

PROPOSED MILTON ROAD RPS - RESIDENT AND BUSINESS FEEDBACK

Response	What it means
Wholly Support	(I wholly support this proposal)
Partly Support	(I support this proposal, but would like the Council to consider additional or alternative measures)
Neutral	(I neither support or object, but would like the Council to consider another related matter)
Partly Object	(I object to part of the proposal, but support or am neutral to other elements of it)
Wholly Object	(I wholly object to this proposal)

	OriginalFeedbackDate	ResponderType	FeedbackCategory	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
1	04/02/2024 22:56:28 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	I don't think there is a parking problem in the area. People who park on the street are not going into town, they are local residents so the measure would not affect them.
2	04/12/2024 08:06:14 +01:00	Resident	Traffic	Wholly Object	I object to this on terms of disturbance, but do note that I feel it is wholly unnecessary and is creating a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.
3	04/09/2024 21:01:13 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	I object to the introduction of parking permits. The majority of houses in Hurst Park Estate (Hurst Park Avenue, Orchard Avenue etc) have off-street parking. Therefore, I think shoppers/commuters should be allowed to park on the street which is otherwise pretty empty.
4	04/10/2024 13:21:15 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	PRO 998. parking 1-27 Arbury Road CB4 2JB. We have been consulted now for 7 years and no one has mentioned till this late date that those parking spaces were under threat. 1-25 are late Victorian Terraces with no space big enough to park very small cars in front gardens. All are occupied by owners with young families who require cars for work and trips to nurseries or schools, or older residents [REDACTED] requiring carer parking too. The Project Manager from the County Council who inspected the proposed Zebra site 11-15 Arbury Road said to ARERA that it was not technically feasible as cyclists could approach from the adjacent lane blinded; ARERA consulted on that option and chose Maio Road crossing anyway. I fail to understand your logic. For 7 years ARERA has been insisting the main problems are bullying speeding cars which your proposal encourages; and secondly that the direct cycle route to/ from the College/GP practice/vet/shops/river/Cambridge North goes down our road. I certainly cannot manage at [REDACTED] without my parking space...or cycling into town when I'm able.
5	04/08/2024 20:23:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	The objection already submitted by me, Xxxx Xxxx, is in connection with traffic order PRO 998, and specifically the proposal to put double yellow lines in front of houses 11 - 27 Arbury Road, houses that offer no other possibility for parking, except on the road. I understand that the Parking Scheme proposed seeks "to prioritise on-street parking for residents and, in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available." That describes these houses perfectly.
6	04/08/2024 20:00:37 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines from No. 11 to No. 27 Arbury Road which, apart from 2 proposed parking bays would prevent on road parking for the first 12 houses in the street. [REDACTED] do not have any possible parking except on the road as front gardens are too small to allow for conversion to hard standing for cars. Houses further along are more fortunate. Seven of the twelve houses are family houses with children of different ages. They need to be able to park near at hand. Some neighbours have two cars. There can be difficulties in finding parking near our homes as it is. I sometimes have to park round the corner in Leys Road when visitors to local businesses park outside [REDACTED] For years those of us who live on Arbury Road East have been campaigning for LESS traffic. We hoped for a modal filter. The Milton Road work has meant an increase of traffic down Arbury Road and drivers will be used to coming this way now. Please do not make an increased flow of traffic easier to achieve by removing our parking. And cyclists of all sorts will continue to use our pavement as their right as they do now if traffic on the road is as heavy or heavier. The shops and businesses down on the corner also have no parking except on the pavement. They are worried about further loss of trade. Please consider parking bays for them so that cars do not have to stop on the pavement, often making pedestrians walk in the road.
7	03/18/2024 14:48:51 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	The proposal is not taking into account the local shops who rely on passing trade. In order to keep a vibrant local neighbourhood we need to encourage access to these small businesses. [REDACTED] This proposal would severely impact [REDACTED] business, if not completely kill it. If this proposal is targeted at commuters using the road as a car park, why not reduce the hours to a couple , in the middle of the working day (11.00 -12.00) , these would discourage commuters, but allow genuine users.
8	04/09/2024 11:33:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	[REDACTED] I wholly object to this proposed scheme which removes all access for residents of the NE side of Arbury Road for parking. There is no parking for residents within a reasonable distance and no parking for visitors within a reasonable distance. Residents on the NE side of Arbury Road should at least be able to buy visitors permits for people visiting their houses and for tradesmen etc. There is an issue of the safety of visitors after dark having to walk considerable distances. It seems very unfair where one side of the road is given access to park and for their visitors to park and the other side having these rights removed.

9	04/08/2024 11:58:09 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>This proposed resident's parking scheme removes all access to parking on Arbury Road for residents on the NE side of Arbury Road other than parking on land at the front of their houses. If visitors or tradesmen need to visit one of these houses, there is no parking available to them within a reasonable distance.</p> <p>Residents on the NE side of Arbury Road should be included in the scheme or at the very least should be able to buy visitors permits for people visiting their houses, otherwise the parking problems that are trying to be addressed by this scheme, will be pushed out to more distant parts of the city and the safety of (particularly evening) visitors may be put at risk having to walk considerable distances to the nearest available parking spaces.</p> <p>Additionally those who do not use their "front gardens" for parking or have more than one car, will not be able to park within a reasonable distance of their homes.</p> <p>It seems terribly unfair for one side of a road to be given rights to park while the residents on the other side have all their rights taken away.</p>
10	03/18/2024 14:54:22 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>As a resident of x Arbury Road, in my view and in the main I don't have a problem with parking near to my house from Monday- Friday 9:30 - 3pm. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>For the businesses such as the hairdressers and beauticians, introducing permitting will mean customers (or the business) have to pay extra money for a daily permit in order to access the business (a lot of these clients are elderly) which may hinder their profitability and cause extra strain on a local family business.</p> <p>What does cause an issue, and traffic, are the cars that temporarily pull up to visit Al Noor Groceries. This could be for 15-20 minutes at a time directly on the pavement outside blocking pedestrian access or on the double yellow lines which makes it difficult for cars to pass and causes congestion. Many of these are loitering vehicles and contribute to the unnecessary noise and emissions. I don't believe that residential permitting is going to help this particular situation or dissuade drivers to temporarily park on the road.</p> <p>Further to the below, there seems to be a huge amount of parking between 15-27 Arbury Road removed in the proposal if my understanding is correct. These are all houses without their own driveways.</p> <p>I suggest that this needs to be revisited, as we will have more cars fighting for fewer spaces and having to pay for the privilege of doing so and most residents don't understand why most of the on street parking has now been taken away as part of the proposal.</p>
11	09/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>We would like to object to the proposal for no on-road parking in the northern side of Arbury Road.</p>
12	26/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>As a resident of the northern side of Arbury Road I am emailing to state my strong objections to the proposed residents' parking scheme that will include Leys Road.</p> <p>I fail to see how it can be fair or reasonable to deny residents who are simply located on the 'wrong' side of Arbury Road access to any on-street parking within their immediate neighbourhood, which will in effect preclude any provision for accessible parking for guests or tradesmen who may be visiting local businesses and residents, my property included.</p> <p>[REDACTED] I find it wholly unreasonable that I will be denied any right beyond this to public parking or to visitor permits for parking within my local neighbourhood and would appreciate some clarification on where within the limitations of this scheme visitors and tradesmen providing a service to my property would reasonably be expected to park. I would urge those who are seeking to implement this scheme to question whether, were they in the same situation as Arbury Road residents, they would consider the scheme a fair and practical one.</p> <p>The parking situation in Leys Road is not currently problematic: on the contrary it is a great example of neighbourhood and community cohesion in that people park with due consideration for others and there are always spaces available, with the road accessible to those who require extra parking in the area, including residents, their visitors and employees and customers of local businesses such as the veterinary surgery located on the northern side of Arbury Road. To abandon this and introduce parking restrictions or remove completely the right for on-street parking for some local residents in order to presumably generate funds from parking permits seems a backwards step in terms of the dissent that would be caused by a divisive scheme that would award permits to 'south-side' residents of Arbury Road but not those living opposite them! I believe that the scheme would be unnecessarily problematic in terms of the inconvenience and obstruction it would bring for residents and local businesses who co-operate to benefit from the present parking situation. Finally, the scheme would ironically be contrary to efforts towards improved road safety (that has seen the implementation of recent cycle paths on parts of Arbury Road) in that it is foreseeable that visiting guests and tradesmen would be likely to resort to kerb-parking on Arbury Road for purely practical reasons, e.g. for access to tools and materials required to complete property repairs and renovations.</p> <p>Whilst emailing may I also convey my concern that I do not recall any notification of the County Council's formal consultation on this scheme that I understand took place in October-November 2022 and which evidently excluded those residents who would be adversely affected by the scheme. I welcome the opportunity now to voice my concerns and objections to the scheme.</p>
13	17/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am getting in touch to object to the proposal to put double yellow lines in front of our house, xx Arbury Road, and replace the parking for all of the houses without driveways along Arbury Road south of Leys Road with only 12 parking bays spread along the whole street south of Leys Road. Why isn't there one space per drivewayless house? What is the rationale for reducing the current number of parking spaces?</p> <p>Many of the families who live between 1 and 61 Arbury Road have small children and need to load and unload close to their houses. If this scheme goes ahead, what will happen if no parking space is available on Arbury Road? How will I get home with three kids and their bags, in the pouring rain? Am I supposed to drive around the whole parking zone looking for a space, some of which are a fifteen minute walk from our house?</p> <p>I'm sure the plan is wonderful for the Hurst Park residents who will be able to use their driveways, or for the people of Chesterton Hall Crescent who all seem to get a designated bay! But it does feel like part of the continual marginalisation of Arbury Road's residents in favour of drivers who want to be able to speed down our 20 mph road at 30 or 40 mph and now won't be held back by needing to drive carefully around parked cars. This will only add further danger to our residential road.</p>

