to register an objection to the Victoria Parking Scheme going ahead.

We think that the scheme is ill thought out and will severely harm the everyday lives of residents of Green's Road. There are at least 22 cars owned by residents of Green's Road, and the scheme only allows parking for 6 cars. This means that on a daily basis up to 16 car owners will be forced to find parking spaces in streets that can be a 10 to 20 minutes walk away. Primrose street will also have a severely reduced parking capacity and will also have to find alternatives.

In reality, having only 6 spaces in Green's Road will mean that they will always be full. There are many mothers with small children in Green's Road, as well as some older people. Imagine, if you will, on a cold, rainy winter's day a mother and child coming home from shopping and, of course, there is no parking space. So, park on a double yellow line, unload the shopping, and then off on a hunt to find a parking space, and the long walk back home with a child or two. This is not as it is now, there is rarely a problem with parking on Green's Road, especially on a weekday.

Green's Road, Primrose Street and those living in houses nearby on Victoria Road make up a relatively small number of the houses covered by the scheme. Victoria Park and Garden Walk have far more houses and therefore voting power in the choice of whether or not to accept a Parking Scheme in the area. It doesn't seem fair that these residents should be significantly disadvantaged but unable to counteract the superior numbers of those in larger streets wanting the scheme.

At the presentation about the scheme, we pleaded with councillors and officials that 5 parking spaces in Green's Road was an unrealistic number, and it could with some imaginative thinking be at least doubled, but in the end, only one extra space was found. This is clearly inadequate and as a result it calls the viability of the whole scheme into question. Primrose Street parking was reduced from the preliminary scheme from 9 to 8 places.

We also object to the fact that the procedure only allows a vote on a preliminary scheme, not the finished one. We also object to the fact that only a simple majority of those that vote are counted. There was a very small percentage of households that voted, and of this, only a very small majority were for the scheme, 53%. I think there should be some sort of threshold, say 50% of all households vote for it or 60% or so of those that vote. In any case, within these numbers 83% of Green's Road households who voted, voted against the scheme.

The choice of street for the scheme was not thought out properly as the size is too small to allow for the severe restrictions in parking on Green's Road and Primrose St. The displacement of cars from Green's Road and Primrose St will also affect the other roads in the scheme in a way those residents may not realise. On Green's Road and Primrose St, double yellow lines will prevent parking outside of bays 24/7 so displaced cars will always need to find places elsewhere in the scheme. The extra advantages of not having outsiders in the posted hours may not bring the advantages they expect as Green's Road and Primrose Street spillage may wipe out those advantages and after hours and on Sundays things will be worse than now.

Please consider these problems and reject the scheme in it's current iteration. It is not to the advantage of residents in the scheme.

Reference PR0480 – Victoria Area Residents Parking Scheme

I strongly object to this scheme being introduced on the following grounds:

- 53% in favour based on a minority total vote does not constitute a majority in favour of the scheme
- The scheme is unworkable as there are not enough parking spaces for the number of residents – especially in Green's Road and Primrose Street. This will force the residents of those streets and Victoria Road to seek parking in the other streets in the area, thus undermining the whole basis of the scheme.
- More yellow and white lines plus the permit street signs will clutter these largely untouched Victorian streets.
- The student Primrose Lodge flats in Primrose Street won planning permission as long as students living there did not own a car. Will the Council be able to enforce this rule and not issue parking permits to those residents in this building?

Yours

To whom it may concern

As stated on the survey sent out to residents of the area, we are strongly opposed to the proposed permit parking scheme in the Victoria Road area. This is because there will be fewer parking spaces (as additional double yellow lines will be introduced) and more people invited to join the parking area. This will exacerbate rather than solve any existing problems.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

With kind regards,

I am writing to object to the proposed Residents Parking Scheme in the Victoria Road area, Reference Number PR0480.

This proposed scheme would result in a significant net loss of parking spaces, particularly on Green's Road and Primrose Street, due to the addition of double yellow lines in a number of places. The rationale behind removing so much of the currently available parking is not clear. This would likely make parking in this area worse rather than better.

With kind regards,

Good evening,

As a resident of __ __ __, __ __, __ __ I would like to object to TRO ref. PR0481 on the grounds that I do not believe the plans go far enough. I would like to see the proposed hours of operation extended from 9-5 Monday to Saturday, to 8-8 Monday-Sunday. This is because the bulk of non-resident parking takes place on weekends, with people parking their vehicles and walking into town on both Saturday and Sunday.

Many thanks,

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME, VICTORIA ROAD AREA, CAMBRIDGE.
REFERENCE: PR0480

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your letter reference PR04080 dated 03 September 2018.

Simply put, I am not in favour of the proposed residents' parking schemes and my observations on the scheme, as outlined in your letter, can be summarised as follows:

- Cost. We currently have a Cambridge City Council-endorsed residents' parking scheme that, for the most part, works effectively. Its main failing is that the traffic enforcement services do not enforce the Access Only provisions of the scheme effectively permitting visitors to the city unregulated free parking. That we would wish to pay £62 pa for a lesser service is, in my view, unrealistic.
- Reduced Parking Opportunities. The proposed scheme, by adding yellow lines, will reduce the number of parking spaces which is somehow counter-intuitive.
- Hours of Operation. In my personal experience, the majority of residents do not need parking between the hours of the scheme's operation given that their vehicles are used to convey them to and from work.
- Loss of a Functioning Scheme. With the introduction of the new scheme, the current scheme will necessarily be abandoned. For the most part, the current scheme works perfectly well and, aside from the cost of signage, is cost-free. Its administrators are effective in distributing badges to entitled residents and in maintaining functional signage. It is my view that we would be swapping this scheme for an inferior one.
- Loss of Annual Summer Event. Every summer, Victoria Park is closed, with City Council sanction, for a period of 24 hours to the end of making it available for what is effectively a Summer Fair with a ceilidh, book stalls, wine-tasting etc. This event is managed by the same people who organise the parking scheme. The introduction of the new scheme will mean the demise of this enjoyable, community-centred event.

