



Dear Mr Baldwin,

I have recently received the letter concerning the proposed Parking Restrictions in this area.

I have a question which I hope you can answer as it is a concern I have regarding this scheme.


(Although I do not have a car, I request a permit  on )

I propose buying a permit & also permits (vouchers) for my visiting family.

Another point I would like to raise. Car owners living in the flats already have to have a permit to park there.

At the moment some of the residents park in the house even when there is space at the flats. Will they be allowed to park in our spaces? I do not think they should - my opinion!!

A reply would be very much appreciated.

Yours faithfully


Coleridge Road
Cambridge
CB1

25 May 2018

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

Dear Mr Hughes

Proposed TRO (Ref No PRO461)

I am writing on behalf of my elderly mother, who lives at the above address, in response to the letter you sent regarding parking restrictions on Coleridge Road. Having looked at the diagrams regarding space available for residents parking bays we are very concerned about the proposals. It would appear that the draft plan suggests there are available parking bays on both sides of Coleridge Road alongside the recreation ground (rec).

and has witnessed the increase in traffic and problems with parking in this location. There have been accidents on this stretch of the road and we are aware of many near misses. At the moment, as I am sure the Council is aware, there are frequently cars parked on both sides of the road in this location, however drivers always park their vehicles half on the pavement, and fold in wing mirrors, as it is obvious that there is simply not sufficient room for parking safely on the road on both sides. Not only does it narrow the road for moving vehicles, making it dangerous for anyone (particularly children and the elderly) trying to cross between parked and moving vehicles to access the rec, but it is also extremely difficult to safely enter and leave residential drives opposite the rec in the fast moving traffic. The Council must also be aware that the new facilities in the rec have led to a vastly increased demand for parking, particularly in the summer months, and no additional parking facilities have been added. The Council aims to encourage cycling yet the existing danger to cyclists will be vastly increased if cars are parked on both sides of this busy road.

Coleridge Road has become an alternative route to the ring road and is increasingly being used by lorries and other large vehicles, making it a hazardous road for all users. The speed restrictions are frequently ignored. It is also often used by fast moving emergency service vehicles. Having parking bays on both sides would make it an extremely dangerous route. Before any decisions are made we would ask that the Council carries out further research, including risk assessments, to ensure that any decision does not further endanger the lives of residents, cyclists or drivers.

Yours sincerely,



Dear Sir/Madam

With regards to the proposed romsey residents parking scheme PR0461:

I live in __ __ __ which is a _ person house. Plans to only allow 2 residents permits per household will unfairly affect me and my housemates.

Are there any concessions for any of the large HMO's on argyle street?

I think I live in the _ house on argyle street but know that there is a _ person house at No._ and a few _ people house's too.

We have recently moved into the Coleridge West area and so missed out on our opportunity to give our views on the original proposed residents parking scheme which took place at the end of last year.

We would like to make some comments and objections regarding the statutory consultation regarding the council's intention to introduce a residents' permit parking scheme in this area:

1) Only 16% of residents responded to the stage two formal consultation which is a very low % to then take the process forward. Is there not a minimum response rate required?

2) We view the idea of a residents parking scheme as just another form of taxation by the local council.

3) What is the reasoning behind each eligible household being able to apply for 3 residents parking permits? We believe that this is an excessive number per eligible household. If each eligible household can apply for 3 residents parking permits, then we believe that the cost of each parking permit should increase in increments, with the 1st residents parking permit costing less than £64.50 per annum, up to the 3rd residents parking permit being at the highest cost of £64.50 per annum.

4) We disagree with any reduction of current available resident parking bays or partial off-road parking areas - this includes the 4 hour pay & display bays on Hope Street. We strongly disagree with the introduction of the proposed double yellow lines, particularly on Cockburn Street and Stockwell Street. We cannot see any reason why the current double yellow lines from Mill Road need to be extended so far into Cockburn Street and Stockwell Street, especially as both of these road are one way traffic only towards Mill Road, and so do not pose a road safety hazard or access difficulties.

I live at __ __ __ and would like to raise an objection to the proposed position of the parking spaces on this road. The position of the telegraph pole at the end of our drive (which is also shared with number 27) makes it very difficult to get in and out of when cars are parked either side of the drive opposite ours on the other side of the road i.e. the drive for numbers 4 and 5. I would therefore like to see these parking spaces removed, parking moved to the other side of the road or the telegraph pole moved. For the latter, we requested this when it was replaced recently after being hit for at least the third time since we have lived here but were refused.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Dear Sir or Madame

Proposed TRO (Reference Number PR0461) – Proposed Residents Parking Scheme – Coleridge West

I am not sure if sending a message to this email address is the correct way to register my support for the above scheme (the website only mentions objections).

I think that the scheme as drawn up does a fair job of balancing the needs of the various users, and I strongly support the proposal.

best wishes

REF PR0461: coleridge west parking scheme

Hi

I have a comment regarding the proposed parking bays on Derby road. In general I am happy with the plans. However, could the proposed two parking bays adjacent to ___ Derby road be moved northwards slightly.

There is an access road between house numbers ___ and ___ on Derby road, which gives access to the rear of properties fronting onto Cherry Hinton Road (___ – ___). Visibility of oncoming vehicles and cyclists heading southwards down Derby road when pulling out of the access road can be particularly problematic. Further, reversing into the access road can be difficult if a vehicle parks too close to the entrance (as one needs to drive beyond the entrance to then reverse in).

Moving the two bays adjacent to property number ___ Derby road northwards slightly would greatly alleviate the problem. Even moving by a foot or two would make a big difference.

Regards

With council tax increasing by over 5% our Gas/elec/water/all our insurances increasing we now will have to find more money from our pensions to pay for people parking in our streets. I wouldn't mind if it was for all areas in Cambridge but less than 50 yards from my house people will still be able to park there free, that's where the cars will go then and I will tell people who are visiting us to park there. I'm really sorry I have to use a car in Cambridge but we're not as able as we used to be, we still need to shop and go to DIY STORES this would be difficult on bikes. I wondered if a simple parking time limit would have helped to solve some of the problems, with the help of technology now we could have registered our cars and house number with you so commuters could be stopped from parking here all day.

My wife told me not to worry about writing to you because I never replied to the survey, but I just felt that it

I would like to comment further on the proposed parking scheme.

I live at ____ _ and have been in telephone contact with the Council as it is not clear from the drawings how far the yellow lines alongside the park extend and where the parking bays will be sited in relation to my driveway access. The person I spoke to was also unable to interpret the plans in greater detail in order to clarify the issue for me.