14	11/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I write to formally object to the Proposed Milton Road Resident Parking Scheme. I live on the northern side of Arbury Road at number xx.</p> <p>The parking scheme gives households on the southern side of Arbury Road exclusive parking and prevents me and my neighbours from having any on-road parking. For me this means that I have nowhere to park if a second housemate has a car or if I have anyone visiting over</p> <p>I think the whole proposal is meaningless as not that many businesses are around to cause residents that hard life. Instead of creating an increasing number of obstacles for us residents here, you could try and finish roadworks on Milton road which makes it extremely difficult for both cyclists and drivers (I am both).</p> <p>I was never informed about or consulted on the scheme and this is the first I have heard about it</p> <p>This scheme should be stopped.</p> <p>Please log my objection. Please, along with my local councillors, work on my behalf and respond so that I know you are doing so.</p>
15	18/03/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>The number of provision of parking bays is insufficient on Arbury Road. Too few bays are planned at the eastern end where the houses mostly do not have driveways as they do inside Hurst Park estate. More bays should be provided as there will be a shortage a lot of the time. More bays are needed in the space between 27-1 Arbury Road - there is no reason why there are no bays planned there? The reduction of parking in that stretch would mean a very long walk for us and [redacted] elderly [redacted] who visits by car sometimes. We [redacted] and need a bay in front of our home for parking (as we always and currently have). We would have to unload our shopping and [redacted] on double yellow lines with the plan you have circulated.</p> <p>This is an unfair, undemocratic and unjustified removal of parking benefits from residents here of many years. Most of us don't mind moving to paying scheme, but the same number of bays must be provided as now. Car reduction should not impact locals disproportionately just because we live on Arbury Road.</p> <p>If you want to make the road safer and reduce car traffic, make the road one-way or better still add a modal filter as has been requested by the overwhelming majority of residents for years. Listen rather than impose measures. We have been consulted dozens of times on this but have seen no action. Instead you now are proposing to do something we have not asked for.</p>
16	05/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I lodge my formal complaint regarding the current planned provision of parking bays on Arbury Road.</p> <p>My neighbours and I currently have parking spots in front of our houses. Including the house I own at xx Arbury Road. We have [redacted] and shopping and need reliable and close access - especially [redacted]. The other spots are tok far and will be full most of the time as there is not sufficient. [redacted] one house on Hurst PARK ave will have at least 3 bays in front of [redacted] house alone. Each house there seems to have access to at least one bay. The same should be provided for Arbury Road - why the disparity?</p> <p>I support paid parking but there is no reason to not allow such bays in front of all our homes, as currently, as we have no off street parking. It seems only 2-3 spots are provided between numbers 1-25 Arbury Road and the shops have no parking bays! This goes against your own stated objective:</p> <p>"The proposal would introduce a residents' permit parking scheme in various roads in the Milton Road area of Cambridge from Monday to Friday between 9.30am and 3.00pm. The scheme is intended to prioritise on-street parking for residents and, in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available."</p> <p>In addition, our local shops must have competitive access to customers and must have parking bays (free 20 mins at least) just like on Milton road. We have already lost shops due to the busy road and no parking... Make the road one way and add parking bays near the shops. We have all been asking for this for years.</p> <p>There is no reason to have the gap of non-allowed parking between two small bays at this end of the road. We use them often for elderly vsitors (grandparents, delivering shopping and managing babies and young kids.</p> <p>Please provide a response with an updated suggestion.</p>
17	10/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I wish to object to the effects of measures included in the TRO for the Milton Road Area Residents' Parking Scheme on residents and businesses located on Arbury Road east.</p> <p>1. No provision has been made for how the proposals will affect the shops on the south-side of the street next to the junction with Milton Road. There are to be no 30-minute waiting bays outside these shops, as have been provided for those along Milton Road. Nor will there be any 'pay and display' bays provided on Arbury Road east either. The omission of these threatens the economic viability of these shops. Much of their trade involves customers from outside the area who have, until now, parked in spaces further along Arbury Road east. They will now be unable to do so because of the extensive use of double yellow lines on the section of road between Nos. 1-63.</p> <p>2. The installation of these double yellow lines will remove on-street parking for many of the occupants who live between Nos. 1-63 who have no possibility of access to off-street parking within their curtilages.</p> <p>The rationale for the removal of this on-street parking remains unclear despite a request for further information about this by the Arbury Road East Residents' Association.</p> <p>The installation of these double yellow lines, to which ARERA previously expressed opposition, undermines the stated purpose of the Milton Road Area Residents' Scheme which, according to the Statement of Reasons document published to support the Traffic Regulation Order, is "to prioritise on-street parking for residents and, in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available."</p>

					<p>3. The boundary of the parking schemes excludes properties on the north-side of Arbury Road east (even numbers). The occupants of these will be ineligible for parking permits within the scheme. Two of these properties have no access to off-street parking in their front gardens. Nor will they have access to any other parking anywhere near their houses. When asked about the exclusion of these properties, the GCP was unrepentant about the difficulties imposed on these residents: "The majority of properties on the north-east side have off-road parking available. Should the scheme go ahead there would be a 6 month review and revisions to the scheme could be considered at that time." No explanation was offered about what the occupants of these two properties should do during this 6 month period: "They would not be able to park in resident permit holder spaces on Arbury Road or within the remainder of the Milton RPS during its operational hours. If they wish to park on-street from Monday to Friday between 9.30am and 3pm they would need to find alternative spaces in other roads." The GCP offered no explanation of what other roads were meant here. There will be none in close walking distance of these properties. Again, this runs contrary to the stated purpose of the TRO ""to prioritise on-street parking for residents and, in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available." 4. The map in the TRO shows the introduction of a very short stretch of cycle path on Arbury Road east. This will run from outside No. 106 just to where Arbury Road east narrows outside No. 88. No attempt has been made to join this section to the cycle path implemented under Phase 2 of the GCP upgrading of Arbury Road because it is a County Council's 'designated priority cycle route'. Despite being requested to do so, the GCP has expressed its reluctance: "It was highlighted through consultation and discussions with Members to improve cycle infrastructure where possible within the implementation of the RPS. Incorporating larger scale cycle improvements is outside the scope of the programme." The GCP's suggestion that completing a very short, 17m 'join' between the existing and proposed cycle paths is a "large scale improvement" should be challenged.</p>
18	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>1. I wish to make representations about the inadequacy of the consultation process employed by the GCP prior to the issuing of the TRO for this scheme.</p> <p>At some point, between September and November 2022, the north-eastern boundary of Milton Road Area Residents Parking Scheme was changed by WSP, presumably at the request of the GCP. This boundary change was made without discussion with any of the local (residents/business/church) parties on Arbury Road east affected by it. Boundary as shown in Cambridgeshire County Council Plan(Spring 2022) The map above shows parking scheme areas as signalled by the County Council in the spring of 2022. Note the jagged North Eastern edge of the parking area labelled 10b. Boundary as shown in WSP drawing (September 2022) The WSP drawing, dated September 2022, of north-eastern boundary of the Milton Road Area Residents Parking Scheme showed area 10b as having a flat edge. This edge is drawn in front of the properties on the north side of Arbury Road East so excluding them from the parking scheme (which includes those on the south side). This change was confirmed in a slide shown, but whose implications were not discussed, by the GCP at a consultation meeting held on 2 November 2022. Boundary as shown in GCP slide set (November 2022) Without signposting and explanation, these maps and their meanings are extremely difficult to understand. During its 2022 consultation period, the GCP made no attempt to explain them. Nor did it attempt to do so when it issued the documents supporting the TRO. According to then Lib Dem city councillor Jamie Daziell, local councillors at this time were not made aware of this change (or its implications). Indeed, he remained unaware of it until it was pointed out to him by the Arbury Road East Residents' Association in March 2024. The implications of this change – for who would and wouldn't be eligible for parking permits under the revised scheme – were not signposted or explained by the GCP during its November 2022 consultation meeting. Nor were they subsequently discussed by the GCP with any of the parties on the north-eastern side of Arbury Road east who have then discovered from the TRO that they are excluded from applying for permits. The level of consultation offered by the GCP prior to the issuing of the TRO was grossly inadequate, especially given the serious implications that the redrawn north eastern boundary of the parking scheme has for those excluded from it.</p> <p>2. I also wish to make representations about the inadequacy of the consultation process employed by the GCP/CCC at the time of, and since, issuing the TRO for this scheme.</p> <p>The map originally issued in support of the TRO was of very poor quality and still difficult to read even when greatly enlarged. At the request of the Arbury Road East Residents' Association, [REDACTED] replaced this map with a more readable version which he supplied to ARERA and put up on the TRO website. However, despite being requested to do so, a second notification letter was not delivered by the CCC to all of the households involved telling them that a more readable map had now been placed on the website. From my experience of talking to my neighbours, it is evident that many of them gave up trying to understand what was being proposed because of the poor quality of the information provided - often without any understanding the significance of what will happen to them once the scheme is in place.</p> <div data-bbox="1121 1640 1418 1850"> </div> <div data-bbox="1507 1633 1792 1927"> </div> <div data-bbox="2089 1640 2457 1969"> </div>