I am opposed to the proposed scheme and am strongly of the view that greater levels of assistance from Cambridge City Council with enforcing the existing scheme would be of far greater utility to the residents of Victoria Road and Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed scheme.

Best Regards,

Dear __,

Thank you for your acknowledgement but there is no need to spend any more of your valuable time in responding to the foregoing note. I simply need to be counted as someone in favour of retaining what we have on the basic principle of 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it'. The current scheme would however, work a lot better with a little assistance from those who manage the parking within Cambridge City. Thank you again.

Best Regards,
Dear Policy and Regulation Team,

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME, VICTORIA ROAD AREA, CAMBRIDGE.
REFERENCE: PR0480

Thank you for your letter reference PR0480 dated 03 September 2018. I very much appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme for the Victoria Road area.

I wish to express my objection to the introduction of the proposed scheme, as I feel strongly that the current, Cambridge City Council-endorsed residents' parking scheme works efficiently today, for the most part. My thoughts on the proposal, as outlined in your letter and elsewhere, are as follows:

- **Loss of a Functioning Scheme.** With the introduction of the new scheme, the current Access Only scheme will necessarily be abandoned. For the most part, the current scheme works well and, aside from the one-off cost of signage, is cost-free (to both residents and the Council, since it does not appear to be monitored). Its administrators are effective in distributing badges to entitled residents and maintaining functional signage. In my opinion we would be swapping this scheme for an inferior one.
- **Reduced Parking Opportunities:** The proposed scheme, by extending yellow lines – and, I believe, parking meters were also mentioned somewhere - will reduce the overall number of parking spaces available. This is detrimental not only to residents of Victoria Park, but also the wider district who will then experience a resultant squeeze in neighbouring streets from residents unable to park close to home. I recall reference is made in the proposals to a safety concern warranting adjusted parking bays, however in ■ years of living in Victoria Park I have not witnessed any accidents or safety concerns related to current parking layout.
- **Hours of Operation** will do little to address real parking problems. In my experience, parking is less of an issue during the proposed hours of the new scheme, since many residents are out at work or elsewhere. To the extent that there can be pressure on parking spaces during the day, this is mostly accounted for by visiting works vehicles, and unauthorised visitors taking advantage of free parking since the existing residents' scheme is not actively monitored. By late afternoon the parking situation eases again before the evening peak – which the proposed scheme could worsen rather than improve, due to overall fewer spaces and increased demand on them.
- **Environmental impact:** The overall impact of reduced parking space could be increased air pollution, emissions and noise pollution from vehicles circling the streets in an effort to find parking. I would have thought this counter-intuitive to the Council's wider goals on environmental issues.
- **Social impact:** The proposed charges for Visitor Permits seem exorbitant, and could particularly impact the wellbeing of those members of society most in need of frequent visitors and, in some cases, less able to afford the charges, e.g. those not in outside employment and at home more, including the elderly or infirm, carers, and parents of young children. Again, this seems at odds with what I would have thought are wider goals of the Council.
- **Cost.** We currently have a Cambridge City Council-endorsed residents' parking scheme that, for the most part, works effectively. Its main failing is that the traffic enforcement services do not enforce the Access Only provisions of the scheme effectively permitting visitors to the city unregulated free parking. The alternative of paying £62 pa for a lesser service, plus the high fees for visitor permits as mentioned above, is undesirable and, again, will impact some members of society less able to pay.
- **Loss of Annual Summer Event.** On one day each year, Victoria Park is closed, with City Council sanction, for a period of 24 hours to enable a neighbourhood Summer Fair with a ceilidh, book stalls, wine-tasting etc. This event is managed by the same residents who organise the parking scheme. The introduction of the new scheme will mean the demise of this enjoyable, community-centred event.

For all these reasons, I am opposed to the proposed scheme and would strongly ask Cambridge City Council to instead consider retaining the existing scheme, with more assistance in enforcing it. This could be of far greater utility to the residents of Victoria Road and Victoria Park – and, ultimately, cheaper for the Council.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the proposed scheme, and I would be happy to discuss further.

Kind regards,

I write to add my voice to my neighbours' objections to the PRO480.

I know that our voices are not isolated and I urge you to shelve this ill-considered proposal which has NOT been designed with the needs of the RESIDENTS in mind.

Sincerely,

I write to add my voice to my neighbours' objections to the PRO480.

I know that our voices are not isolated and I urge you to shelve this ill-considered proposal which has NOT been designed with the needs of the RESIDENTS in mind.

Sincerely,

Dear Mr Hughes

I should very much like to object to the introduction of residents' permit-only parking on Victoria Park and surrounding roads.

This is for the following simple reasons:

1. There is seldom currently a problem with parking. Most people on Victoria Park can find a parking space almost always. I have never in [redacted] years failed to park on this road. There is not a problem to be solved.
2. The parking permit scheme will reduce the number of spaces, relative to the ad-hoc scheme we currently have. Once disabled spaces and dropped kerbs have been marked out, there will be space for fewer cars, and the appearance of traffic wardens will surely fine anybody who is parked outwith the marked spaces.
3. Because of similarly reduced spaces on neighbouring roads (e.g. Garden walk) there will be increased demand for the (fewer) spaces.
4. There is no penalty for people without permits at evenings and weekends. The time when most people want to return home - having been out at work, or out during the weekend - will have no reduction in demand for spaces - just reduced number of spaces and increased demand from local residents.
5. It costs a significant amount of money while offering no benefit - only disadvantages.
6. It will be impossible for some people to have tradesmen because their limited number of visitor passes.

There is not a problem to be solved.

The scheme will create a problem by reducing the parking capacity.

This will increase the parking demand (with reduced capacity)

During evenings and weekends (when it's important), there is no reduction in demand from non permit-holders.

We will be paying for the council to create a problem where there was not one before!

It will make life very difficult for some.