I wish to request that the planned parking bays do not encroach on the access to my driveway.
I have applied to have a white H line painted and am in the process of applying to extend my dropped kerb but have been advised that this may take some time.

It was also suggested that I make my concerns known before the deadline on 4th June.

Kind regards,

I am writing to object to the proposed residents parking scheme for Coleridge West Area, Cambridge.

I do not think we have a parking issue in Coleridge Road - there is very little on-street parking, including in the surrounding roads. The issue of objections to people parking in the street seemed to have arisen whilst there was building work being undertaken on Rustat Road and possibly in the station area. After the building work was completed the small increase in parking went. I cycle to work on weekdays along Coleridge, Davy and Rustat Road and have not at any time felt endangered by parking or felt it was an issue.

I attended a local consultation regarding parking and the main issue which seemed to cause distress was when parking offences were being committed with people parking inconsiderately, particularly when obstructing driveways. This should be dealt with by parking officers, not through implementing parking schemes - similarly with parking on grass verges.

I consider that the consultation process has been inadequate and unrepresentative. The County Council consultation only permitted one response per household. I live with my brother and a lodger, each of whom should have been able to put in their own response to the questionnaire. Out of 1946 households only 16% responded to the letter - so out of those "households" around 166 people were supportive of the scheme and 144 people opposed to the scheme - ie around 310 people responding out of probably 4000 or more adults. This is hardly a large margin to implement such a draconian scheme. A poor response on the day does not mean that those who did not write in are in favour of the scheme. In addition, although notice was made in the local newspaper, very few people who park on the road will have seen the notice on that day - and I have not seen any notices on street furniture to make the wider public aware of the scheme. It seems unfair that those parking on the road, fully legally and legitimately, have not been given a widely publicized option to comment - and certainly not a vote.

I strongly feel that residents parking permit schemes are detrimental to community. The public transport system has a poor coverage of the city and is not sufficiently cheap, reliable, frequent, or available on all days to make visiting or commuting possible without using a car or taxi when the weather is poor or if adults or children are unable to use bicycles. Visits to the elderly, ill, housebound and those without means will cost households expenditure for unnecessary visitors permits. Those working regularly at properties will not be able to park without expense incurred by homeowners, perhaps leading to unemployment. Amenities in the newer

I am writing as a member of Romsey Bowls Club (and) about the proposed residents parking scheme for Davy Road etc. This will cause insurmountable problems for Romsey and Coleridge bowls clubs who require a dozen or so parking spaces close by May to August weekday evenings 6 to 9 pm. I would make three points. First, why is the south side of Davy Road (or for that matter the west side of Coleridge Road) included when there are hardly any houses in those locations? Which residents will be paying for spaces there? Second, if one of the aims of the scheme is to deter parking by rail commuters could this not be achieved more simply by having say a 2 hour restriction in the middle of the day (as I believe happens in the London borough of Barnet)? And finally if restrictions really are necessary could these not come off at 6pm rather than 7pm which would go some way to meeting our objections? If this scheme is introduced I fear for the future of our clubs - we

I am writing with comments/suggestions on the proposed Residents Parking Scheme – Coleridge West area, reference number PRO461, as follows:

1 The map you sent by post was too small to make sense of the detail – even photographing it and blowing it up did not help. However, now that I can see the expanded map online, I should alert you to the fact that on Pln 3 Sth area you have put residents' parking bays blocking our neighbours' drive (which is the full width of their property) at number ____ Coleridge Road and you will also block a proportion of our own drive at number ____ unless the bays are going to be unusually small. Looking at the actual road, in order to avoid the drives and dropped kerbs, I do not think you can fit two residents' parking bays between ____ and ____ Coleridge Road and certainly cannot fit two between ____ and _____. I should point out that we applied and received permission for the kerbs to be dropped outside our properties last year, prior to the instigation of the parking scheme, so your map may be slightly out of date and may not have taken changes on the ground into consideration.

2 The junction at Coleridge and Cherry Hinton road is always busy and it is noticeable that drivers coming in and out of the new development of properties on the east side of Coleridge Road at this junction already have some difficulty in exiting onto Coleridge Road. I notice this in particular in the mornings as my daughter cycles to school in this direction and I always tell them to watch out for people edging out of this drive if there are cars parked on either side, as the drivers cannot see cyclists easily because of the parked vans and cars (vans making it particularly tricky). My concern with the proposed scheme is that it appears to be boxing in this drive with a residents' parking bay immediately to the north of the drive (if I have understood the plan correctly), i.e. in the most dangerous place possible if there is a combination of a cyclist coming towards Cherry Hinton Road and a resident trying to drive out of this development. I would therefore ask you to extend the yellow lines to the other side of this drive in order to relieve congestion (as cars then will not have to stick out into the road before the driver can see that it is clear to proceed) and to keep my children safe. The traffic very frequently backs up beyond this development and so it seems to me to serve both the purposes of safety and traffic flow to ensure that this drive, used by significantly more people than most others on Coleridge Road and in close proximity to a junction, has safe sightlines.

3 Many people walk their dogs in Coleridge Recreation Ground and those that are either elderly or infirm have to use a car to get to the park. Many of them currently park in Fanshawe Road close to the park
(Letter separate - scanned)

RE: PR0461

I have the following comment and objection to the proposed Residents Permit Parking Scheme - Coleridge West Area.

1. An out of date plan has been used. The following properties are not shown on the plan: ____, ____, ____, ____ and ____ Coleridge Road

2. I object to the parking bay proposed between the properties at ____ and _____. The driveway outside ____ and ____ serves also as a driveway to ____ and _____. Residents currently parking on the road where the bay is proposed, already causes a hazard, as it blocks the vision of drivers pulling out onto _____. In addition, during peak commuter hours Monday to Friday, cars are regularly waiting to turn at the ____ where the proposed bay is, creating an additional hazard. I would ask instead that the current double yellow lines are extended to outside _____.

Dear Sirs

I am a resident of __ (____). I support the proposed parking scheme wholeheartedly.

Looking at the plans, however, I note you intend to create a resident space just to the north of our driveway entrance (just to the south of ____) on the east side of ___. I object to a space being placed here. People currently park in this "space" and it makes turning out of our driveway extremely hazardous. Please could I submit the proposal that this portion is double-yellow lined and/or no space created here at all. In other words, can the first space be created to the north of ____'s driveway (on the east side) where you currently propose four consecutive spaces.

Regards

Re PR0461

As a new resident of __ I would like to write an email to support the proposed changes and the residents parking scheme.