19	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>We wish to object to the Milton Road Residents Parking Scheme and the Traffic Regulation Order which proposes to exclude the North side of Arbury Road.</p> <p>We live on the North side of Arbury Road, [REDACTED] We have lived here since [REDACTED] and have always parked our cars opposite in Leys Road. We have never been made aware of any problem with this situation. The community here manages the parking themselves and fit the parking around the cars as required. There are no painted white boxes designating a parking space, which enables cars to fit in as required.</p> <p>Why is this proposal going ahead which appears to be causing problems where there are none at present?</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead we will have nowhere to park our car. Also, the result will be that we are left without services, as no business/trades people will have anywhere to park to carry out work on our property. How will they have access to their equipment?</p> <p>From a medical perspective. How will doctors, nurses, therapists and carers be able to visit our houses, with their required equipment, as nowhere within the vicinity to park?</p> <p>From a social perspective, friends and family will be unable to park to visit us. Some may be disabled!! How will they visit?</p> <p>To be outside the parking scheme is an impossible situation to be in and we are being penalised. This is against the stated purpose of the Milton Road Area Residents Scheme, which according to The Statement Of Reason Document, published to support the Traffic Regulation Order is "to prioritise on street parking for residents and in particular those with little or no off road parking available."</p> <p>I have previously mentioned we have a front garden, which at present is an eco-habitat. Of course we could dig up and concrete and create a driveway, but greenery is protective against flooding, which will be needed in the future. The trees, shrubs, bushes and grass of the garden help to mitigate the damage caused by traffic fumes and particulates. This Parking Permit Policy is counterproductive to the green agenda.</p> <p>Would you mind sending the document to all the relevant parties that you have mentioned?</p>
20	06/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>There has been very little meaningful communication on this matter. Every time I try to log on to the suggested websites they either crash or just don't work.</p> <p>I've never had a problem with unwanted parked cars on my area of Arbury Road and feel this proposal of double yellow lines, yes, I managed to find out that information on 'ask the police' website, will not be beneficial, or the residents parking permits.</p> <p>Why do the residents of odd numbers on Arbury Road need parking permits when the residents opposite do not?</p> <p>Why are the yellow lines only along parts of Arbury Road and Maio Road?</p> <p>Also, why does driving over the path on to a property cause an offence but if there is a lowered kerb it does not? It's still the same path.</p> <p>If I have any of this wrong it's because the information given is not clear and has to be second guessed.</p>
21	11/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>Arbury Road East has been included in your proposed Residents' Parking Scheme for Milton Road Area, and you have given its residents details of the proposed scheme and a (rather short) period of time for us to consider the scheme and comment.</p> <p>My first comment must be that there has been a lack of care and clarity in the whole way this scheme has been drawn up and presented to those it most concerns. The map you sent round was totally inadequate and when thanks to Arbury Road East Residents Association (ARERA) you issued a revised map it was still confusing and inaccurate as to the current situation re parking (dropped kerbs etc), eg [REDACTED] Arbury Road shows "existing access" to be through a brick wall.</p> <p>NB Residents were not properly informed that there was a second map.</p> <p>Secondly and most importantly the scheme itself is in no way a Residents' scheme, how can it be? It shows no regard whatsoever for those of us who live and/or work here - the actual residents. The following points summarise my objections to the proposed scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it dismisses one side of the road completely, leaving at least one property with nowhere in the vicinity to park; by dividing the road in such a way you destroy community, - it greatly reduces the amount of parking space for residents with not enough bays and too many yellow lines, and adds confusion and potential danger for all traffic. Residents who can currently expect to park within reasonable distance of their homes, under your scheme will struggle to do so, - it pays no heed to the businesses at the start of the road, which should be provided with some form of parking bay to allow them to flourish and continue serving the neighborhood. <p>Thirdly the proposed provision for cyclists is woefully inadequate and would if anything create even more dangerous conditions than does the present lack of a cycleway.</p> <p>We have lived at [REDACTED] Arbury Road since [REDACTED] we have seen an increase in traffic over the years but only since the traffic mismanagement by Greater Cambridge Partnership during the closure of inbound Histon Road has Arbury Road East been subjected to so much traffic including HGVs and to a huge increase in the concomitant problems of pollution, speeding, house shaking. Should there be an interest in the welfare of the residents of this corner of Cambridge, then those in power should turn their attention to dealing with our real problem, the overuse of our road by non local traffic.</p> <p>Parking itself has not been a real problem for Arbury Road East: your proposed scheme would do us much more harm than good.</p>

22	18/03/2024	Business		Wholly Object	<p>I firstly note that we have received no official notification of this, [REDACTED]. I understand this is because the north side of Arbury Road is not considered to be included in the scheme? It again appears that the Council has informed, and consulted with, only those who would benefit from, and not with those who would suffer the consequences of, the scheme.</p> <p>The fact that we are 'not included' seems to mean also that we won't be able to apply for a resident's parking permit on the road on which we have residential property, nor for a visitor's permit for occasional visitors that exceed on-site parking capacity. I therefore object to this TRO on the basis that as residents on the street, we should have the same access to permits as residents on the south side of the street.</p> <p>[REDACTED] however staff need to park to [REDACTED] work and there is no mechanism [REDACTED] to apply for a permit for staff to park on the street. [REDACTED] also have occasional contractors on site who need to park, while still allowing customer parking for the [REDACTED] and as such would like to be able to apply for a visitor's permit and this seems not possible. I therefore also object to this TRO on the basis that insufficient regard has been given to existing, longstanding businesses operating on the north side of the road, to provide sufficient parking for staff and contractors, and that we are also again unfairly blocked from applying for parking permits.</p> <p>At the least the proposed scheme – should it be to proceed – should include all the residents of the road it affects, and not unfairly just include those living on one side of the road to be able to receive benefits, and those on the other side excluded from any benefits and furthermore to have to suffer the consequences as both residential property owners and business operators. However I feel even with this, insufficient regard has been given to business needs for parking, and as such the scheme should not proceed.</p>
23	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed parking scheme that affects us on Arbury Rd. If implemented we may have real trouble parking, as will any visitors.</p> <p>I live at xx Arbury Rd - the side of the road which seems to be arbitrarily excluded. The proposal looks to be unfair.</p> <p>There seems little reason to implement the scheme. Rather, something should be done about the speeding and idling traffic (and pollution) on the road - which is a real problem that should be fixed. The road is also unsafe for cyclists.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and to object to the proposal.</p> <p>If it does go ahead it should at least use the boundaries for the Milton Road Primary School Catchment that includes our side of the road too.</p>
24	20/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to complain regarding proposed residential parking scheme - Milton road area.</p>
25	11/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I believe one of the stated intentions of your scheme is to "prioritise on-street parking for residents, and particularly those with little or no off-road parking available"</p>
26	03/19/2024 20:46:06 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>In regards to proposal PR0998; I wholly object to this proposal. The presence of paid parking permit in this area. The use of parking permits in this area is unnecessary, as there is often multiple on street car parks available with minimal competition for residents and visitors. Additionally by assigning this as a parking permit area, it will limit families (or people with movement disabilities) being able to access community structures/hubs, as the car parking for these areas is often full. Additionally by extending so far up Arbury road, you are negatively impacting the local business that benefit from people being able to park and quickly buy/purchase things (as their allocated parking is often full). Overall this would not only impact the social and business aspects of the area, but also negatively impact the residents and should not be pursued (especially with the ongoing roadworks in the area that further limit car parking anyway). The basic point of resident parking to <u>make parking more available and easier for residents, along with ensuring adequate space on to allow for emergency passage of vehicles. Paid permit parking would not further either of these</u></p>
27	03/21/2024 10:59:16 +00:00	Resident	Safety	Wholly Object	<p>Ref PR0998.</p> <p>Chantry Close is an unadopted private close off Chesterton Hall Crescent with ten residential homes. We object on two grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) You have not included the ability for Chantry Close residents to purchase residential permits. Chantry Close residents and their visitors regularly need to park in Chesterton Hall Crescent so need to be offered residential permits as part of the scheme. 2) Chantry Close already suffers from people such as tradesmen parking in our driveway when Chesterton Hall Crescent is full. They routinely park partially on the pavement of our driveway and prevent access to emergency vehicles. We suspect this problem will worsen with the proposed parking scheme and counter-propose that if the scheme proceeds then budget should be added to erect bollards or a railing on the kerbside down Chantry Close to prevent people parking partially on the pavement and creating a significant safety issue.