Why would any reasonable person inflict this on nice people like me?

It occurs to me that there may be some selfish people who are retired and only move their cars seldom and during the day. These people may find it easier to keep a parking spot very close to their house. But - given that there generally isn't a problem anyway - it seems an unnecessarily high price for everybody else to pay for a small chance of a tiny return for a small number of unpleasant but vociferous people, who may be just in my imagination.

I urge you to consider cancelling the scheme, so that the six clear and significant disadvantages don't befall us. Many thanks

(Working-during-the-day person and owner of a single car for our household)

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am totally against the proposed new residents' parking scheme for Victoria Park and surrounding streets. There is not a problem with parking in the area. Maybe a few times a year someone cannot park right in front of their house, but there are usually several spaces and everyone is tolerant and moves around and squeezes up when necessary. Under the scheme there would be a significant loss of space available for parking in these streets. This would affect not only residents, but visitors (friends, family, carers, tradespeople). Visitors' permits would be costly and overly rationed; there are a lot of elderly people here who would find it difficult to obtain these permits for their visitors and carers who attend daily.

Please do not force this scheme on us.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been a resident in central Cambridge [REDACTED]. I am a pedestrian, daily cycle user and occasional car user.

I agree fully with the points raised in the email below. The residents' parking scheme as proposed is not fit for purpose, and the particular proposals would have very negative results for me, namely the reduction in parking spaces, the annual limit on visitors, the cost of visitors' permits and the annual cost to residents.

For these reasons I strongly oppose the planned scheme.

Yours sincerely,

I am writing to express by strong dissatisfaction with the councils proposal for re-organising parking in the Chesterton area. The scheme is deeply flawed and badly thought through and takes no account of the locals needs. It appears to be an arbitrary policy with no clear aim other than to deter drivers from coming to Cambridge; an aim that is likely to have worse consequences for the well being of the whole city.

The principal errors are

- a) The scheme propose to limit the number of visitors by car anyone can have by car to 100 per annum. The is draconian and for sick or infirm or elderly people an appalling limitation. For example, there are several people in Victoria Park their children visit regularly - certainty more than 100 times per annum. It is an unreasonable imposition on anyone. This also must be a breach of our human rights to be refused visitors by car.
- b) The cost of £2.40 per visit is absurd. In London I visit my daughter who pays 40p per visitor permit with no limit on the numbers. The cost for most people on top of the charges for registering your own car is untenable. The council should NOT be using this scheme as a money making exercise and the cost is unaffordable for most average households
- c) The scheme involves the loss of a huge number of car parking spaces in the area. It is clear that old Victorian streets are rarely designed to fit modern transport but the enforced removal of parking outside peoples homes is again an imposition on all the local households and will probably mean that parking availability will be even worse. 473 households in the Victoria Park area have 177 car parking spaces under the scheme - that is clearly insufficient fir the people who live there never mind visitors.

There is no need to implement any parking scheme as most affected roads have TROs. Encourage the police to enforce the TRO 3 times randomly per street per annum and the rogue parking problem will disappear at almost no cost to anyone

Continue with the scheme and I will certainly not be voting for any councillor who supported it at the next election. Nor I suspect will any of my neighbours

Hello,

I sent this response yesterday but with the wrong reference number.

I have been a resident in central Cambridge since 1995. I am a pedestrian, daily cycle user and occasional car user. My daughter cycles and walks.

The residents' parking scheme as proposed is not fit for purpose, and the particular proposals would have very negative results, namely the reduction in parking spaces, the annual limit on visitors, the cost of visitors' permits and the annual cost to residents.

For these reasons I strongly oppose the planned scheme.

Yours sincerely,

(Letter separate - scanned)

Attn: Policy and Regulation Team

Please find attached my objection to the proposed Victoria Road area Resident Parking Scheme and TRO (ref: PR0480).

Please acknowledge receipt.

With best wishes

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to respond to the proposed scheme for parking in Victoria Park and surrounding areas (ref PR0480).

I am in favour of a residents parking area BUT I feel strongly that the hours of operation should include evenings and not just daytimes as it is mostly in the evenings when non residents bring their cars into Victoria Park and the parking for residents becomes squeezed.

Thank you for taking the time to read my response. I look forward to the outcome and an easier parking experience in the near future!

We are writing to register our wholehearted objection to the proposed Victoria Parking Scheme (ref PRO480).

Our objections are:

1. The loss of overall parking spaces in the area. Many people on many occasions will simply not be able to park, not just in front of their own house, not just in their own street, not just in another street but no-where within any part of the Victoria Parking scheme. Where do they then go?
2. The excessive charges for visitors and the restriction on the number of visits per year. Our son/brother comes to visit quite often and we would have to curtail his visits which seems utterly unreasonable. He was born and brought up in Victoria Park. He grew up playing in the green, he learned to ride a bike on the quiet road, he "hung out" as a teenager. Now he will have to pay to visit me, and visit less often.
3. There is no need to implement any parking scheme as most affected roads have TROs. Encourage the police to enforce the TRO half a dozen times a year and the rogue parking problem will disappear at almost no cost to anyone.
4. The process you have been through is undemocratic. If you look at the very small numbers of people living in the affected area who commented on the draft proposal, we do not believe you have a mandate for change. Moreover, the scheme on which you are now consulting is substantially worse for the residents of the proposed area. We had originally been in favour of the scheme but seeing the proposal in its final form we have switched and now objective to it in the strongest terms.

Please acknowledge this objection.

Best regards

Dear Sirs

Ref: PR0480

We should like to state our objection to this scheme, not so much on the actual provisions of the scheme, but more on the procedure by which the so-called 'vote' was conducted.

When we completed the form within the booklet we received, 'Parking in your street', it was in no way made clear to us that our response constituted a 'vote'. And we know that there are others of exactly the same opinion. The general tenor of the booklet was couched in language which suggested something to the contrary - that this was an opportunity to express one's views on the proposals set out by Cambridgeshire County Council and that the council would consider these views, perhaps amend the proposals and then present the amended proposals for a formal and properly constituted vote.