Dear Sir, Madam,

I am a resident at no. __ __, would like to object to the introduction of residents parking in ___. For the following reasons:

- health and safety: __ is a very safe environment, particularly for children, due to the very the low vehicle speeds (as a result of the narrowness between cars). The proposals will change this and encourage vehicles to drive at normal speeds.
- parking amenity: the significant reduction in parking spaces will severely impact amenity for residents
- other amenity: the street is a very pleasant environment for pedestrians and cyclists due to the low vehicle speeds
- availability: currently there is almost always spaces available for residents. The proposals would severely reduce availability
- appearance: the unnecessary introduction of double yellow lines will be unsightly in what is a conservation area.

There are currently no issues with movements, as I perceive. They are just slow, which is a good thing.

David Street is an exception in the area and a more sophisticated approach would recognise this.

The proposals should be reconsidered. Thank you,

Kind regards,

I write on behalf of my neighbours on __ who are feeling powerless over the proposed loss of so much parking in our street (from __ spaces down to __) and the loss of spaces in Fletcher's Terrace, Swann's Terrace and Stockwell Street which will impact us too. We currently manage to park but will have to start paying for not being able to park anywhere near our houses, especially on a Saturday when there will be no restrictions and non residents park for Mill Rd and the town centre as well as the train station. Due to the blocked off streets, displaced residents cars will have to be driven a long distance to find parking within the proposed zone.

We, therefore, urge you to reconsider the proposed parking in __. We understand the need for access and presume that the turning space is to prevent people from reversing into Argyle Street. Could it be that all vehicles have to reverse into the road, thus doing away with the need for turning space? Could we increase the number of spaces to 8 by having two spaces either side of the road at the end, then a space for turning and then 6 spaces on one side? (Please see attached photos.)

We would welcome a response to these questions.

With kind regards

(Letter separate - scanned)

Dear Policy and Regulation Team

I write about proposed residents parking scheme - Coleridge West Area, Cambridge.

As a resident of __, which is included in the proposed scheme, I am in full support of the introduction of residents parking. I have no specific comments about the proposals, other than that they seem satisfactory to me.

I note, however, that I continue to deplore the use of partial off-road parking on the residential streets between Greville Road and Mill Road. This makes the pavements often extremely difficult for pedestrians with any kind of mobility issues, including those with walking frames, or people with small children in buggies. Is there any intention to review their use when this proposed scheme is implemented?

Yours,

We are writing to highlight the necessity of ensuring cyclists' safety after the introduction of the residents' parking scheme in the Greville Road area.

As residents of ___, we drive and walk down our street, but more often we cycle down this street - often several times a day. Even though it is generally quiet at off-peak times, there are often cars and vans who speed towards cyclists, or come too close as they overtake, so that we, and other cyclists, have to stop or go on the pavement.

Greville Road is an artery cycle route to and from the cycle bridge leading from Romsey/Coleridge into town or the station, and cyclists (and pedestrians) should not feel endangered or exposed to bad language, bad behaviour and even road rage as they use this route. A speeding car crashed into a lamppost and overturned a few years back, and another neighbour was hit as he turned into Greville Road from Coleridge Road by a speeding car. The only thing slowing traffic down at present are the randomly parked cars that force speeding cars to slow down at the Charles Street end (but not the Coleridge Road end). This street is not safe for children to play in, and it is not a safe cycle route, even though designated as such, and so we ask that, in introducing residents' parking, you also introduce speed protection measures for this road by:

1. reducing access to residents only

or

2. introducing traffic calming measures such as street 'pinches', that will slow cars down whilst permitting bikes to flow.

or preferably

Re your 8 May letter from Gary Baldwin outlining the proposals, you state that 'residents of eligible addresses will be able to apply for up to two resident permits per household'.

Could you please clarify the definition of household? Would every unit within a house in multiple occupation be able to claim two permits? There are quite a few HMOs (some small terraced house display up to five doorbells) in the Argyle Street area where parking is, now, at a premium. It's very difficult to see how these streets could accommodate the owners of so many potential permits. Even without the HMO complication it seems more practical to allow one permit per house (or household whatever that is) and the opportunity for residents to purchase a fixed number of visitor tickets?

Thanks

As residents at ___, ___, we wish to register our objection to the proposed permit parking scheme. There is not a major problem with parking on Rustat Avenue so the introduction of bays and permits seems unnecessary. It seems unfair that we should be subject to the new scheme when most of the development is unaffected.

Regards

properties. So adding restrictions on both sides of the road in front of Rustat Avenue __, __, __, and __ would be unfair and excessive. If any road restrictions need to be added then they should only be applied on the opposite side of the road and not on the dropped kerbs / side of the road closest to these __ properties.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,

To whom it may concern,

With reference to the proposed resident parking scheme in Coleridge West, Cambridge (Reference PR0461) - I note that on pdf of the proposed parking controls (Plan 2 Nth area.pdf), that on the road __, Cambridge, that in addition to parking restrictions / parking bays in front of numbers __-__, there appear to be a number of areas marked with red lines (accompanied by a number). In particular, I notice that there is a short red line directly on the dropped kerb in front of my own property number __-__ (similarly there are red lines in front of __, __-__-__), I therefore oppose the proposed parking restrictions on the dropped kerb as many residents park in front of their houses and having such a restriction would prevent me from doing so and potentially affect the value of the properties compared to neighbouring properties with no yellow lines in front of their property / dropped kerb.

I look forward to hearing from you in this regard and also a clarification if in fact those red lines marked in front of those houses are indeed proposed restrictions to parking.

Best wishes,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Further to the proposed Plan 2Nth PRO461.

I live in __ which seems to have escaped much in the way of restrictions. Having generally supported the original plan, the current proposal does not go far enough. It does not retain my support in its current form.

Because of the proximity of Rustat Avenue to the railway station and station development I fear it will be overrun with cars looking for a place to park. It's bad enough now and will only worsen. The number of parking bays is insufficient as currently, visitor parking is very difficult.

I support park and ride, restricting commuter parking and being able to live in Cambridge without thinking one is living in a car park.

I hope this plan does not go forward in its current form.

I am welcome the introduction of the Residents parking scheme for the Coleridge West Area and would like to ask for the following amendments to be considered. I am the owner of __-__. We do not have off-street parking - having chosen to maintain the trees and front garden.

The number of potential bays at the Cherry Hinton end of __ is very limited and I would be grateful if your planners would consider two changes:

1) At present the plans have allowed for one residents parking bay in front of No __-__ although there is space for two - I expect because the kerb was lowered as part of the original build, but no driveway exists and we have no intention of creating one. Since the frontage is sufficient to support two bays, I would be grateful if you would consider changing the plans to allow two residents parking spaces. If necessary I would be prepared to pay to raise the kerb.