28	09/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to express my vehement objection to the Council's current proposal to impose discriminatory parking restrictions on residents of the northern side of Arbury Road, Cambridge. This ill-considered plan not only lacks fairness and equity but also demonstrates a blatant disregard for the welfare of our community.</p> <p>The inherent injustice of this proposal is glaringly evident: while some residents are granted protected, exclusive parking rights directly outside their homes, others are unfairly burdened with restrictive measures that severely impact their ability to park nearby. Such a biased approach to parking management is morally indefensible and potentially illegal.</p> <p>Of particular concern is the evident targeting of elderly residents in Havenfield. It is no secret that these proposed restrictions will disproportionately affect older members of our community, who may rely on their vehicles for essential transportation. Despite repeated objections and clear evidence highlighting the discriminatory nature of these regulations, the Council has chosen to turn a blind eye to the plight of our elderly residents. This constitutes a clear case of age discrimination, and the Council cannot feign ignorance of this fact.</p> <p>Furthermore, the manner in which objections have been handled underscores the undemocratic nature of this proposal. Many valid concerns raised by residents have been disregarded or dismissed without proper consideration, denying affected individuals the opportunity to have their voices heard. Such procedural irregularities not only undermine the principles of democracy but also raise serious legal concerns under the Equality Act of 2010.</p> <p>In light of these issues, I urge the Council to halt its current plans and engage in meaningful dialogue with the community to develop fair and inclusive parking policies that benefit all residents. It is imperative that any future decisions prioritize the well-being and rights of vulnerable populations, including the elderly. Failure to do so would not only be a grave injustice but also a dereliction of duty on the part of the Council.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I trust that the Council will act in the best interests of our community and rectify this unjust situation promptly.</p>
29	04/09/2024 13:01:34 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Chesterton Road is not included in either the De Freville or Milton Road parking schemes. We and/or our visitors will be unable to park in either area should it be required, as the schemes are not adjacent. I have been informed that the double yellow lines will also prohibit parking on the wide pavement outside our house, as we currently do, which is necessary for tradesmen visiting the property/</p>
30	04/06/2024 17:27:37 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>With this proposal, I could no longer park my car! Where would I park my car to walk to my house?</p>
31	07/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am very concerned that the north side of Chesterton Road appears to have been excluded in your deliberations. You will be aware that because of the continuous yellow line along the entire stretch of Chesterton Road in both lanes there is no parking provision over 24 hours for the residents of Chesterton Road who were also overlooked when the DeFreville scheme was implemented. The information that you now provide indicates that we will not even be eligible to purchase parking permits for the scheme as we are not covered in the specific roads you have identified as eligible.</p> <p>I am [REDACTED] living on Chesterton Road and [REDACTED] visits from my family [REDACTED]. There is also the matter of parking provision as and when I require services from tradespeople.</p> <p>I am requesting that you consider adjusting the scheme to serve the residents along Chesterton Road, possibly to move the boundary so that it becomes adjacent to the DeFreville parking permit boundary. It is difficult for me to understand the thinking behind your decision to exclude these residents whether deliberately or by an oversight.</p> <p>I would welcome a response from you before I am obliged to take the matter further.</p>
32	04/08/2024 08:44:09 +01:00	Resident	Access	Wholly Object	<p>[REDACTED] Were this scheme to be brought in, it would mean, if we were to go out during those hours we might have to park some distance away. Currently we have to park in Oak Tree Ave, opposite our house as we cannot park [REDACTED]. As Oak Tree is not in the scheme I fear many current customers of Stir who "clog up" Hawthorn Way when it's open will go across to Oak Tree and we will be imprisoned in our house during those hours! Stir is usually at its busiest during the proposed hours - strangely?!</p>
33	04/11/2024 09:21:49 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>We object to this proposal in principle for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The status quo is not, from our point of view, problematic. [REDACTED] at Hertford St. in a controlled zone the parking in the area proposed is no more difficult. Given the overall reduction in number of spaces it is hard to see how this scheme is going to improve matters. 2) The scheme does not appear to give consideration for the narrow nature of the streets in this area, inflexible general policies have been applied without due consideration to this resulting in a sub-standard scheme. 3) There is currently a reasonably good chance of being able to park outside one's own home. This will be degraded resulting in it no longer being viable to install EV charging facilities (this is getting increasingly common and particularly beneficial when backed with Solar PV / battery systems) and being problematic for anyone with mobility impairment insufficient to acquire a blue badge dedicated parking space (particularly pertinent to visitors). 4) The plan as shown does not appear to show the disabled parking bays already present on George St.
34	04/10/2024 15:11:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>The decision to substantially reduce parking in Herbert Street will force many cars from there onto other streets within the scheme. This means the whole scheme is flawed, it will cause problems on every street involved as a large number of cars now need to find parking outside Herbert Street. As a long-term resident of George Street, it is always difficult to find parking and I believe that the new scheme as proposed will make things substantially worse.</p>
35	03/21/2024 20:18:00 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>We are [REDACTED] and rely on vehicles as transport for [REDACTED] the number of permits per house would not match the number of occupants that have cars, which was a benefit of moving to this road.</p>
36	04/11/2024 09:32:21 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>After taking into account off street parking availability there will be an insufficient number of bays for resident's vehicles at all times; because the restricted period is 09:30 to 15:00, I do not believe the overall situation will be improved.</p>
37	04/11/2024 23:06:07 +01:00	Resident	Access	Wholly Object	<p>I object to the scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A number of houses on George St and Chesterton Rd have off-street parking accessed via a very narrow entrance lane off George St. This is an extremely tight 90° turn off a very narrow single-lane street, so that significant clearance is required around the entrance. The entrance is frequently obstructed by cars parked on George St; in such cases, the back-up option, when we are unable to access our off-street parking, has been to park instead on the street (obviously undesirable as this unnecessary reduces available on-street parking spaces). With residents' parking, this back-up alternative will no longer be possible (unless we also pay for permits that we don't need), and parking on neighbouring streets won't be possible either (all will be within the RPS). Therefore it's essential that any scheme includes improved markings and enforcement to prevent obstruction of the entrances to off-street parking; this probably means an extended set of double-yellow lines around the lane entrance. We have raised this issue via our Councillor but no resolution has yet been forthcoming. A solution needs to be in place before any RPS can be introduced. (2) The loss of around half the parking spaces on Herbert St will mean that parking will be also full on the neighbouring streets in the RPS due to overspill from Herbert St. Given that parking is already tight, this seems like a major flaw in the scheme. (Once again, this reinforces the point that we need to make sure that all residents with off-street parking are able to use it, and encouraged to do so, to reduce demand for on-street parking - see item (1) above).

38	09/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I object to the planned Resident Parking Scheme for the Milton Road area which includes the road I live on (George Street) on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The vast majority of time George Street is only full in the evenings not during the daytime during which the scheme operates. Therefore the parking scheme will have no effect on the availability of parking for residents. 2.There is no mention of parking for local small business owners who find George Street a helpful place to be able to park. 3.The scheme proposes 3 cars per residence: the only possible benefit of this scheme is to encourage people to have fewer cars and the provision of 3 cars does not do this. In addition, this seems to be weighted in favour of wealthy residents who can afford the extra charges. 4.The scheme adds an extra charge ('tax') to living in George Street and, as detailed above, there will be no benefit as a result for George Street residents and again those with lower incomes a larger percentage of their income than wealthier residents. <p>In general, I also object because there is no visibility about how the council expects this to form part of an active transport plan for the area or the city as a whole. In addition, it provides no solution to the issue that there are simply too many cars that people expect to be able to park in the city. One solution to this would be to provide secure parking in an area outside the city and a longer running park and ride scheme enabling people to drop their cars off and get the bus to their houses.</p>
39	03/21/2024 21:51:06 +00:00	Business	Parking	Wholly Object	Restricted parking will have a detrimental effect on our business.
40	03/18/2024 20:54:53 +00:00	Resident	Financial	Wholly Object	I live in Hawthorn way, I am completely against the proposal. The parking by commuters, customers and clients in my street is awful. But never in my [REDACTED] of residence have not had space to park. I have only ever had my drive way blocked once. But that was in contravention of existing road markings. I appreciate the amenities that exist on this road and know the price to pay is increased traffic. Should the parking charge come in to force, the cafe, yoga studios, shop, schools, charity centres will be effected. This could lead to closure and then render the need for permit parking unnecessary, but leave me with the expense. More of a pressing concern, although once again not detrimental, is the closing of the road for the half marathon. The ongoing road works on milton road, the condition of the road. Please don't introduce this to a social housing street mixed street.
41	03/18/2024 20:50:37 +00:00	Resident	Financial	Wholly Object	I believe the consultation to be ridiculous given the increases to council tax (50% over the last 10 years) and the state of Cambridges roads. The country is facing a cost of living crisis and the councils response is to tax its residents to park outside their own homes.
42	04/11/2024 20:18:17 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Objections against residential parking scheme (Chesterton Road , Hawthorn way) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)Local social centres (Stir, Yoga, Polonia, Spar) attract people for socialization. The arrive from outside of Cambridge to enjoy communication. It is vitally important after long pandemic period and in time of economical slow down. Residential parking scheme in local area (Hawthorn way) will significantly hurt to this vitally important for people of Cambridgeshire social activity. 2)Local small businesses (Stir, Yoga, Polonia, Spar) will be significantly damaged by that residential parking scheme as will lose easy accessibility , which exist due to free parking. That will diminish payments they do to city and that is used for the benefits of city. 3)The local free parking places are usually occupied for a short time and residents anyway can park after parking place is freed. 4)Cambridge is diamond in British history. It is vitally important to provide easy access to it historical and cultural treasury to support intellectual and cultural growth of British nation. It is vitally important to provide affordable parking close to centre, as it already done in Ely, to facilitate young families to involve their young children in getting the British historical and cultural life. Free parking close to Cambridge centre and absence of residential parking scheme servers to this Great goal.
43	04/12/2024 19:04:10 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>This proposal does not solve the problems that the parking causes and just taxes residents to be able to park where it was free before. The main issues around parking occur because people drive to visit the cafe on weekends between 08:00 and 14:00 or the yoga studio on weekday evenings. There are some issues on weekdays but this is generally the time when there is little to no activity from residents. Also, this reduces the ability for residents to have regular visitors without paying for extra visitor permits and being able to park in front of your own drive (as there will be "H" markings).</p> <p>As a resident, if I am going to be charged for parking on my own street, I want to be guaranteed a space every time I return home, which this will not do.</p>
44	04/11/2024 10:00:20 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	The modifications to the proposal since the consultation have not changed its severely negative effects for residents of Herbert Street and Springfield Road. The ability to park within half a mile of home does nothing to address the following: inadequate accessibility for vulnerable residents, those with mobility problems, and carers; electric car charging from home on the 'no parking' side of the streets becomes impossible; with residents almost none of whom commute to work by car, the limited spaces will remain full during the day, giving no access for tradespeople -- who will as a result refuse work on these streets. These and other significant problems for these residents considerably outweigh any benefits of the proposal.
45	04/10/2024 23:22:17 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>TRO PRO998 Milton Road Area Cambridge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction of spaces in Herbert Street and Springfield road leaves a deficit of about 30 spaces -where are these cars to park? Parking in other parts of controlled area could result in a long walk. [REDACTED] 2. Suggested that residents will be able to apply for up to 3 permits per eligible households - if households have more than 1 vehicle in regular use, this would exacerbate the situation even further. 3. As both roads consist of terraced houses, with residents parking on one side of the road only, residents on the other side would not be able to access car charging points installed in their own home. Cost of using other sources of charging would be much more expensive .and not accessible if charging required overnight for example. 4. For residents working unsocial hours which requires them to use their car late at night or in hours of darkness, having to walk longer distances to get to or from their car could put them at risk, especially women on their own. I know at least one resident who would often be in this situation.
46	04/11/2024 21:20:04 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Proposal does not accommodate parking for residents in the area. Whilst understanding the need to discourage non residents from parking, this will only exacerbate the situation for current residents.</p> <p>The scheme wholly underestimates the needed parking to the proposed amounts of parking to Herbert street and Springfield road residents in particular. Our road is regularly used by residents on adjoining road who also have limited parking already.</p>
47	04/10/2024 16:59:53 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	Like most of my neighbours, I am very unhappy with the proposal to remove so many existing parking places in Herbert Street. We depend on these places to park near our homes, to receive visitors, who will not know the surrounding area, and most especially to accommodate tradesmen -- plumbers, electricians, decorators, piano tuners and many more -- who need to park close by, needing access to their tools. In practice, builders and others will have to park in Herbert Street to unload tools and materials, so they may as well be allowed to stay there, occupying the currently available space on both sides of the street. The drastic reduction in parking space proposed is quite unnecessary and will cause very significant problems for residents. Please accommodate us by adopting a more flexible approach. It is unlawful to apply a general policy without consideration of special circumstances applicable to the particular case: the existence of a standard policy is no excuse for ignoring our request for flexibility.

