

**TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH THE
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN LICHFIELD
ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

To: **Cambridge City Joint Area Committee**

Meeting Date: **30th January 2018**

From: **Executive Director, Place & Economy**

Electoral division(s): **Queen Edith's and Romsey (County)
Coleridge (City)**

Forward Plan ref: **n/a** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To determine the objection received in response to the
publication of waiting restrictions in Lichfield Road,
Queen Edith's, Cambridge**

Recommendation: **a) Implement the restrictions in Lichfield Road,
Cambridge as published.
b) Inform the objectors of the decision.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Richard Lumley
Post:	Assistant Director
Email:	richard.lumley@cambridgeshire. gov.uk
Tel:	01223 703839

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1** Lichfield Road is located approximately 2.7km south east of Cambridge City centre in the electoral division of Queen Edith's and the District Ward of Coleridge. Lichfield Road is connected to Cherry Hinton Road on its south side and Coleridge Road on its west side. (Appendix 1). Lichfield Road is on a bus route and is busy at certain periods of the day due to its close proximity to primary and secondary schools.
- 1.2** A Local Highway Initiative (LHI) was submitted in November 2016 to address the issue of vehicles parking on the sharp 90 degree right hand bend approximately half way along Lichfield Road. Concern was raised that vehicles parking on this bend were reducing visibility of road users entering and exiting the bend and forcing vehicles onto the opposite side of the carriageway, this is exacerbated by the fact that Lichfield Road is a bus route.
- 1.3** The LHI application therefore proposed to introduce prohibition of waiting (double yellow lines) on both sides of Lichfield Road for the length of the bend (60 metres on the south side of the carriageway and 86 metres on the north side (as amended). The LHI application also proposed to introduce double yellow lines at the junction of Lichfield Road and Coleridge Road to prevent parking at this junction to improve visibility and road safety. The proposed TRO will also implement double yellow lines across the accesses of the car parking areas of the Community Flats in Lichfield Road.
- 1.4** The LHI application for the parking restrictions is supported by the Lichfield Road Residents Association, the Local County Councillor and City Councillors.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO) PROCESS

- 2.1** The TRO procedure is a statutory process that requires the highway authority to advertise, in the local press and on-street, a public notice stating the proposal and the reasons for it. The advert invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a minimum twenty one day notice period. There is also a requirement to consult with certain organisations, such as the emergency services, and others affected by the proposals.
- 2.2** The TRO was advertised in the Cambridge News on 16th November 2017 and the statutory consultation period deadline was the 7th December 2017. A plan showing the proposed restrictions can be seen at Appendix 2.
- 2.3** A total of three written representations were received, of which one objected to the proposal.
- 2.4** The most common issues raised by those submitting representations were as follows:
 - Length of waiting restrictions too long and will cause a loss of parking places for residents.
 - Single yellow lines preferred to double yellow lines as only real problem of parking on the bends is when Lichfield Community Hall is in use.
 - The main issue in Lichfield Road is speeding and rat-running and therefore speed restriction measures are needed i.e. speed humps.

- 2.5** Following the receipt of the representations and objection a revised proposal reducing the double yellow lines on the on the south western side of the bend by 20 metres and both southern ends by 10 metres was proposed by Highway Projects and approved by the Local Member. The amended restrictions are shown in a plan at Appendix 3. The three parties who made the representations were sent a copy of the amended restrictions plan on the 22nd December 2017 and asked for their comments by the 8th January 2018. Of the three parties consulted on the amended restrictions one replied that they were happy with the amended restrictions, one replied that they were still opposed to the restrictions, and no response was received from the third party. The outstanding objection to the restriction and the officer response is summarised in Appendix 4.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

The necessary staff resources and funding have been secured through the Local Highway Improvements process.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications for this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The statutory process for this proposal has been followed.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications for this category.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The statutory consultees have been engaged, including County and District Councillors, Police and other emergency services. Notices were placed in the local press and were also displayed on the road where it is proposed to implement the restrictions and a letter drop carried out to effected properties. The proposal was available to view in the reception area of Shire Hall and online.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The County Councillor and City Councillors have been consulted regarding the scheme.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications for this category

Source Documents	Location
Objection (redacted) Draft Traffic Regulation Order	Vantage House, Washingley Road, Huntingdon PE29 6SR

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by Finance?	No (n/a) Name of Financial Officer:
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Debbie Carter-Hughes
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Joanna Shilton
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Iain Green