2) there is a short stretch of double yellow lines proposed between __ and __-__ - when this could easily accommodate another bay; the space is currently used for parking. Given the shortage of spaces at this end of the road - this appears unfair and unnecessary. Would you please consider adding an additional residents bay in this spot?

Kind regards

should not be put into effect,
because:

1. The go-ahead for this scheme is based on a narrow majority from an extremely low turnout. There have been various surveys, questionnaires and meetings over the years about introducing residents parking and respondents may have been suffering from respondent fatigue. It was not clear at the time that that this particular survey would be the last one that would set the process in motion. I know of other residents that now wish they had responded and have encouraged them to respond to this consultation instead.
2. The material sent out during the residents' consultation did not say that a simple majority of respondents would be sufficient for the scheme to progress. In fact, it said "a clear consensus of support for the proposed parking plan is required". I do not feel that an approximately 50/50 split on a 16% turnout constitutes "consensus".
3. In the material provided, there appears to be no analysis of why non-residents are parking on the roads covered by the scheme. Whilst I can believe that people park near the Carter bridge and walk to the station, there are clearly plenty of other non-residents parking elsewhere within the area for different reasons. For example, they park for the Scout hut on Flamsteed Road, the leisure park and shops on Cherry Hinton Road and Mill Road. The council hasn't provided any analysis of the proportion of cars involved for each of these, what the intended effect is, and how the proposed scheme achieves that. In fact, the only statement I could find that described the intention of the scheme was "to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users and for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs" but there's no description of how the scheme achieves this, and in particular why any other alternatives (such as introducing a few parking restrictions in particular areas) wouldn't achieve that goal at lower cost and with less disruption for residents. Other residents I have spoken to think that the intention of the scheme is to stop commuters parking for the station. If that's true, then perhaps that's what the statement should say?

~~I am writing on behalf of my father, Mr _____, who lives at _____ and will be affected by the Proposed Residents~~
Parking Scheme for Coleridge West should it be approved. He has asked me to write to you to express his concerns as follows:

- He is anxious that the introduction of Residents Parking in Stockwell Street and the immediate surrounding streets will decrease the number of bays available for residents to park in. It is already difficult to find spaces and he fears that introducing the scheme (including additional yellow lines and metered bays) will make it even more difficult.
- He does not feel enough account has been taken of the impact of the proposed scheme on elderly residents. He considers the scheme is ageist as it has potentially more impact on elderly residents. As part of the Equality Act, The Public Sector Equality Duty requires public bodies to consider fairness and equality when making decisions. The impact of the cost of the permits is considerable for someone who relies on their pension alone to pay for the permits. In addition, pensioners will need to pay for visitor parking permits. This issue is of particular concern to my father. He is ____ years old and a _____. Whilst physically capable enough at present not to be reliant on daily care, he does however, rely on support and company from frequent visitors. His daughter lives in ____ and calls regularly to help with paperwork or small jobs and to provide company for him. If only 2 visitors come to see him each week, in a year this could amount to a cost of around £250 in visitors parking permits. Whilst you might argue that visitors can park elsewhere or that they should come by public transport, not everyone that visits has either the time or the ability to use other methods for visiting. Friends of elderly people are often less mobile themselves and it is not possible for them to use public transport or walk long distances to visit. The way that the visitors parking permits operate, mean that his daughter and other visitors may be put off simply 'popping in' to have a quick cup of tea and a chat as this would use up one of the

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in response to the proposed Coleridge West parking scheme (PR0461). I already noted my support in the initial consultation, but I would like to reiterate my support for the introduction of such a scheme, to help reduce congestion and pollution, end the area being used as an overspill car park for the station, and make the neighbourhood a more pleasant place to live.

I trust the council will do the right thing, and support the majority of local residents' wishes in the initial consultation, and go ahead with the scheme.

Yours,

Good morning,

I received a letter outlining the plans for a residents parking scheme in this area. I have recently moved to the area so this is the first I have heard of so thought it best to offer my comments. Where you only got 16% response I think it is ridiculous to go ahead with scheme. However, I do realise that there are a lot of cars in this area that park and don't live here. I do understand that this could be beneficial for residents but I rarely struggle to find a space outside my house so I don't see much point in it.

I would also like to add that the rent on my house is £_____ a month. I find it ridiculous that I would need to pay an extra £65 a month for the luxury of parking on my own road! I pay almost £_____ in council tax. You have also said there will be additional double yellow lines and some paid parking bays, so by reducing the amount of spaces even if I was to pay for the permit I might not be guaranteed a space anyway?

I see no point in this scheme for permits, as it still doesn't seem like it will guarantee a space. However I do drive down Greville Road a lot and cars park and its difficult to get my car through, let alone an ambulance, fire fighters etc. So I do believe this needs looking at. I have no problem finding a space now although there is limited parking around. You are proposing to make it more limited and have to pay for it which seems absurd to me.

Thanks for reading this, and I hope you get more residents to respond than last time.

Kind regards,

Dear Madam/Sir,

I am writing in reply to the letter I received from the Cambridgeshire County Council about the proposed parking scheme. I did not have the chance to express my view on this matter at the end of last year, possibly because I was abroad at that time, but would like to do so now. My take is that a residents permit parking scheme is completely unnecessary and should definitely not be implemented. It will bring a completely avoidable extra bill to a city that is already hugely expensive and, in my case, to a road where parking is never an issue.

Instead of considering additional charges to car owners, you should focus your attention on how to improve, promote and provide incentives to public transport and bicycles, so that people would consider using that over their personal vehicles. The improvement of air quality and reducing exhaust fumes should be on your priority list on a city that is overcrowded with cars and traffic is horrible.

Best wishes,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed parking permit scheme. While I understand the logical necessity for a limit of the number of parking permits per house I am curious to know whether there will be any leniency for residents of HMOs.

As a group of _ medical students living in a single house these proposed parking permits pose an issue for us- we need separate vehicles as we all are placed in different hospitals across the region- Ipswich, King's Lynn, Stevenage, Peterborough, Hinchbrook and Bedford are some of the locations we have to commute to on a weekly basis.

Under these circumstances a 3 permit limit per household poses us serious difficulties; have situations like this been considered in the consultation process? If so, what logistical solution can be offered to residents like us?

Dear Mr Baldwin,

I'm concerned about this scheme as a Hope Street resident.

1) At the moment the garage on Hope Street parks a number of cars in the street. How will the scheme deal with this?