48	04/11/2024 21:39:19 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Dear Cambridgeshire County Council:</p> <p>██████████ moved to Herbert Street (house #xx) in ██████████. We love Herbert St, and Cambridge in general. Among the many aspects we enjoy of our neighborhood, we appreciate the access to parking on our street, and as we were assured by ██████████, we have fine-tuned our parallel parking skills. It's come to our attention that the previously rejected plan to implement a Residents Parking Scheme with reduced parking to only one side of the street, is being considered again. We strongly oppose changes from the status quo that would result in considerably reducing the number of available parking spaces.</p> <p>While we understand the concerns about access to the street, we think that in practical terms they are entirely removed from reality and do not take into consideration the lived experience of residents. If the council is set on making changes, we propose the following:</p> <p>1.)Address the choke point at the bottom of Herbert Street. On the east side of the street, in front of house #6. Here the street becomes narrower. The occasional choke point could be resolved by extending the double yellow some 6-18 feet (effectively reducing by one car length). ██████████ with a window that looks out directly on this choke point. I feel as well qualified as anyone in terms of observing the day-to-day traffic and occurrences at this spot. Slightly extending the double yellow line will resolve this minor issue.</p> <p>2.)Retractable bollards by the Co-Op: This would allow additional access for emergency vehicles if it were ever necessary.</p> <p>Please do NOT reduce the parking to just one side of the street.</p> <p>Our primary objections (although this full list is much longer) are:</p> <p>1.)Halving the number of available spots is impractical: We ██████████ the home with the understanding that the street was narrow but it had roughly the number of parking spaces equal to the number of houses on the street. There are 56 homes on Herbert Street, and approximately 60 parking spaces. Reducing this to half, by restricting parking on one side of the street will create <u>chaos, parking animosity, and extremely unnecessary inconveniences. Why create a problem where there is not one?</u></p> <p>2.)Access to elders and young parents: If elders have to walk to park on other streets because they can't find parking on their own street, not only does it create the massive inconvenience of driving down and back up Herbert St., unsuccessfully looking for a spot to then circle to another street... but they then have to walk potentially several streets to get home. This is the same for young parents. If ██████████, and we've just gone to the shops, how are we supposed to safely carry the items and ██████████ from another street? This could create a massive safety and inconvenience issue involving multiple repeat trips back and forth from the car to our house, carrying ██████████ in one hand and the items in the other.</p> <p>3.)Timing for residents parking: The proposed 9:30am-3pm. This would only minorly reduce non-resident or commuter parking. It ends too early to ensure parking for residents who are returning from work or picking up children at school. In short, it further adds to a potential problem, where one does not currently exist.</p> <p>Please do not make changes to Herbert Street which will reduce the number of parking spaces currently available (aside from the one choke point mentioned above).</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>House ██████████</p>
49	03/25/2024 12:09:06 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed changes to parking on Herbert Street, in which I have lived for ██████████. During that time, I have had numerous conversations with representatives from successive incarnations of the County Council, all of whom have ignored the direct experience of Herbert Street residents with regard to the practicalities of parking on the street. This has resulted over the years in a number of entirely impractical proposals for changes to the parking provision. This latest proposal is no different and again threatens to inconvenience greatly Herbert Street residents who wish to park their cars on their own street.</p> <p>To anyone living on Herbert Street, it is clear that the existing number of parking spaces is almost precisely sufficient to accommodate all the cars of its residents. This would be an ideal situation were it not for the fact that a large number of non-residents also use the street to park every day, both on weekdays and at weekends, in order either to visit or work in the shops around Mitcham's Corner, or even to visit the city centre. This leads to a considerable shortfall in parking spaces for residents typically during the hours 8am-6pm. Moreover, any difficulties in accessing Herbert Street usually occur due to inconsiderate or incompetent parking that is invariably caused by non-residents, who either do not know the road well enough to avoid the single 'pinch point', or have insufficiently honed parallel-parking skills, which are typically only acquired by actually living on the street.</p> <p>Having mentioned the pinch point, it is worth briefly pointing out in passing that every case that I have ever witnessed where access to the full length of Herbert Street has been compromised has occurred because a non-resident has parked at some distance from the kerb in the last available parking place before the start of the double yellow lines just outside Number 6. If the double yellow lines here were simply extended to remove just this one space, the access problems on Herbert Street would be reduced to those that occur on many other narrow streets in Cambridge, and would be the result primarily of Amazon or supermarket deliver vans being parked in the middle of the street for an extended period with their hazard lights flashing. I have mentioned this cheap and simple solution for resolving the access issue to numerous council representatives over many years, but they have all predictably ignored the suggestion, believing that they know better how to solve Herbert Street's access problems than someone with over two decades' direct experience of them.</p> <p>Aside from the depressingly predictable access issue outlined above, I have never witnessed any other problem regarding access in Herbert Street, either for bin collections or emergency services. The bin lorry is backed all the way down the street to Number 6 each week (with admirable expertise, one has to admit) and the bins are collected without incident. I have personally witnessed the successful arrival of fire engines all the way down the street to Number 6 to put out a fire in its kitchen. I have also seen numerous ambulances and police cars navigate the full length of the street without any problems. I therefore do not consider the issue of access for bin collections and the emergency services to be a relevant consideration in any way whatsoever.</p>