Such a vote would be very carefully and unambiguously presented. For example: "I support the proposals for an RPS in" (followed by a box where one would mark one's X); "I am opposed to the proposals" (again, (followed by a box where one would mark one's X).

How on earth did the Council determine the figures of 53% for and 47% against with 1% undecided from what was basically an opinion-seeking questionnaire?

By what majority in the 'vote' did residents support the hours of 9 am to 5 pm?

Was the count on the 'vote' independently audited?

It is not our wish to prolong the process of creating proposals and then implementing them, but frankly, the way in which this has been done is a travesty of the democratic process. It leaves one with the unpleasant taste in one's mouth that the Council had already decided what it wanted to do and then contrived a result in its favour.

We shall be sending a copy of this objection to our local city and county councillors, urging them to press for a rethink on the way this scheme has been followed through. We shall also be urging the neighbours we have spoken to who were also unaware that they were participating in a 'vote' to do likewise.

Yours sincerely
Dear County Council

We're writing to strongly support the introduction of the Cambridge Victoria Area Residents Parking scheme since we have an ever-increasing problem with non-resident parking - which denies space for residents and their visitors.

Kind regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express complete agreement with the objections raised in the email below.

In addition, I note that margin in favour of the scheme was small, and the turnout was very small. I believe not all of the streets polled were in favour, and given the greatly different impacts of the scheme on the streets involved, it is fundamentally unjust and undemocratic to impose this scheme on the streets that voted against. The streets are non-contiguous and disparate, and the way they have been lumped together is open to legal challenge for gerrymandering.

yours sincerely,

I am writing to express by strong dissatisfaction with the councils proposal for re-organising parking in the Chesterton area. The scheme is deeply flawed and badly thought through and takes no account of the locals needs. It appears to be an arbitrary policy with no clear aim other than to deter drivers from coming to Cambridge; an aim that is likely to have worse consequences for the well being of the whole city.

The principal errors are

- a) The scheme propose to limit the number of visitors by car anyone can have by car to 100 per annum. The is draconian and for sick or infirm or elderly people an appalling limitation. For example, there are several people in Victoria Park their children visit regularly - certainty more than 100 times per annum. It is an unreasonable imposition on anyone. This also must be a breach of our human rights to be refused visitors by car.
- b) The cost of £2.40 per visit is absurd. In London I visit my [REDACTED] who pays 40p per visitor permit with no limit on the numbers. The cost for most people on top of the charges for registering your own car is untenable. The council should NOT be using this scheme as a money making exercise and the cost is unaffordable for most average households
- c) The scheme involves the loss of a huge number of car parking spaces in the area. It is clear that old Victorian streets are rarely designed to fit modern transport but the enforced removal of parking outside peoples homes is again an imposition on all the local households and will probably mean that parking availability will be even worse. 473 households in the Victoria Park area have 177 car parking spaces under the scheme - that is clearly insufficient fir the people who live there never mind visitors.

There is no need to implement any parking scheme as most affected roads have TROs. Encourage the police to enforce the TRO 3 times randomly per street per annum and the rogue parking problem will disappear at almost no cost to anyone

Continue with the scheme and I will certainly not be voting for any councillor who supported it at the next election. Nor I suspect will any of my neighbours

I am writing in support of the views of residents in Victoria Park who have submitted their objections to the proposed changes to Parking rights.

The existing TRO of 1968 is still valid and would continue to work well. It is rare not to be able to park near one's own house and to feel confident of returning home to be able to find a space somewhere in the park. It is clear from correspondence that most people in Victoria Park do not want the proposed parking scheme.

The residents of Victoria Park should have the right to determine any parking restrictions in Victoria Park. The proposal for free parking after 5pm will cause much more antagonism than the existing scheme in my opinion.

The proposed restrictions will be much much worse than the status quo for residents and their visitors.

Those residents arriving home from work after 5pm, as most workers do, may find parking spaces filled by non residents using the park for evening and over-night parking.

Older residents may have to drive around to find parking many streets away in dark winter evenings. We would be grateful if you you would give full consideration to our concerns.

Thank you for your kind response to my previous email regarding the proposed new Parking Scheme for Victoria Park.

I am advised that I should emphasise that it is specifically the PRO480 that my vehement objection relates to. Thank you again for your attention to this matter

Kind regards

__ makes a series of points below with which I wholeheartedly agree and confirm that the proposed scheme is

- 1 contrary to the established rights by user of residents

- 2 a draconian anti car agenda that takes insufficient account of the social needs of residents

- 3 overcharging

- 4 open to legal challenge owing to the poor turnout of consultees

- 5 profoundly undemocratic

It will undoubtedly have unintended consequences including the restriction on the ability of households to switch to green electric cars (they will be unable to charge at home) and a huge incentive for households to concrete over their front gardens to make off street parking.

As __ says, proper enforcement of the existing TROs would be a far better solution.

The proposed parking scheme should NOT be introduced.

I am writing to express by strong dissatisfaction with the councils proposal for re-organising parking in the Chesterton area. The scheme is deeply flawed and badly thought through and takes no account of the locals needs. It appears to be an arbitrary policy with no clear aim other than to deter drivers from coming to Cambridge; an aim that is likely to have worse consequences for the well being of the whole city.

The principal errors are

- a) The scheme propose to limit the number of visitors by car anyone can have by car to 100 per annum. The is draconian and for sick or infirm or elderly people an appalling limitation. For example, there are several people in Victoria Park their children visit regularly - certainty more than 100 times per annum. It is an unreasonable imposition on anyone. This also must be a breach of our human rights to be refused visitors by car.