2) Currently we can park within 20 yards of the house about 25% of the time. The majority of the cars parked in Hope street are owned by residents. If you then implement both pay and display and resident's parking in the street, this will reduce the number of limited available places and incur a cost but not improve the situation. I see no value to this scheme for us but I see it as a costly system that will waste time and money for residents.

3) Why has Hope street been chosen to have a pay and display bays?

Best wishes,

PS I cannot see where to find a summary of the questions raised and your responses from this webpage.

Please explain where they are:

<https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/roads-and-pathways/roadworks-and-faults/traffic-regulation-orders/>

Rustat Road to provide short duration permit-free parking. I object to pay and display as there are no shops or businesses on Rustat Road that require short term paid parking - the only visitors would be genuine visitors for residents or work/service men who are serving residents and they should not be required to pay for parking.

I have a weekly gardner and a cleaner come it would increase their costs substantially if i had to pay for them each to have a parking permit or pay to park on every occasion.

Best

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed residents parking scheme in Coleridge West.

I agree that parking has been more difficult since the new flats were built on Rustat Road but a resident schemes from 9am-7pm would be very inconvenient- particularly in terms of visitors / friends visiting in the evenings etc.

The primary problem is people parking here for the train station for the entire day.

I would prefer a system of more limited hours eg residents only from 1-2pm This would stop people from using the area for parking for the train station or whole day parking but not overly inconvenience friends, relatives of of residents or traders delivery men gardeners and cleaners visiting and requiring short term parking.

I would emphasise: short term parking in the area is not a problem, the problem is long term parking by people using train station and this would be avoided by a simple 1-2pm residents only sign. This would also be much simpler to police and enforce.

Unless the timings are reduced substantially as above then i would be in complete opposition to 9am-7pm

15 May 2018

I am writing in connection with the proposed residents permit parking scheme for Coleridge West. PR0461

1. I am concerned that this scheme will not help residents find parking places. There are simply not enough places to accommodate all the cars. Why should we have to pay for the right not to find a parking place?

2. I understand that the aim is to 'tackle issues associated with all day non-resident parking that denies parking spaces for residents and their visitors'.

The consultation in Coleridge West had a 16% response, suggesting perhaps that residents are not interested in this issue, because it doesn't affect them.

What evidence has been provided that this is an issue? And if it is an issue, why do we have to pay for the permits?

3. I live in __ where there are around __ houses and __ parking places. In addition, I note: ' __ would have some 4 hours general pay and display parking as well as resident permit holder parking (Mon-Fri 9am to 7pm)'. So that would reduce my chances of finding a parking place even more.

4. Given the lack of response to the consultation so far, I suggest that this is a non-issue. It is merely a way for the County Council to raise money.

I look forward to hearing from you

Results from Stage Two formal consultation in Coleridge West

No. of Households	No. of responses	% Responded	% Support	% Opposed	% Undecided
1949	314	16%	53%	46%	1%

Dear Sir/Madam

I just received the letter detailing the proposed residents permit parking scheme in Coleridge West, and since I missed the earlier consultation and vote I would like to give my views on the scheme.

I do not have a strong opinion but I object to the proposed plans. I find the statement of reasons for the proposal to be inaccurate, as I have not encountered difficulties driving in the area, nor finding parking nor do I understand why it would make the area safer.

When I have had visitors they have also not had difficulty parking nearby.

As I have an off road parking spot it won't directly effect me, but it will be a cost and a minor nuisance to visitors.

Therefore my objections are on the grounds that it will be an unnecessary cost and hassle to friends and family visiting, and that it will also be an unnecessary cost to the taxpayer for implementing and monitoring the scheme, should it not receive as much funds as expected.

Thank you for taking the time to read my feedback on the proposed scheme.

Regards

I'm a resident in the Coleridge West area, and I would like to express my objection to the proposed scheme.

I do not believe this will help the situation in the area. What the area requires is an increase in the number of physical parking spots in the area. I propose turning Coleridge Park into an underground garage with Coleridge Park above the garage. I realise this will be expensive, but this will create spots that will serve the area in the long term.

Regards,

Hello,

If this parking zone goes through, when would it start being active?

Thanks,

I wish to comment on the proposed Residents parking scheme. I am concerned that firstly you have decided to progress this further when your initial consultation produced a very low response in favour, approximately about 9% of the households in the area in favour. Surely that will tell you that it is not wanted by most. I live in __ and there are only 15 proposed parking spaces allocated in the first section of the road where I live. There are __ flats in this section and several are privately owned and multiple occupancy. If households can apply for up to 3 parking permits there will simply not be enough spaces for everyone, let alone visitors. I myself have a disability following a stroke and am not very mobile so need regular support from my family. I understand that I should be eligible for free parking for my visitors. With these restrictions there may not be a space free for them. We are troubled at the moment by people using this road to park when they go to the station but it is always possible to find a space still. Why wasn't money invested in a multi-story car park at the station amidst all the new development there as so much of the parking problem in Coleridge area is due to people using the local streets to park when they go to the station? If this had been done and priced at an affordable rate (not like our city car parks which are too expensive) it might have solved the problem. Instead lets penalise the residents and make them pay.

Residents would have to pay for the right to use a space but with the restricted number of spaces no guarantee of getting one. Simple mathematics. This scheme may bring the Council extra revenue but will do little to improve things for the residents. Nearby Coleridge Road does have cars parked on both sides but this is a wide road. I object to the proposed Residents Parking Scheme advertised as Coleridge West area, Cambridge no.PR0461 because it is grossly unfair to the residents of Romsey Town south which has been wrongly lumped in with Coleridge. Romsey Town is not part of Coleridge, it has a different history and at City Council level is a different ward with different political representation. There is no off-street parking in the Victorian terraces typical of Romsey Town, both north and south of Mill Road. The houses in Coleridge by contrast have ample off-street parking and wide road verges.

I live in __ on the intersection with __. On __ parking is available on only one side with double yellow lines all the way down the other side. In __ cars are required to park halfway onto the pavements to allow parking on both sides. The residents now have almost too many cars for the spaces available in this Victorian terraced housing area. On the first May Bank Holiday Monday at 7am I took photos from my front window which show every space occupied in Hope Street and Argyle Street (see attached - where gaps appear there is either a skip or double lines). It is highly unlikely that at an early hour on a Bank Holiday those cars belong to anyone other than residents. Commuters and people using the shops can reasonably be excluded from the pressure on parking in this area. Commuters and shoppers are usually blamed for the pressure on parking but they could never rely on finding a space when they are taken by residents even on normal working days.