					<p>Given the above observations, it is clear that the ideal solution for parking in Herbert Street is the introduction of a residents' parking scheme that preserves all the spaces on both side of the street, apart from the single space just outside Number 6, as mentioned above. Notwithstanding the fact that bin lorries and emergency vehicles can and do traverse the full length of Herbert Street on a regular basis, it is my understanding that concerns about such access, which are alleged to arise from the narrowness of the street, mean that the councils own rules prevent it from marking out residents' parking bays on both sides of the street. Setting aside the illogic of such Kafkaesque reasoning, an alternative solution to providing residents-only parking on both sides of Herbert Street, which does not break the council's own rules, would be to make the street a Permit Parking Area (PPA), as is the current proposal for George Street. Since, at its narrowest point, the width of George Street between its single row of parked cars and the opposite kerb is narrower than the space between the two rows of parked cars on Herbert Street (apart from at the 'pinch point' discussed above; I have measure this - perhaps you should too), then the argument regarding access cannot be relevant to the decision by the council not to allow Herbert Street also to be a PPA. What, then, is the reason for this decision? Could you please enlighten us?</p> <p>What the currently proposed scheme instead advocates is the unnecessary removal of more than half of the existing parking spaces on Herbert Street, with no parking at all on the even side. This reduction will lead to substantial inconvenience for residents of the street, who will, on average, be forced after every other journey to seek alternative parking on 'adjacent' streets, many of which are, in fact, quite some distance away. This will be especially problematic for the more elderly residents of Herbert Street, of which there are many, who moved into their houses with the expectation that they could park on their own street. Moreover, with an eye on the future, how will residents on the even side of Herbert Street be expected to home-charge electric vehicles if all the parking spaces are only on the odd side of the street? I very much doubt that the access issues which seem so important to the County Council will be improved by residents lying electrical cables across the street.</p> <p>A further serious failing of the proposed scheme is that residents parking is provided only during the hours of 9.30am-3.00pm. The end of this period is far too early for it to be of any practical use whatsoever. At the very least, this period should be extended to 6.00pm (better still 8.00pm) to allow for residents to return from work, or from picking up children from school, and have a chance of finding a parking space before non-residents are able to park. Given the large number of shops, wine bars, public houses and restaurants on Mitcham's Corner, allowing non-residents to park from 3pm is an open invitation to them to drive into the city, thereby causing noise and pollution, to park in the Ascham parking zone for free in order to visit Mitcham's Corner or even the centre of the city during from late afternoon onwards. If the proposed residents-only parking hours of 9.30am-3pm were to be combined with a reduction by one-half in the spaces in Herbert Street, it is unlikely that residents returning from work or the school-run will ever be able to find a parking space in their own street. For all the above reasons, the proposed scheme is therefore unacceptable, particularly given the alternatives available, such as instituting a PPA. Indeed, the proposed scheme constitutes a considerable worsening of the parking situation relative to the status quo, which would be preferable to the proposed changes despite still allowing non-residents also to park in the street. I therefore implore the County Council to reconsider these proposals, which constitute the imposition of the will of a few remote County Councillors, who know nothing of the practicalities of parking on Herbert Street, on the lives of its residents. These proposals will severely and adversely affect the daily lives of people living in Herbert Street and should not be allowed to proceed.</p>
50	04/12/2024 17:39:42 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Dear Cambridgeshire County Council,</p> <p>I am contacting you to object in the strongest possible terms to your proposals to introduce a residents' parking scheme for Herbert Street. The plans will inconvenience Herbert Street residents who want to park their cars on their own street and will add stress and anxiety especially for more elderly residents [REDACTED] [REDACTED] expected to be able to park close to where I live and this proposal is therefore very worrying.</p> <p>In your document entitled 'PR0998 Statement of Reasons' you state that the Authority's reasons for proposing to make the above named Order(s) are:</p> <p>i. For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). ii. For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.</p> <p>The proposals do not achieve these aims and indeed make the current situation far, far worse. There are many reasons why so many residents such as myself are in despair about these proposals including the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Loss of parking for those residents who offer critical services. · This reduction will lead to substantial inconvenience for residents of the street, who will, on average, be forced after every other journey to seek alternative parking on streets some distance away. This will be especially problematic for the more elderly residents of Herbert Street, of which there are many, who moved into their houses with the expectation that they could park on their own street. · We shall have to pay a fee with no guarantee of a parking space. · Electrical work has only just been completed for the building of charging points for electric cars in the future – how will this work with the proposals? It may actually be impractical on the evens side as you would need to run a cable across the street even if you could get a space.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Will simply shift problems for parking elsewhere. I understand that County policy says that the design of resident zones must avoid cars relocating nearby: this obviously fails that test. · Parking capacity will be inadequate (loss of more than half of the current parking spaces). · Residents may not use their cars for fear of losing their parking space. · An alternative solution to providing residents-only parking on both sides of Herbert Street, which does not break the Council's own rules, would be to make the street a Permit Parking Area (PPA), as is the current proposal for George Street. At its narrowest point, the width of George Street between its single row of parked cars and the opposite kerb is narrower than the space between the two rows of parked cars on Herbert Street. Is PPA not a possibility and if not why not? · It should be obvious to anyone considering the proposals that residents of Herbert Street will be affected more than anyone. Yet the direct experience of Herbert Street residents with regard to the practicalities of parking on the street has not been sought. We have many useful suggestions to offer and would welcome a dialogue. · There are a large number of non-residents who also use the street to park every day, both on weekdays and at weekends. This leads to a considerable shortfall in parking spaces for residents typically during the hours 8am-6pm. A serious failing of the proposed scheme is that residents parking is provided only during the hours of 9.30am-3.00pm. The end of this period is far too early for it to be of any practical use. At the very least, this period should be extended to 6.00pm or later to allow for residents to return from work etc and have a chance of finding a parking space before non-residents are able to park. · If the double yellow lines here were simply extended (in front of number 6) to remove one space, the access problems on Herbert Street would be reduced significantly. Access in Herbert Street, either for bin collections or emergency services is achieved currently and bin lorries even reversed all the way down the street to Number 6 each week. I understand that during a previous consultation fire services have also supported the introduction of access via collapsible bollards at the end of the street. · By removing parked cars on one side of the street it is likely vehicle speed will increase, leading to more noise for residents living on a quiet street and danger to pedestrians and cyclists. · Putting parking bays along the even side of Herbert Street would accommodate several more cars than on the odd side. But for some inexplicable reason it has been decided have bays on the odd side only. <p>Residents will suffer greatly if this inconsiderate proposal is allowed to progress in its current state. The proposals will make daily life more stressful and difficult for people living in Herbert Street and should not be allowed to proceed.</p>
51	10/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I am contacting you to object in the strongest possible terms to your proposals to introduce a residents' parking scheme for Herbert Street. The plans will inconvenience Herbert Street residents who want to park their cars on their own street and will add stress and anxiety especially for more elderly residents [REDACTED] expected to be able to park close to where I live and this proposal is therefore very worrying.</p> <p>In your document entitled 'PR0998 Statement of Reasons' you state that the Authority's reasons for proposing to make the above named Order(s) are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs. <p>The proposals do not achieve these aims and indeed make the current situation far, far worse. There are many reasons why so many residents such as myself are in despair about these proposals including the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Loss of parking for those residents who offer critical services. · This reduction will lead to substantial inconvenience for residents of the street, who will, on average, be forced after every other journey to seek alternative parking on streets some distance away. This will be especially problematic for the more elderly residents of Herbert Street, of which there are many, who moved into their houses with the expectation that they could park on their own street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We shall have to pay a fee with no guarantee of a parking space. · Electrical work has only just been completed for the building of charging points for electric cars in the future – how will this work with the proposals? It may actually be impractical on the even side as you would need to run a cable across the street even if you could get a space. · Will simply shift problems for parking elsewhere. I understand that County policy says that the design of resident zones must avoid cars relocating nearby: this obviously fails that test. · Parking capacity will be inadequate (loss of more than half of the current parking spaces). · Residents may not use their cars for fear of losing their parking space. · An alternative solution to providing residents-only parking on both sides of Herbert Street, which does not break the Council's own rules, would be to make the street a Permit Parking Area (PPA), as is the current proposal for George Street. At its narrowest point, the width of George Street between its single row of parked cars and the opposite kerb is narrower than the space between the two rows of parked cars on Herbert Street. Is PPA not a possibility and if not why not? · It should be obvious to anyone considering the proposals that residents of Herbert Street will be affected more than anyone. Yet the direct experience of Herbert Street residents with regard to the practicalities of parking on the street has not been sought. We have many useful suggestions to offer and would welcome a dialogue. · There are a large number of non-residents who also use the street to park every day, both on weekdays and at weekends. This leads to a considerable shortfall in parking spaces for residents typically during the hours 8am-6pm. A serious failing of the proposed scheme is that residents parking is provided only during the hours of 9.30am-3.00pm. The end of this period is far too early for it to be of any practical use. At the very least, this period should be extended to 6.00pm or later to allow for residents to return from work etc and have a chance of finding a parking space before non-residents are able to park. · If the double yellow lines here were simply extended (in front of number 6) to remove one space, the access problems on Herbert Street would be reduced significantly. Access in Herbert Street, either for bin collections or emergency services is achieved currently and bin lorries even reversed all the way down the street to Number 6 each week. I understand that during a previous consultation fire services have also supported the introduction of access via collapsible bollards at the end of the street. · By removing parked cars on one side of the street it is likely vehicle speed will increase, leading to more noise for residents living on a quiet street and danger to pedestrians and cyclists. · Putting parking bays along the even side of Herbert Street would accommodate several more cars than on the odd side. But for some inexplicable reason it has been decided have bays on the odd side only. <p>Residents will suffer greatly if this inconsiderate proposal is allowed to progress in its current state. The proposals will make daily life more stressful and difficult for people living in Herbert Street and should not be allowed to proceed.</p>
52	29/03/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I wrote earlier to express my objections to the proposals for making Herbert St CB4 "1 side only parking". I understand that many of my neighbours have submitted similar objections, and many more will do so before the deadline. Please STOP this plan. It's nonsensical. It will benefit nobody other than people who chose to dump their cars in Herbert St to head off into Cambridge. All residents will be massively disadvantaged - quite a few are stressed out and thinking of selling - their family won't be able to get a space to visit, and they themselves will have to walk back to their homes, having (if lucky) found a space at a distant street. PLEASE STOP THIS PROPOSAL NOW. -as a matter of urgency, safety and wellbeing for all residents of Herbert St.</p>