- b) The cost of £2.40 per visit is absurd. In London I visit my daughter who pays 40p per visitor permit with no limit on the numbers. The cost for most people on top of the charges for registering your own car is untenable. The council should NOT be using this scheme as a money making exercise and the cost is unaffordable for most average households

- c) The scheme involves the loss of a huge number of car parking spaces in the area. It is clear that old Victorian streets are rarely designed to fit modern transport but the enforced removal of parking outside peoples homes is again an imposition on all the local households and will probably mean that parking availability will be even worse. 473 households in the Victoria Park area have 177 car parking spaces under the scheme - that is clearly insufficient fir the people who live there never mind visitors.

There is no need to implement any parking scheme as most affected roads have TROs. Encourage the police to enforce the TRO 3 times randomly per street per annum and the rogue parking problem will disappear at almost no cost to anyone

Continue with the scheme and I will certainly not be voting for any councillor who supported it at the next election. Nor I suspect will any of my neighbours

To whom it may concern

I have lived in __ for __ years and unlawful parking has increased significantly over the years, particularly by commuters and workmen on nearby building projects trying to find parking, together with local businesses advising customers to use Victoria Park for parking.

My ____, initiated one of several voluntary self help schemes that have existed over the years which involved residents identifying themselves as bona fide residents by displaying a badge, thus enabling those who had no lawful access due to the access only sign to be penalised. This scheme was discussed with and supported by the Police and enforced for a time with considerable success. It was discredited by a few residents (long gone) who did not give visitors badges and protested against subsequent penalties. The Police understandably resented this waste of their time and for several years no one has policed the parking with the resulting situation.

However I feel strongly that the reintroduction of such a scheme when the alternative is to pay for parking permits should elicit support and be far less costly and time consuming for everyone.

I am also concerned at the loss of parking spaces in nearby streets which will inevitably offset any advantages gained by the proposed formal parking scheme.

Dear Sir,

Bearing in mind that Victoria Park already has an Access Only order, which when it was monitored solved most of our difficulties, if we do have to move to a residents scheme, I feel it should be for 7 days a week.

Unfortunately, your information does not give any alternatives for times and costs. Neither does it show if any of the spaces will be metered ones. What happened to residents being able to vote on such things? Who decided it was to be 9-5? Views were asked for and the response was low (I was not here at the time to make any comment, apologies). We were led to believe that there would be some form of discussion to finalise things. Are you saying this is it?

Yours faithfully

To Whom It May Concern,

I understand a City wide Parking Scheme is going to be implemented over a period of time and my concerns are for the above as I live in Victoria Park.

1. I think the hours restricting parking should be longer as many workers finish at 5 pm.. I A more realistic time would be minimum 9-6 pm or best scenario 9-8 pm to avoid folk from outside the area using these roads as parking lot in the evening instead of either Park and Ride or city car parks. As nearby roads are 9-6pm (for example, Alpha Road, Holland Street etc.) we should be allowed the same hours.

2. I would like a written confirmation that the two sets of flats built on Victoria Road (one beside Rubber Stamps shop with 10 flats and the other between Vic Park and Garden Walk) will not be given parking permits as a condition for planning permission for these flats were that parking was not allowed.

Thank you and look forward to hearing from you concerning these matters.

Kind regards,

Dear Sirs

The process that is underway to put a parking permit scheme in the area north of Victoria Road, Cambridge (PR0480) is unsafe. The manner in which it is being orchestrated; by manipulating the information provided to residents is deeply prejudicial, making the results illegitimate. Hence, the survey must not be used as justification to move PR0480 to the statutory stage.

The following information was not provided in that survey:

- 1) That existing TROs covering the dead-end streets: Victoria Park, Primrose Street and Green's Road would be removed.
- 2) That over-all parking available in the affected area will be significantly reduced; we estimate by 40%.
- 3) No impact assessment was conducted/provided for how PR0480 would affect the community.
- 4) That funding for PRO480 is being provided by an organisation whose sole mission is to reduce the number of cars in Cambridge.

The above information was available to the Council prior to devising the survey, and should have been provided to residents to make a balanced informed decision. It was not.

1) Existing TROs

The first I heard that the TROs would be under threat was when the results of the survey were circulated. The TROs are about traffic not about parking. That is not to say they are not related but if that is the case, the TROs should have been mentioned in the survey.

There is a small park in the centre of Victoria Park. It is continually used by unsupervised small children; kids learn to ride bikes on training wheels cycling around the park; the road itself is used for skateboarding almost every evening. The entirety of Victoria Park is used for recreation. Removing the TRO would jeopardize this amenity. This should have been pointed out in the survey. It was not.

2) Over-all reduction in parking spaces

Maps were provided of where the parking bays would be located in the proposed PR0480. It was left to respondents to figure out how that would impact them. Not everyone is able to interpret maps, and we all lead busy lives. We trust our government bodies to do our research for us and provide intelligible information. It would be a simple matter for the authorities to count how many cars are currently parked in the affected area (and have parked in this manner for 50+ years) and inform residents of the actual/estimated reduction in car parking spaces. This was not done. Why not?

3) Lack of Impact Assessment

What happens when you reduce the available parking by 40%? What do residents do when they come home after work and there is nowhere to park? Parking is the number one reason for strife between neighbours. We posit that reducing parking by 40% will ruin our community; we will be fighting with each other. No community impact assessment of PR0480 was offered in the survey. Why not?

4) Funding Body

The body contributing funding to PR0480 should have declared an interest in the survey. Motivation matters. The Greater Cambridge City Deal is tasked solely with reducing the number of cars in Cambridge – not with the well-being of affected residents.

That this interest was not declared raises doubt as to how the process is being conducted. Is this why the simple arithmetic behind the over-all reduction in parking spaces was not shared with residents?

It is evident that information has been rationed. Whether this is by mistake or by design does not matter if the Policy and Regulation Authority reject the PR0480 Survey as grounds to progress matters to the statutory stage.

The results of the PR0480 Survey are unsafe. Not only because it is inaccurate, which is likely, but because the process so far is questionable leaving grounds to challenge any future determination both politically through the press, and legally through the courts. Moving forward based on the existing PR0480 Survey is a waste of time and money – both for government authorities and for affected residents.

