TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSAL TO INSTALL DOUBLE YELLOW LINES ON CARISBROOKE ROAD, WARWICK ROAD, AND TO INSTALL A NO STOPPING ORDER OUTSIDE MAYFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

То:	Cambridge City Joint Area Committee
Meeting Date:	22 nd October 2019
From:	Executive Director, Place & Economy Directorate
Electoral division(s):	Arbury
Forward Plan ref:	Key decision: No
Purpose:	To determine objections received in response to the publication of proposals to install double yellow lines at on Carisbrooke Road, Warwick Road and the installation of a No Stopping Order outside Mayfield Primary School
Recommendation:	a) Implement the proposals as advertised b) Inform the objectors accordingly

	Officer contact:		Member contacts:
Name:	Sonia Hansen	Names:	Councillor Richard Robertson
Post:	Traffic Manager	Post:	Chair
Email:	Sonia.Hansen@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	richard.robertson@cambridge.gov. uk
Tel:	0345 045 5212	Tel:	07746 117791

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Carisbrooke Road and Warwick Road areas are located in the Arbury Ward of Cambridge. Being just off Histon Road, the area suffers from congestion, in part caused by on-street vehicular parking.
- 1.2 As a result of a successful Local Highways Improvement (LHI) bid the County Council proposes to install double yellow lines and a no stopping order to reinforce existing School Keep Clear markings located at the entrance to Mayfield Primary.
- 1.3 The aim of the scheme is to alleviate congestion and improve safety by prohibiting vehicles from parking in unsafe areas as shown in Appendix 1.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) procedure is a statutory consultation 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 public notice invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a twenty one day notice period.
- 2.2 The notice for the proposed TRO was advertised in the Cambridge News on the 28th August 2019. The statutory consultation period ran from the 28th August 2019 to the 19th September 2019.
- 2.3 The statutory consultation resulted in 1 objection which has been summarised in the table in Appendix 2. The officer responses to the objection are also given in the table.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone There are no significant implications for this priority.

- **3.2 Thriving places for people to live** There are no significant implications for this priority.
- **3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children** There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 **Resource Implications**

The necessary staff resources and funding have been secured though Local Highways Improvements Initiative.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The statutory consultees have been engaged including the County and District Councillors, the Police and the Emergency Services. The Police offered no objections and no comments were received from the other emergency services. Notices were placed in the local press and were also displayed on site. The proposal was made available for viewing in the reception area of Shire Hall, Castle Street, Cambridge, CB3 0AJ and online at http://bit.ly/cambridgeshiretro

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The County and District Councillors have been consulted and have offered no comments.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications for this priority

Source Documents	Location
Scheme Plans	Vantage House
Consultation Documents	Vantage Park
Consultation Responses	Washingley Road
Consultation Responses	Huntingdon PE29 6SR

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared	Yes
by Finance?	Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council	Yes
Contract Procedure Rules implications been	Name of Officer: Gus de Silva
cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk	Yes
implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications	Yes
been cleared by your Service Contact?	Name of Officer: Elsa Evans
Have any engagement and communication	Yes
implications been cleared by	Name of Officer: Sarah Silk
Communications?	
Have any localism and Local Member	Yes
involvement issues been cleared by your	Name of Officer: Richard Lumley
Service Contact?	
Have any Public Health implications been	Yes
cleared by Public Health	Name of Officer: lain Green

Appendix 1



<u>Appendix 2</u>

	Objection	Officer's Comment
1	The road is sufficiently wide to allow parking on one side and still leave plenty of room for other vehicles, including fire engines and delivery trucks.	Whilst the road width may be conducive to two way traffic flow with parking permitted on one side, this still doesn't improve safety for pedestrians who are likely to be crossing the street.
	There is currently one pinch point immediately to the left of the car park gates but installing longer double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road would remove this.	The extension of the double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road are required to improve the safety of any pedestrians that intend to cross the road. By leaving the whole length unrestricted pedestrians have to cross the street between parked vehicles which is not ideal.
	The school car park is not large enough to accommodate school staff and visitors and, if parking is not permitted on this stretch of road, parking will move onto the side streets outside residential properties, increasing inconvenience to our neighbours. Our staff come from a wide geographic area and public transport is not a viable option for many.	There will always be an element of displacement with any parking proposal. Whilst it is not ideal, the safety of highways users holds primacy.
	We have previously been advised by Cambridgeshire County Council that having some parked vehicles around the school reduces vehicular speed, making it safer for children crossing the road at the start and end of the school day.	Vehicular parking on-street does slow down traffic speeds, however slow speeds is only one aspect of road safety to consider. The scheme proposed seeks a balance between keeping some on-street parking in to assist in the reduction of overall traffic speeds while improving safety by removing parking around corners and in areas where pedestrians are likely to cross.
	The revised plan would suggest there are no yellow lines on the east side of Carisbrooke road on the bend between Lexington Close and Chatsworth Avenue. This would mean that any parents dropping off or picking up their children would park on the side of the road furthest from the school and the children would have to cross the road.	Parents are permitted to drop off or pick up children on existing yellow lines, what they are not permitted to do is park. The area identified is not the only place that parents can do this and there may well be better alternatives currently.

If the width of available road remains a	The scope of this project is limited to
concern then an alternative would be to	managing the existing parking configuration
move the footpath further into the green	on-street. The facilitation of additional parkin
space on Carisbrooke Road and use the	is outside the scope of the project and in any
current grass verge area to provide a	event what has been suggested has not bee
layby.	budgeted for.