53	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>Finding a parking space in Herbert Street is often difficult, and has been for many years. You only need to visit the street or try and park your car here to find out. When residents' parking was first suggested I imagined that it would provide adequate parking spaces for all residents in the street that have cars. Some properties may have more than one car if the property is divided into flats. The proposal would provide less than half the parking spaces that we currently have because parking will only be permitted on one side of the street. There will be even fewer places available because parking on Milton Road has been removed to make way for the cycle ways.</p> <p>I have been told that residents would be able to park in other streets that are part of the 'Ascham' zone. [REDACTED] She may not finish a shift until 9 or 10pm, or later if she has to go to a [REDACTED]. She can not be expected to try and find a place on some other street (e.g. Gurney Way) and walk home to Herbert Street in the dark at that time of night. There are often suspicious people hanging around the back of the Co-op or the alleys at the other end of the street. Making her park elsewhere is a potential safety issue for her. It is too far for her to cycle to work and back (especially in cold/bad weather) and she can not be expected to travel on the bus on her own late at night.</p> <p>I don't believe that there would be adequate parking elsewhere for the spaces lost on Herbert Street. It would be difficult for residents to carry their supermarket shopping all the way from Gurney Way or Chesterton Hall Crescent to Herbert Street especially if they are older or if they have small children.</p> <p>The bin lorries manage to come down the street although it can be tight at the Milton Road end, perhaps a couple of parking spaces could be lost on that corner to make things easier, but not loosing half of the parking spaces as suggested in the proposal.</p> <p>The residents' parking in the De Freville area is 9am to 5pm, but that does not help residents who need a place to park when they come home from work.</p> <p>I find the proposal completely unacceptable, and I believe that most residents would agree. It would make what is already a difficult situation significantly worse and we will have to pay for it. Who will benefit from these proposed changes, certainly not us. Why can we not have residents' parking on both sides of the street? I understand that there may be rules, but surely exceptions can be made if the changes are detrimental to residents. We have lived in our house on Herbert Street [REDACTED] and there has always been parking on both sides. Although the current situation is not ideal it would be far better than the proposed changes. Please keep things as they are, or provide residents' parking on both sides of the street.</p>
54	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I would like to register my disquiet with the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme update for Milton Road area, Hurst Park Estate, and neighbouring streets, particularly with reference to Herbert Street and Springfield Road.</p> <p>It is generally expected that Residents' Parking schemes improve the lives of residents, but this proposal does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Herbert Street has sufficient parking for residents within its current configuration. At present, non-resident commuters hover in their cars in the mornings to take up spaces during the day to go to work, or even park longterm to go away on holiday, so to eliminate this aspect through a residents' only scheme would be an advantage. However, to remove half of the spaces at a swoop creates a huge headache for residents, and merely pushes the problem out to another area. * Most residents live in Herbert Street to take advantage of the ability to walk or cycle, and reduce car use. However, there are times when a car is vital, such as mothers with small children who have to shop, people who are very ill or with mobility issues, shift workers returning late at night, presenting safety issues in a phase when current public transport is inadequate or not feasible. To penalise residents is a poor strategy in the quest to reduce car use in Cambridge. * The proposed timing of the scheme from 0930-1500 hours is illogical and does not help residents at all. It should be extended to mirror schemes elsewhere in Cambridge, i.e. 0800-1800hrs, or 0900-1700hrs, to offer residents the ability to park outside these hours easily. * There is no detailing of how compliance with the proposed scheme would be implemented - to date, a traffic warden is never seen in Herbert Street, and non-residents park carelessly creating pinchpoints and traffic headaches with wearisome frequency. Would the scheme even be effective? * As residents of Herbert Street, [REDACTED] I have attended the Public Consultation and read the Council literature. Along with many others, we have been disheartened by the lack of imagination of how this will affect residents in the area, and inaccurate-looking literature. The Ascham Road scheme was parroted as a local success, but many of the homes in this area have a driveway. In addition, the maps used to denote proposed bay placement etc show bays across driveways in Chesterton Hall Crescent. <p>Please reconsider the details of this drastic scheme,</p>
55	09/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I wish to register my formal objection to the above proposed TRO.</p> <p>I am a resident of Herbert Street where more than half the current number of parking spaces are due to be removed.</p> <p>The proposal will not 'preserve or improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs'. In fact it will do the opposite. It will remove amenities (ie parking) for residents.</p> <p>From what I understand from neighbours there is a groundswell of opinion against the proposal from the very people it is intended to benefit.</p> <p>It seems obvious most car users in Herbert Street will be forced to park some distance away from their homes - something which currently happens to an unlucky minority.</p> <p>How many parking spaces will be available in the whole of the area proposed for the scheme?</p> <p>Does the number accommodate the number of vehicles currently parked within the scheme boundaries?</p> <p>I am astounded that three spaces are to be available per household - given there are around 60 properties in Herbert Street that means around 180 vehicles in theory. Is it confirmed this number of vehicles could be parked daily within the boundaries of the scheme?</p> <p>I believe this scheme to be poorly thought out and to fly in the face of Herbert Street residents. It will make parking and amenities worse for us.</p>
56	31/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I live on Herbert Street, I can't quite see from the drawing of the proposal is limiting parking TO ONE SIDE OF THE STREET ONLY. If this is the case, and if you are allowing residents to be able to have 3 parking permits, then only a few people will ever be able to park.</p> <p>This road is absolutely fine for double parking, the only thing that needs changing is the corner at the top of Herbert street and the narrowing at the bottom. Parking should not be possible there, otherwise, please allow people who live here to be able to park.</p> <p>[REDACTED] the last thing I need is to come home with supplies and not be able to park. I'm not the only person in the road with [REDACTED]</p> <p>Yes, I agree, people who do not live here should not be parking here, but please do not limit our parking to one side of the street only, this would be a disaster.</p>

57	01/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>██████████. We love Herbert St, and Cambridge in general. Among the many aspects we enjoy of our neighborhood, we appreciate the access to parking on our street, and as we were assured by the previous owners, we have fine-tuned our parallel parking skills.</p> <p>It's come to our attention that the previously rejected plan to implement a Residents Parking Scheme with reduced parking to only one side of the street, is being considered again. We strongly oppose changes from the status quo that would result in considerably reducing the number of available parking spaces.</p> <p>While we understand the concerns about access to the street, we think that in practical terms they are entirely removed from reality and do not take into consideration the lived experience of residents. If the council is set on making changes, we propose the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Address the choke point at the bottom of Herbert Street. On the east side of the street, in front of house #6. Here the street becomes narrower. The occasional choke point could be resolved by extending the double yellow some 6-18 feet (effectively reducing by one car length). ██████████ feel as well qualified as anyone in terms of observing the day-to-day traffic and occurrences at this spot. Slightly extending the double yellow line will resolve this minor issue. 2.) Retractable bollards by the Co-Op: This would allow additional access for emergency vehicles if it were ever necessary. Please do NOT reduce the parking to just one side of the street. Our primary objections (although this full list is much longer) are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Halving the number of available spots is impractical: ██████████ with the understanding that the street was narrow but it had roughly the number of parking spaces equal to the number of houses on the street. There are 56 homes on Herbert Street, and approximately 60 parking spaces. Reducing this to half, by restricting parking on one side of the street will create chaos, parking animosity, and extremely unnecessary inconveniences. Why create a problem where there is not one? 2.) Access to elders and young parents: If elders have to walk to park on other streets because they can't find parking on their own street, not only does it create the massive inconvenience of driving down and back up Herbert St., unsuccessfully looking for a spot to then circle to another street.. but they then have to walk potentially several streets to get home. This is the same for young parents. ██████████ and we've just gone to the shops, how are we supposed to safely carry the items and ██████████ from another street? This could create a massive safety and inconvenience issue involving multiple repeat trips back and forth from the car to our house, carrying ██████████ in one hand and the items in the other. 3.) Timing for residents parking: The proposed 9:30am-3pm. This would only minorly reduce non-resident or commuter parking. It ends too early to ensure parking for residents who are returning from work or picking up children at school. In short, it further adds to a potential problem, where one does not currently exist. <p>Please do not make changes to Herbert Street which will reduce the number of parking spaces currently available (aside from the one choke point mentioned above).</p>
58	09/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I am writing in response to the recent proposals for Herbert street Cambridge ██████████</p> <p>We have lived here ██████████ and are very unhappy with the proposed plans for parking on one side.</p> <p>I am making the objection on the grounds of safety and the knock on effect and stress this is going to cause our daily lives.</p> <p>Having to park miles from the house on a regular basis and having the uncertainty of never knowing where we will park is going to be stressful.</p> <p>██████████ and it will mean at the end of the day driving around to find a space and then walking home in the dark to the house. This feels unfair and not satisfactory.</p> <p>Also we feel this is going to create stress with the neighbours and the chance of ever getting a work man in, in the future.</p> <p>We are not happy with this decision and it is not what we want in the whole street. Many neighbours are extremely unhappy this is being forced on us.</p>
59	11/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I am a resident of Herbert Street and writing you with some concern about the proposed residents parking scheme that you intend to bring into force. My concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ██████████ - I am worried about safety, especially in the winter months when it gets dark early and is dark in the mornings. If I cannot get parking on Herbert Street then each morning and evening of the school term, I will have to walk, ██████████ in the dark to our house on Herbert Street. I do not feel secure and comfortable about this and it is already causing me quite a lot of anxiety. 2. Today, we have just returned from visiting family in London and I have unloaded my bags. - it has taken me about 30 minutes as although I was able to park on Herbert Street, I was not able to park near my house. How much longer would this have taken me if I had to park on another street? 3. I feel you are going to be charging me for the privilege of not being able to even park on my street. 4. Finally - as ██████████ I feel our property prices will drop. Who will want to buy a house on a street where they cannot even park their car? <p>My main concern is the first one - safety, which I do not think you have considered. Why is it not possible for residents parking to exist on both sides of the street - refuse and emergency vehicles have accessed the road whilst we have not had residents parking. I say this as a resident of the street for ██████████. Have you looked at multiple car ownership to see if something can be done about not parking more than one vehicle on the street?</p> <p>I am very concerned about the safety aspect and am happy to speak to you further should you wish to do so.</p>
60	12/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I wish to register my formal objection to the above proposed TRO.</p> <p>I am a resident of Herbert Street where more than half the current number of parking spaces will be removed.</p> <p>The proposal will not 'preserve or improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs'. In fact it will do the opposite. It will remove amenities (ie parking) for residents.</p> <p>Most car users in Herbert Street will be forced to park some distance away from their homes - something which currently happens to an unlucky minority.</p> <p>We will be excluded from parking on streets closest to Herbert Street – the Defreville area.</p> <p>Can you give us the results of your residents' survey which would give an indication of how many parking spaces will be available in the whole of the area proposed for the scheme?</p> <p>Does the number accommodate the number of vehicles currently parked within the scheme boundaries?</p> <p>Three passes are to be available per household is far too many given there are around 60 properties in Herbert Street that means around 180 vehicles in theory. Is it confirmed this number of vehicles could be parked daily within the boundaries of the scheme?</p> <p>I believe this scheme to be poorly thought out and to fly in the face of Herbert Street residents. It will make parking and amenities worse for us.</p>
61	10/04/2024	Resident	Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to you to strongly object to the proposal by Cambridgeshire County Council that we acquire residents parking on Herbert Street, here in Cambridge. Remember that Herbert Street here in Cambridge is a terraced street with no off road parking at all.</p> <p>If you do not read the small print and examine the map carefully attached to the proposal sent to us, you might at first think that this could be a very good idea, parking just for residents in our street. However, on close inspection, there will be a considerable reduction in parking spaces available to such a degree whereby there will not even be enough spaces for everybody living in this street, never mind their family and friends who may visit from time to time.</p> <p>We have lived at ██████████ Herbert Street for ██████████ and I have never had a problem parking in the street. Whatever time I come home, day or night, I find a space close to our house.</p> <p>Of note ██████████ I often come home late in the evening, or in the night, ██████████ so I need to be assured that the present arrangements do not change, in relation to parking close to home when it is dark and quiet to protect my safety.</p> <p>Please respond to my email at your earliest convenience to inform me of what I should do to have my objection taken seriously.</p>