Please consider the desperate situation that PR0480 will place residents in if it should be implemented. The lack of a community impact assessment means that you do not know unless we tell you as we are now that this will ruin our community. We are backed into a corner, fighting for our friends, neighbours, and for ourselves. Why are you doing this to us?

If PR0480 progresses, we will be forced to proceed with Freedom of Information Act requests for all records and correspondence between the Council, all involved authorities, political representatives and the Greater Cambridge City Deal pertaining to PR0480. Subsequently, we will retain legal counsel to seek depositions from pertinent officers to ascertain the "Why", this will be a public process because it should be and the matter may end up in the courts.

We do not want to pursue the "Why" if it can be avoided. Doing so will involve a great deal of time and money from all parties. This can be avoided, if it is recognized that the undertaken PR0480 Survey is not safe ground upon which to progress PR0480 to the statutory stage.

Sincerely

Dear Sir/Madam,

Having studied the proposed PPA for the Victoria Parking scheme, it seems to me that our problem here in Victoria Park is also about people parking in our street, and then walking (or cycling) into town (or to their student accommodation nearby) outside the hours of the scheme. Evenings and weekends, there is often nowhere for residents to park because of this.

I would strongly recommend that the 5pm end of restrictions is extended to 8pm, thus preventing people from coming and parking before going off for their evening entertainment in town.

This has been a problem for several years and the proposed time restriction would not fully solve this situation.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing on the final day of public consultation to voice my strong opposition to the proposed parking scheme PRO480 for the Victoria Road area.

Those of us residents who voted for residents' parking in the beginning, were concerned with the fact that our TRO or Limited Access Order in Victoria Park is constantly being roundly ignored. Consequently there is often nowhere for residents to park.

The proposed scheme will clearly make things much worse for the residents, for those reasons clearly set out by my neighbour ___, so I will not repeat all his points here. Please consider his points carefully.

I would strongly reiterate the fact that, **for much smaller cost** than implementing a new scheme, our existing TRO (or LAO) could be policed regularly and at random to enforce an order which is at present proving to have no effect at all.

(NB Having previously written on 19th September to suggest the hours of the new scheme be extended, I now realise that it would not solve anything at all under your proposals)

Yours sincerely,

Please record my opposition to the proposed parking scheme for Victoria Park and surrounding streets, and refer to the e mail submitted by my neighbour __ (___ __) for the whole range of reasons why we consider the proposed scheme to be detrimental.

Thank you.

(Letter separate - scanned)

Dear Policy and Regulation Team

Please find attached a copy of the letter posted to you this week together with the enclosure.

Please can you email me to confirm receipt – thank you.

Yours faithfully

Dear Sirs

We wish to register our objection to the proposed scheme in the strongest terms.

As it stands the proposal is in our opinion a poorly designed and probably unnecessary response to a problem for which there seems to be mostly only anecdotal evidence. Furthermore, the initial consultation survey was of doubtful validity in that it covered a population of which more than half had no existing parking place outside their house. Thus the proposed scheme would unjustifiably restrict the lives of, especially young and elderly, residents of the area by obstructing spontaneous visits by family, friends (young and old), carers, and others. Furthermore, it would impede unforeseen and thus unplanned visits by tradespeople to carry out, for example, emergency repairs.

A revised proposal should be put forward which:

1. adopts a less blanket and more targeted approach by, for example, restricting parking to residents only for an hour between 9am and 5pm (say 10-11am) in order to deter commuter parking. Such strategies seem to be commonplace in other places in England such as, for example, Tunbridge Wells.
2. makes more provision of pay and display places to facilitate "spontaneous" visits
3. addresses the question of meeting the greatly increased demand on spaces in Victoria Park resulting from the effective removal of all but a handful of parking places in Greens Road and Primrose Street together with the large increase in the numbers made eligible to park by the inclusion of parts of one side of Victoria Road.

We look to local authorities to take action to improve living conditions in general, blind implementation of this proposal is a significant retrograde step in this area by introducing a bigger problem than it was intended to resolve.

yours faithfully

As owners of _____, we would like to OBJECT to the proposal of introducing a residents parking scheme to the Victoria Road area.

Thank you

Dear Cambridgeshire Council,

I am a resident on [REDACTED] and I strongly object to the proposed TRO ref PR0480 to have double yellow lines installed on Greens Road. We are an enclosed resident area and the parking on the road are all taken up Greens Road residents. Installing double yellow lines will make it exceedingly difficult for any resident to park their cars which would be very inconvenient and unnecessary.

I would be grateful if you would reconsider this parking scheme on Greens Road.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

(See letter with email)

Comments

I generally support the scheme - however there needs to be a few minor amendments to the current proposal

The design for Primrose Street and Greens Road needs to be a bit more creative to allow some on street parking - appreciating they are narrow roads and bin lorries and emergency vehicles need access but in other areas half on/off footpath spaces have been designed

The order needs to enforce the no parking for students in the property on Primrose Street that was the day care center - in line with their planning consent and also the 10 studio flats on Victoria Road (no 64-64?)

The order should be Monday - Sunday as weekend parking is very difficult due to shoppers - who could use the park and ride

The order should be 9am - 8pm

Thanks

Residents Parking Scheme, Victoria Road. Reference Number PR0480

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to say that I object to this proposed scheme.

I can't afford to pay the fees for a parking scheme. I am on a very low income.

Double yellow lines everywhere will make it impossible to park. There are hardly enough parking spaces already, but at least we are able to park without paying.

I really hope this parking scheme does not happen.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I do object to the residents parking scheme for the Victoria Rd area.

I live in _ _.

We are going to lose almost all our parking spaces.

The building of a students' residence in Primrose St recently has already upset the parking in the area very badly. Those students are not allowed to have cars, as a condition of their tenancies, but a lot of them do have cars.

It would be better to stop them bringing their cars to the area, instead of introducing a parking scheme, which will be punitive for all the longterm residents of Primrose St and Green's Rd,

I cannot afford the fees for a yearly parking scheme.