If this scheme is imposed across these two different areas every resident in south Romsey who owns a car will be obliged to pay to park near their home, or to receive visitors who come by car. Permits will not be correlated

Dear Gary Baldwin,

I am responding to your letter about the proposed parking scheme which was delivered recently to my home in Coleridge Road.

There were several reasons why I voted against such a scheme at the time. However, I'm writing to you now because I am astonished at how the process is unfolding. In your letter you state that 1949 households were contacted. You received responses from 16% of which just over half were in favour of such a scheme. This means that only about 8% of residents voted positively for the parking scheme, hardly a democratic exercise. How could you rely on this result for such fundamental changes which will affect us all? Not least the many out of area users of the recreation ground.

I hope my observations will receive due consideration.

Yours sincerely.

From _ a resident of _ _

Dear Gary

In reference to our phone call yesterday, here are my views in regards to the parking scheme reference PRO461.

I do not feel it is necessary to have double yellow lines and only a few residents parking bays in Rustat Avenue. Most cars parked there (if not all) are already residential cars. This is evident, as they remain there (parked) during the day and over night. So by putting in the restrictions it will be denying space for these residents, which will mean they will have to park elsewhere (in Rustat Avenue) thereby taking up other spaces intended for visitors.

This would then further reduce the availability of visitor parking and have an effect to all (of which they are many) who reside at Rustat Avenue. And therefore make the visitors permit scheme not work efficiently.

I strongly object to the hours that are proposed 9-7pm (mon-Friday). It is not necessary. If the scheme is to go ahead then at least reduce it. I feel 10am-3pm would be sufficient enough to deter anyone (commuters or other) from parking in the Rustat avenue area.

I hope these points will be taken into consideration.

Please can you confirm in receiving this.

Thank you

Kind regards

When I saw the stage 1 plans I objected because yellow lines were clearly drawn across the front of my house preventing parking there. I want the choice to park there.

The bays proposed were too few for the neighbourhood. The scheme is unnecessary - currently most people get to park near or in front of their homes - there is an equilibrium. As residents drive out in the morning visitors move in. There is never any disagreement. People respect the front of our houses and do not park there.

If you bring this scheme in there will be competition for fewer places, people will fall out with each other. Your idea that up to 3 residents badges per household is completely unworkable as there were insufficient bays for even 1 each.

I can't help thinking this is a money making scheme. Once it is introduced what is to prevent ad hoc increases beyond our control as is happening in Bermuda Terrace?

Now this second stage lacks any clarity about the intentions for Rustat Avenue. What are we voting for or against? What kind of drawings are they that show a couple of random black lines on the overview that disappear when magnified? On plan 2 north it seems by the red lines that the whole area will have yellow lines outlawing any parking whatsoever without the provision of any parking bays. When magnified on my tablet they pixilate so badly as to be illegible. I request that the scheme is halted until something clear and definite is conveyed about where I may park on my street. Please furnish me with a response before this second stage is finalised.

Lastly, I maintain that this should be a vote in not vote out scheme. It feels like we are being railroaded into something based on such a low majority. Relying on residents' apathy or tenants' lack of opportunity or knowledge is a synical way of bringing in an obviously unpopular scheme. This is not democratic. It strikes me that allowing the construction of Grand Central without proper parking consideration was what contributed to

To whom it concerns,

I am a resident of _ _ _ and park my car in one of the car parks in the Close. These parking areas are signposted as being private and for residents only. There are always available spaces to park there, even during the working week.

I am very concerned about the proposal to make _ _ _ a residents' parking only location. This would mean additional cost to the residents to buy a permit - not just for their own cars but to allow visitors to park there too. I cannot see the justification of imposing costs and inconvenience on the residents with these parking regulations when parking is not an issue in the parking areas of this street.

I hope that the introduction of these parking regulations for _ _ _ will be reconsidered.

~~I note that only 10% of households in this area replied and only 55% were supporting the proposed restrictions. This means that only 8.5% of the households in the area support the proposal. This is a very low percentage to put the restrictions in force.~~

I have lived in Cambridge for ___ years and I have parked my car regularly in the Coleridge West area over the last 9 years.

I see people parking in this area for a full day going to the train station on foot using the footbridge for walkers and cycles. However I also see people like me using the roads and working locally but not able to park at our work places. In the last few years the numbers of workmen parking has increased due to all the house building taking place in Coleridge Road and commercial building in Station Road. I can't see these workmen parking their vans in the multi storey car park at the Leisure Complex or using public transport. The proposal says it is to tackle issues with all day non-resident parking that denies parking spaces for residents and visitors but the majority of households in this area have drives to park their cars on. Many of them have drives big enough to take 3 cars and some have recently paid to have larger dropped kerbs. I imagine these are the households that didn't reply.

When the new properties were built on Flamsteed Close in the last 2 years I note an underground car park was part of the complex. I have seen people coming out of those properties to their cars parked on Coleridge Road, adding to the strain on parking spaces. This should not happen. The council has allowed the car parking situation to worsen by its decision for expansion of more properties being built residential and commercial. Clifton Road businesses are going to suffer if you introduce pay and display parking on this road. Currently there is a hot food and drinks van that parks on Clifton Road and has done for the last 15 years, what is he

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am emailing to express my dissatisfaction with the proposed parking permit scheme which is currently under consultation. I do not believe that the proposed scheme should be put in place.

As a resident of ___ we currently have no issues with parking on our cul de sac from my household's perspective and we currently appreciate there being parking available for visitors to come to our property in front of our property, as we only have one parking space on our drive. Also the run up to our drive is narrow as it is between a telegraph pole and a tree, meaning that both us and our neighbours use the same driveway to both our properties.

The proposal of the parking permits on either side I would potentially mean that it is difficult for us to access our driveway, if vehicle bays were put on both sides too close to the entrance to our driveway, as currently those in the cul de sac are considerate and ensure there is space for us to access our driveway.

My preference would be for the scheme to not take place at all, but if it was that the scheme has to go ahead I would like to suggest that the timing that the parking scheme is in use is not the 9-7 Mon to Fri currently proposed, but that instead it is reduced to a much shorter time, say between 12 and 1 between Mon-Fri meaning that it would prevent the commuter parking, but would also mean that families could park to access the Coleridge Park and Splash Pad and also that those visiting friends/relatives in the area would not be

I am a resident on ___. Two things I want to comment: 1) The only public notice on __ is difficult to be seen by public, as the notice is hidden in leaves (see attached photos). I live on rustat avenue and just noticed the notice yesterday. The notice should be put at a clear place so that more people can see it. Unless the council doesn't want to hear the comments from the public. 2) As far as I know that rustat avenue is private property, all house residents pay annual management fee to maintain the neighborhood. Is it legal that council charges us an extra fee for resident permit?