Also it would mean that if anyone from Primrose St or Green's Rd arrives back late at night, they will be at risk walking around dark night streets while returning to their houses after parking their car a long way from their home.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Graham Hughes,

I am a resident of _ _ and greatly in favour of the introduction of enforced parking restrictions in Victoria Park. I've lived here since [REDACTED] and in those years have often found it extremely difficult to park or occasionally impossible.

However, I am very disappointed and worried that the proposals under review by the Council are for restrictions between 9am and 5pm. Although this will stop the hundreds of commuters who currently use us as a free car park during the day, it will do nothing to stop others doing the same thing in the evening and overnight. My greatest worry about parking is coming home late – say at 9pm – and finding the Park jammed full with visitors cars. On many occasions I've had to turn round and drive back into town and find a space a couple of miles away on one of the college sites I can use. I then need to get a taxi home. Expensive, infuriating, time wasting and unfair – and all because unauthorised visitors are using my road for free parking during the evening.

Please please consider extending the restrictions to say, 9pm. This will deter the unauthorised parkers from using us during the evenings and will make the enforcement a sensible and effective scheme. I know others feel the same way and I am encouraging them to write separately to you so you have some idea of the depth of feeling about the hours for the proposed scheme. A 5pm end time will only encourage those coming into town for evening activities – or possibly local residents who either don't have parking or don't want to pay for a permit – to use Victoria Park. At the moment the taxi drivers call us Victoria Carpark (I was told!) and we all operate a one-way system driving round to the left because of the double sided parking mostly of visitors' cars. It would be so lovely to be able to come home in the evening and not worry that my street will be full of unauthorised cars and I won't be able to find a space. Very few of us get home by 5pm so the daytime restrictions are of little use to us.

I do hope you will reconsider the timings placed on the proposals. It would make an enormous difference to all of us who live here.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a resident of __ and now I have had a chance to review the proposed parking restrictions I am extremely concerned about them. I am consequently writing to express my strong dissatisfaction with the council's proposals. The scheme appears to be carelessly thought through and is in danger of presenting more problems than it solves.

My main concerns and I believe, those of my neighbours, are:

- a) The scheme propose to limit the number of visitors by car anyone can have by car to 100 per annum. The is draconian and for sick or infirm or elderly people an appalling limitation. For example, there are several people in Victoria Park who have regular visits from family - certainty more than 100 times per annum. To say they can only have a maximum of 100 visits from anyone by car (including tradesmen and health carers) is an unreasonable imposition on their civil liberty.
- b) The cost of £2.40 per visit is absurd. Most schemes I am aware of have no limit on the numbers of visitors allowed and charge a reasonable, low fee for each visitor permit. The cost of this proposal for most people on top of the charges for registering your own car is untenable. The council should NOT be using this scheme as a money making exercise nor should you impose excessive charges for normal legitimate activity and social engagement.
- c) The scheme involves the loss of a huge number of car parking spaces in the area. It is clear that old Victorian streets are not designed for modern transport but the enforced removal of parking outside people's homes is again an imposition on all the local households and will probably mean that parking availability will be even worse. 473 households in the Victoria Park area have 177 car parking spaces under the scheme so from the start it is clear there is insufficient parking space for the people who live there, let alone visitors.

There is no need to implement any parking scheme as most affected roads have TROs. However, since these are unenforced they are not worth the paper they are written on. If the police enforced the TRO as often as possible, and at the very least once a month I believe the rogue parking problem would disappear at almost no cost to anyone.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to lodge strongly my objection to the proposed Victoria Residents' Parking scheme PRO480. I live on __ and have done so since _____.

Firstly I do not believe residents parking is needed or would solve any problem people believe they have parking. As there are over 100 homes in Garden Walk; many with more than 1 car (and I do not object to that); the essential need for owners to have work persons attend their homes for vital works;family;friends;visitors; health care workers ; the list could go on of people, all with legitimate and essential reasons for parking in the street. I do wish to stress these are all legitimate reasons to allow residents to maintain their physical/ mental health and well being and people should have this freedom of movement and access to their properties . I have first hand experience of residents parking where more permits were sold than parking spaces were available in the surrounding streets. I do not believe any issues people are having are due to many people who do not have a legitimate reason for parking in the street, just the number of people who legitimately need to park in the street. This scheme then becomes a bureaucratic, expensive waste of time and resources.

This leads to my second point, as a Labour held City Council I am horrified that in this financial climate and uncertainty for everyday workers that you would support a scheme which yet again puts undue financial pressure on hard up families. Wages have not been increased for the majority (I myself have not had a pay rise since [REDACTED]) and the cost of living continues to increase. I have worked hard to buy my own property in Cambridge but now struggle to make ends meet despite working full time as a [REDACTED]. I need my car for work (no public transport available) and fear what other essential basic items I will need to give up to pay to park in my own street or pay for visitors/ essential workers. I then begin to believe that it is not just the Conservative party who want to control the areas where different social classes should live. I now begin to feel marginalised by a party I was raised to believe supported the working class person I am proud to be.

My third point is to ask that you address real issues such as increasing a better service of public transport not just in the city but across Cambridgeshire and do something about the continued chronic underfunding of schools in Cambridgeshire.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding the issues I have raised.

Yours Sincerely,

We live in __ (__), and have become increasingly distressed by the use of our once quiet family cul de sac as a city centre car park by shoppers, commuters, clubbers and tourists. The noise starts at 5.30 am, engines, doors, mobile phones, and as early workers (not from Victoria Park) leave new commuter cars appear to take their spaces on both sides of the road especially in the 'neck' of the Park where we live. This goes on all day, with parking for residents and their visitors becoming increasingly scarce. All this in spite of a never-enforced access-only sign at the entrance. In addition, the exponential increase in parkers bring with it a proportionate increase in foot traffic. So what was not so long ago a quiet and fairly private existence here becomes just like a city centre car park. I don't see why we should suffer this fate when our near neighbours in Holland Street, Searle Street are protected.

We would like longer residents only hours, say 8.00 am to 6.00 pm. This just might give us some peace.

Yours

I have just re-examined the salient points of the proposed scheme and wish to reaffirm my objection to it. Looking at the maps of the proposed parking bays it is clear that in most of the other roads included in the scheme there will be considerably less parking available than at present and this will add considerably to the congestion to parking in Victoria Park. Residents in the other roads will therefore take up bays in this road thereby denying VP residents the spaces currently available. As members of the scheme will not have a right to a designated bay they could be worse off than at present and also having to pay for that outcome. The hours of operation of the scheme will not benefit residents who arrive home from work after 5pm as any free spaces will be taken by then by non-members and there will be no bays available in adjacent roads. This could be a daily nightmare for those people. If the scheme does go ahead its hours should be extended to 8pm or even 9pm. The charges for visitor permits appear to be excessive and the number of visitor's permits allowed is very limiting as a household will not be able to have their visitors parking more than twice a week and evening visitors will be unable to find a bay free. I think there are too many flaws in the system for it be executed successfully and for the benefit of its members.

Yours sincerely,

I am writing to express my strong dissatisfaction with the council's proposal for re-organising parking in the Chesterton area. The scheme is deeply flawed and badly thought through and takes no account of the local needs. It appears to be an arbitrary policy with no clear aim other than to deter drivers from coming to Cambridge; an aim that is likely to have worse consequences for the well-being of the whole city.

The principal errors are

- a) The scheme proposes to limit the number of visitors by car anyone can have by car to 100 per annum. This is draconian and for sick or infirm or elderly people an appalling limitation. For example, there are several people in Victoria Park whose children visit regularly - certainly more than 100 times per annum. It is an unreasonable imposition on anyone. This also must be a breach of our human rights to be refused visitors by car.
- b) The cost of £2.40 per visit is absurd. In London I visit my daughter who pays 40p per visitor permit with no limit on the numbers. The cost for most people on top of the charges for registering your own car is untenable. The council should NOT be using this scheme as a money-making exercise and the cost is unaffordable for most average households.
- c) The scheme involves the loss of a huge number of car parking spaces in the area. It is clear that old Victorian streets are rarely designed to fit modern transport but the enforced removal of parking outside people's homes is again an imposition on all the local households and will probably mean that parking availability will be even worse. 473 households in the Victoria Park area have 177 car parking spaces under the scheme - that is clearly insufficient for the people who live there never mind visitors.

There is no need to implement any parking scheme as most affected roads have TROs. Encourage the police to enforce the TRO 3 times randomly per street per annum and the rogue parking problem will disappear at almost no cost to anyone.

Continue with the scheme and I will certainly not be voting for any councillor who supported it at the next election. Nor I suspect will any of my neighbours.

Thank you for your reply. I am told I got the reference incorrect and it should be PR0480?

I am concerned that the proposed parking scheme does not provide sufficient space for the current households who might own a car. In addition to the high cost of visitor parking the lack of space also restricts any visitors or carers who need to park.

I believe the full and lasting impact on the residents in the area has not been given enough consideration.

yours sincerely

In reply to your email I live in Victoria Park. I am not sure which code number relates to this area, apologies.

Yours

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to give my strongest objections to the parking scheme proposed for the Victoria Road Area (PR0480). Specifically I object to the following:

- i) the significant reduction in the number of parking spaces in Greens Road. At the time of the initial consultation this was proposed to be 7 and was considered viable by the relevant people at the planners. Whilst this was already not viable, it has now been reduced to three - the reason for this, timing of the change and its poor communication (the drawings online are almost impossible to interpret given the lack of a suitable legend) mean that the policy proposed is substantially different from that now being put forward.
- ii) that even with this issue with parking the council continues to grant planning permission for large scale developments without considering parking during the construction phase. This is further compounded by the planning stating that occupants will not have cars but their being no effective policing of this.

Given the tight nature of the responses (passed by 2 votes) I feel that the letter from the council dated 3rd September overstates the level of support for the proposal - especially given the low level of response. I would thus urge for further consultation and a reconsideration of the parking spaces allocated within the proposed scheme. Including a response from the council as to where they think the cars displaced by the scheme will be able to park.

I am writing to complain with the other residents of Victoria Park as the present scheme does not take into consideration the residents' needs, and does not cater for trades.

I am writing to express my disappointment in the proposed above scheme . It won't be viable due to the problems re the removal of virtually all parking in Green's Road and the loss of some spaces in Primrose Street . All streets in the scheme have TROs and if these were enforced the issue would be resolvable . Also the limit on visitor permits will make life v difficult for elderly residents whose family visit v often and for those having any extended building done .

I would like to register my strong objection to the current proposals for parking schemes in Victoria Park and the Chesterton area.

The proposed scheme will not help residents at all and will in fact cause considerable extra parking problems. It entails a substantial loss of parking space throughout the Victoria Zone, with plans on the Council's website showing just 177 spaces for 472 households.

Crucially, the proposed operational hours of 9am – 5pm is of little use to residents, many of whom leave during these hours but need to park near their homes when they return from work in the evenings. If I return from work at 7-8pm, as I frequently do, after a long drive, there is no obvious alternative for me if parking bays are all occupied, which they are highly likely to be given the reduction in number of spaces. In this situation, my current employment (outside of Cambridge) would no longer be tenable for me.

The availability and cost of visitor permits under the proposed scheme is far too restrictive.

A better solution would be enforcement of the existing Traffic Regulation Orders on many of these streets.

Dear Cambridgeshire County Council,

THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 22) ORDER 20\$\$

THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AREA B (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 1993 (AMENDMENT NO. 40) 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,

A couple of suggestions for cycle parking:

- Bateson Rd at the front of the play area where there are double yellow lines
- Primrose Street near the Open Space building where no restrictions are proposed.

Regards