Thank you!

Best wishes,

Hello,

We are Cambridge residents who are considering moving to a house on __t this summer. We were informed by the current residents that a proposal is under consideration at the City Council (PR0461) to severely restrict the number of cars parked on __ and on other streets in the neighborhood.

When we visited __ on Saturday there were 14 cars parked on __ (about half on each side of the street). We reviewed the plans on the Cambridge City Council website and saw the proposal would restrict parking on __t to only _ spaces. There are at least __ households on __. This proposal would make it very difficult for current residents to park. And because similar cuts are being suggested throughout the whole neighborhood, it will make it very difficult for residents to find parking nearby either.

Restricting parking in the neighborhood to residents' parking only (24/7) would be a good way to reserve the street parking for local residents. However, we would hope that the Council will not restrict the number of parking spaces, e.g., by preventing parking on one side of the street, as this would present a particular hardship, especially for families with small children. Where would current residents be able to park if this plan were implemented?

We would also like to know when the decision will be made about the parking. If the proposal is implemented as currently stated, it would be very difficult for us to live at the house on __ as we need parking for our car in order to get to work/daycare.

Kind regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing with three questions about how parking will be regulated on my street in Cambridge, __.

A Public Notice was issued on 9 May 2018 saying that the Council proposes to introduce on-street parking controls in roads in the Coleridge West area of Cambridge, including __. The notice says that all on-street parking in this area will become either resident permit holders' parking; 4 hour free limited waiting, 4 hour pay & display parking, mixed use (shared resident permit holders/4 hour pay & display); disabled badge holder parking; or will be subject to no waiting at any time.

I would be grateful if you could tell me:

- (1) What controls will be introduced on __?
- (2) When they will be introduced?
- (3) If there are no answers to these questions. as yet, can you tell me when the Council will decide this?

Many thanks in advance!

Best wishes,

As a private resident of the Rustat Avenue estate in Coleridge ward, I wish to object to the Coleridge West Residents' Parking TRO.

I fully support the principle of this review. However I am concerned because:

1. insufficient action has been taken to protect the guest parking currently available in the complex, and which was marked on the original deeds. Spaces are now reduced, and residents will need to bear a cost.
2. I am concerned that the private carpark, which is not in the scheme, will be under increased pressure from commuters. I have already been told that County will not police this, and that any cost will need to be born by the residents. I cannot afford the several thousand pounds our management company have quoted to install a locked pole to act as a barrier in my space.

However, if the scheme is to go ahead, I categorically do not wish to see the development exempted.

I wish to object to the proposal to introduce a residents' parking scheme in the South Romsey area, linked to West Coleridge. The areas have significantly different characteristics, with much of West Coleridge having wider streets, and much off-street parking. In contrast, all parking in Romsey is on-street, and frequently taken up by residents only. As a result, we will have to pay for something which is currently free, with no benefit, and in fact some reduction in available parking. This amounts to a stealth tax. The majority in favour of the scheme was very small, on a small turnout, and given that this was spread across two areas which might be expected to have very different voting patterns for the reasons mentioned above, I feel that this should not go ahead in its current form.

Yours,

Begin forwarded message:

From:

I am one of the residents and find the idea of our road only having 7 places to park quite ridiculous. My _ _ _ _ has recently moved in with me at no _ _ (my _ is the one in _ _ _'s photos). I cannot conceive of _ having to walk from wherever I am lucky enough to find a space inevitably some distance away. I totally see the problems of traffic in Cambridge but I really don't believe cutting parking spaces so drastically for people who live on these streets is the way forward. Please rethink the amount of residents cars allowed to park in this cul de sac and give thought to the needs of ordinary families who live here.

Date: 4 June 2018 at 13:22:55 BST

To: "policyandregulation@cambridgeshire.gov.uk" <policyandregulation@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>

Subject: PR0461

I write on behalf of my neighbours on _ _ who are feeling powerless over the proposed loss of so much parking in our street (from 18 spaces down to 7) and the loss of spaces in Fletcher's Terrace, Swann's Terrace and Stockwell Street which will impact us too. We currently manage to park but will have to start paying for not being able to park anywhere near our houses, especially on a Saturday when there will be no restrictions and non residents park for Mill Rd and the town centre as well as the train station. Due to the blocked off streets, displaced residents cars will have to be driven a long distance to find parking within the proposed zone.

We, therefore, urge you to reconsider the proposed parking in _ _ . We understand the need for access and presume that the turning space is to prevent people from reversing into _ _ . Could it be that all vehicles have to reverse into the road, thus doing away with the need for turning space? Could we increase the number of spaces to 8 by having two spaces either side of the road at the end, then a space for turning and then 6 spaces on one side? (Please see attached photos.)

We would welcome a response to these questions.

With kind regards

Hi,

Thank you for the correspondence regarding the proposed parking permit schemes in the Coleridge West Area in Cambridge.

Firstly I do not think that a parking permit scheme is necessary around Davy Road (where I live) as I have not found it an issue to park. I work weekdays during the day so perhaps I only ever see the quiet times. There is not enough parking on the _ _ d car park that serves the flats that I live in so it would make it necessary for me and others to have to buy two permits which is very inconvenient.

If a permit scheme does need to be put into place, I don't see why the timings need to be from 9am - 7pm as a much smaller restricted period, say 11am - 3pm would still stop people from parking during the day for work, but leave spaces free for visitors etc. who would be coming by in the less busy times (early evening for instance) and would not necessarily have a permit.

Finally, from a statistical point of view the response rate of 16% and only marginally over half in favour is not a significant enough majority to warrant such a major change to the parking in this area. I'd suggest taking a more robust analysis of resident's views on this in the future.

Regards,

Dear Sir/Madame

I have only recently become aware of this issue since my last tenants did not pass on the information you provided. I was not therefore able to take part in the survey sent out last year with a closing date of 4th December.

Be that as it may I own a property in the above street which I let to students attending Anglia Ruskin University. This is the only property I own and whilst I am still able I manage it myself. This necessitates my making fairly regular visits to the property to make minor repairs, attend to the garden and to spend a week or so at each changeover to prepare it for new tenants.

On reading the documentation online this morning I can find no permit proposal to which I would be entitled. As a consequence I am concerned as to what I will be able to do in terms of the management of my property.

It may be that there will be a permit to which I will be entitled and that I have misread the documents! I would appreciate your advice/help on this matter as the enforcement arrangements should I transgress, may be punitive.

Yours

We are instructed by the ___ () to submit an objection to the proposed TRO.

This property lies within the area covered by the proposed TRO and takes access from ___. For the purposes of identification, we identify the property in red outline on the extract from your proposed south area plan below which shows it lies at the western edge of the area, immediately adjacent to the ___. The entrance from ___ is marked with a black arrow.

___ is the successor of the former ___, ___. ___ is currently the sole designated provider of the ___ pursuant to the ___ and as such is required to deliver the minimum ___ requirements set out by the ___ and ___ made thereunder. Its services are regulated by ___. It also operates ___ which is a ___. ___ who operate the national network of ___ and ___ are no longer part of the ___ group of companies and remain wholly owned by ___. This property is in constant operation, 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the ___ and ___ of ___, and as a customer service point. This location is well suited to the existing use because there are no nearby residential properties whose amenity could be affected by the activities at the ___ site. This particular site operates a fleet of ___ small vans with about ___ staff on-site from ___-. During the evening and overnight there are up to ___ staff on site. In addition, there is an enquiry office for customers to ___ and ___ items attracting up to ___ visits daily.

The proposed TRO intends to convert some existing on-street parking to short-term pay and display parking, and to introduce additional double yellow lines which will remove other existing on-street parking places in the vicinity (see plan above). The pay and display bays will operate Monday - Friday, 09:00 - 19:00, max stay 4 hours, no return within 4 hours. The combined effect of these changes is to remove about 60 parking spaces which are available to support local employees without providing replacement provision. Even the proposed pay and display bays are only available for a half a standard working day. The loss of these bays does not provide any benefit for local residents as there are none along Clifton Road which is industrial in character.

We consequently wish to lodge the strongest possible objections to these changes as they will affect the attractiveness of this location for employment and in effect remove all employee parking. The introduction of

Dear Sirs.

I write concerning the above proposal. Whilst I am in total agreement to the necessity to control commuter parking in this area, the proposed time scales will have a devastating effect on Coleridge & Romsey Bowling Clubs which are situated in Coleridge Recreation Ground. I write to see if the timing of these proposals could be reduced to finish at 6p.m.

Both Clubs have a very active membership and over the course of the summer season May to September, we have between us, 50 + Clubs from all over the County coming to play bowls on the green. The time scale for matches are from 6 p.m. onwards from Monday to Friday. As most of the players are elderly and as bowls are heavy, players need to be able to park within a reasonable walking distance to the green. Finishing the restriction at 6 p.m would solve this problem.

As a considerable amount of Council money has recently been spent in improving all the facilities in the park and bowling green, it would be a terrible waste of money if the clubs folded due to the fact that visiting teams cannot get to the green. As per Government, NHS, Doctors and Local Councils guidelines, we are trying our hardest to keep fit and active in our older years by paying a regular sport several times per week. Over the course of the season 2000 people play bowls on the green.

Your help in enabling us to continue to do this would be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Secretary Coleridge Bowling Club.

Good Afternoon

We see from the latest letter received regarding the proposed parking scheme for __ that as a business revolved around _ this scheme is likely to have a major impact on our business, currently we are lucky that customers drop off there _ in the morning once our neighbours have gone to work using the surrounding __ and we move them into our _ during repairs then park them up once the repairs have been carried out, we currently have space outside the _ for only two _ on the __. Understandably we would object to this as we would not be able to use the _ to our benefit which would affect us considerably, hence if the scheme was to go ahead will we be able to purchase a number of __ that could be used in different _ on a daily basis for us to continue _ during the daytime.

Many Thanks

Many Thanks From

Hi Gary,

Thanks for this. Pleased it is moving quickly. Am I right in assuming you are aiming for the July 11 Highways Committee meeting?

And hence there is a chance that, if approved, it could be implemented this autumn?

kind regards

have on our clubs ability to continue to operate if members and visiting players, who travel from all parts of the county, are unable to park between 6pm and 6:30pm, which is the start time of our games.

While we recognise the problem commuters parking in these areas cause, the extension of the restrictions to 7pm, will cause considerable issues to our own and visiting players, many of whom are elderly and have to carry heavy woods to the green. Although you are proposing to provide a number of 4 hour restricted spaces that users of the recreation ground can use, these spaces are going to be great demand in good weather when the paddling pool will have many visitors.

Reducing the restriction by one hour to 6pm, would solve this issue without any detrimental effect on the main aim of the proposal.

I would also like to point out that over the last year the city council have spent considerable sums upgrading the facilities on the recreation ground including those for the bowlers, which will be rather wasted if one or both clubs folds because their members give up or move to other clubs because they cannot park within a short walk of the green

Regards

— —

Hon Sec. Romsey Bowls Club.

Dear Cambridgeshire County Council,

THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 19) ORDER 2018

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, taking into account 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,

Gary,

Please ensure that buses will still be able to access their stops when providing parking areas.

Regards,

It is really important that cycle parking is included as part of these schemes. Many of these areas have a very high demand for cycle parking and the existing situation is that bikes obstruct or at least clutter the footways. We have removed residential car parking on Thoday street in order to provide cycle parking and these schemes provide the opportunity to replicate this layout in similar narrow streets with no easy access to cycle parking both in order to encourage cycling and reduce clutter on the footway.

Coleridge West:

The area designated for cycle parking at the Argyle St/Mill Rd junction is welcomed although the space available has been decreased with the contra-flow cycle lane which has recently been put in so this needs to be checked.

As for Hardwick and Derby St in Newnham many of these streets are terraced houses which front directly onto the footway with no easily accessible cycle parking which results in bikes being left on the footway which is detrimental to pedestrians. At least one area of cycle parking is needed on each of these streets, similar to that put in on Thoday street, with the removal of one parking space or on proposed double yellow line space if possible. On Hope street the amount of P&D parking spaces should be reduced to allow for cycle parking.

Davy Road is a difficult route for cyclists as cars try to pass cyclists at speed which is intimidating, especially for the school children who use this street as a route to school. It has been on a list of routes which the City Council would like to improve for cyclists for some time. There are few houses without their own parking and so it is difficult to understand why so much residential car parking is required. To reduce speeds and provide more space to overtake cyclists I would therefore propose that the amount of residential and limited waiting bays is reduced so that there is no parking on both sides of the roads and, instead, car parking is set out so that it is in blocks on alternate sides of the road.

Happy to discuss any of the above further and to work with you to agree optimal space that can be found for cycle parking.