62	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed TRO associated with Herbert Street and Springfield Road.</p> <p>The plan to remove more than half the parking spaces will have a large negative impact for the residents. We already struggle to find parking, so we need more spaces, not less. I'm struggling to see the benefits to anyone, Herbert Street is a dead end street, it's not going to improve traffic flow as there is no traffic, it's not going to improve access to amenities as there are no amenities to gain access to, it's a dead end road.</p> <p>often finishing late at night, if these proposed changes go ahead, this would mean I would have to park far away from home and walk in the dark, as a female this is not going to be safe.</p> <p>As a tax payer, I'd like to think that the opinions of the residents would be taken into account when it will have such an effect on them. In the case of Herbert Street and Springfield Road, these changes serve no benefit only inconvenience and potential safety issues late at night.</p>
63	04/12/2024 10:38:25 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I would prefer that this resident parking was not progressed. These roads are part of the public highway and should be available for anyone to park on. Residents on the whole have front gardens so have the luxury of off road parking. Sensible and considerate parking instead should be encourage - probably by simple road markings / double lines / drive way markings etc. The idea of using valuable resources for lots of signage is grotesque. Longer term planning will hopefully leave this scheme redundant but we will be left with ugly signage which will then be added to land fill or recycled at best. Waste of money.</p>
64	04/12/2024 22:15:45 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>In my view the local authorities should use their limited resources to improve the condition of the roads in this area rather than increase the cost to the residents for using them.</p> <p>If this scheme does go ahead, my view is that the authorities should ensure that lighting, signage, paintwork and street furniture are subtle, limited and small scale, such that light pollution is minimised and the overall uncluttered aesthetic of the street - which is well established and cared for by residents - is retained.</p>
65	04/12/2024 14:17:09 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I understand that the desire of the residents' parking is to discourage commuters from parking in the streets for the whole day. I would therefore urge the Council to consider shortening the hours so that it prevents people from parking at the beginning of the working day (for example, 8.30 - 10.30am or 8.00 - 10.00am). This will stop commuters being able to access day long parking while also allowing residents with elderly or disabled family members or visitors, contractors, businesses, to park more flexibly without the added financial burden on residents to provide parking permits for them.</p> <p>It is important that parking provision is made for any businesses in the area. We are one of the few areas in Cambridge where independent businesses are sited and we do not want to risk them going out of business.</p> <p>I do want to state that I fundamentally disagree with the concept of residents' parking whilst the public transport provision is both so expensive and unreliable. It penalises those who cannot afford to live in Cambridge, often in vital but poorly paid jobs. It pushes the problem onto adjoining streets (the areas where it is being introduced in this plan have suffered from increased on street parking because of residents' parking being introduced in the De Freville area and then subsequently Ascham Road/ Gurney Way areas.</p> <p>The Council needs to make better provision for what is an increasingly busy city which has made no allowance for its growth and therefore the pressure on public services. Free park and ride provision along with a Council owned bus service where the profit is put back into the service as in other metropolitan areas such as London needs to be considered as a priority. Running a public service for profit and charging extortionate fares is not effective. For too long, Cambridge residents' willingness to bicycle has allowed public transport provision to be ignored.</p>
66	03/29/2024 07:19:56 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I am concerned that a parking bay is drawn blocking my drive and that there will not be enough parking bays for residents and their guests. cannot walk far. I am concerned that not be able to park near my house when visits.</p>
67	03/18/2024 19:43:20 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>The proposal is a reheat of a previous proposal that was submitted to us 1-2 years ago. Our family objects again for the same multiple reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) there is no traffic or parking issue down Highfield Avenue ii) there is very little traffic issue on the Hurst Park Estate, and absolutely none at weekends and after working hours iii) we do not want to pay for parking (resident or visitor) when there is no parking issue to solve. This reduces the number of parking places available, costs us money and so makes no logical sense. iv) the plan forbids us from parking outside our house, even if the road is completely empty v) very often similar schemes to this one get stoked up by a vocal minority (eg the houses that live at the start of Hurst Park Avenue). A lot of other families in the area then get all the disbenefit of the proposed scheme before they realise what the minority have imposed on them. Please could there be a supermajority vote on this issue, as there will be a large portion of residents who do not want this scheme, but will not reposit (until too late). I know of a similar resident scheme in Cambridge (Long Road area) getting voted in by a very close majority, which the majority ended up regretting. vi) there are finite council resources. Please could you spend the money instead on mending the many holes in the roads (on the Hurst Park Estate and wider Cambridge area); these are very dangerous for cyclists and damaging to cars <p>We would be grateful if you could stop asking about this proposal, and concentrate on more important matters for our community.</p>
68	04/12/2024 09:40:06 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I object to this scheme. There will be too many signs and paint on the streets making our neighbourhood look more urban. Further restrictions are not needed in our neighbourhood.</p>
69	04/05/2024 10:05:00 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I think the proposed scheme is unnecessary and would negatively affect the feel of the neighbourhood (traffic wardens, additional signage.)</p>
70	25/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed scheme. It is a financial burden in the cost of living crisis time. It will have negative social effects since friends and relatives will think twice about visiting us. This expense on top of the high council tax is not justified.</p>
71	03/28/2024 21:44:58 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>There is always plenty of parking space available in the street, restrictions are unnecessary and will only be an annoyance for visitors.</p>
72	04/12/2024 18:36:14 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>We object to this scheme on the grounds that so many spaces overall will be lost. Yellow lines can be used for the heavy areas in George St and the bottom end of Hurst Park rd.</p>
73	03/18/2024 11:22:59 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Despite my having notified the Highways Department on a previous occasion that I have a dropped kerb outside my house for vehicular access on to my property (for which permission was sought and obtained), I note from the map that a Residents Parking bay is to be situated along side my dropped kerb , if this proposal goes ahead.</p>
74	03/29/2024 07:39:01 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Residents Parking for Hurst Park Avenue Estate</p> <p>Strongly oppose</p>
75	04/04/2024 12:50:56 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I would not approve of double yellow lines this will cause issues for our visitors parking at the bottom of our drive. I understand them on the bend but not so far up the road. Whilst we have access to a driveway I do not understand making people who live in the street and do not have a driveway to pay for parking at their own property.</p>

76	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>Objection Grounds</p> <p>I object on the grounds that I believe to achieve the objective of deterring congestion and improving aesthetics, the Scheme does not need to run for the long period of six hours, 9am until 3pm. I believe this is too long a time to restrict parking especially in the outer parts of Cambridge. In my opinion, it should be run over a shorter period of time, such as, the lunchtime hour eg 10 until 2pm. This would, in my opinion, deter commuter parking which is the main issue. By doing a shorter scheme, it would allow for short term visitors to use the road either to visit residents' or to use local amenities. In my opinion, the current scheme set up of daily visitor permits is expensive and onerous especially for those with no driveway or small driveways.</p> <p>In my opinion, there is no effective public transport system network in Cambridge and Cambridgeshire so people are still reliant on cars especially in outer Cambridge for some visits. This type of scheme will potentially deter visitors' who may wish to pop in on a resident, who need help or caring or otherwise, but only plan to stay a short time.</p> <p>Separate Comments</p> <p>I am also concerned about road safety regarding those entering or exiting their driveways and that there are proper sight lines allowed for those who have driveways. There is no information on how much allowance is being made around driveways. It is difficult to see from the drawings, but it seems the boundary delineating parking spaces in places seems to encroach either onto driveways or very close to... I am referring specifically to Highworth Avenue in this instance which is where I live and where the characteristics of the Avenue make it particularly challenging entering and exiting a driveway and road safety is an issue in my opinion.</p>
77	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I write to reiterate my objection to the Proposed Residential Parking Scheme -Milton Road Area.</p> <p>I am fundamentally opposed to the scheme. The long-standing threat of the scheme has already had the impact of causing increasing numbers of owners of houses to drop kerbs and park in front garden, degrading the appearance of the street and diluting its visual quality and also significantly reducing the amount of available on-street parking. The parking has been further constrained by overly wide white lines being painted in front of many properties with dropped kerbs.</p> <p>Although the claim is that there is overall support in the area for a controlled parking scheme I cannot but believe that the support is inherently dependant upon how the area is drawn. This proposal, like the current works to Milton Road (which may benefit cyclists, but no one else) is overly bureaucratic and does not provide the comprehensive solution that is needed. Leave things as they are.</p>
78	04/09/2024 18:45:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Sorry! This is my third attempt!</p> <p>Living at the bottom of Hurst Park Avenue I find that I and my immediate neighbours are not inconvenienced by commuter parking as we have adequate off road space. The cost and inconvenience of seeking permits would therefore not be offset by any advantage.</p> <p>Rather it will only deter family and friends from visiting (as I am deterred from visiting family in London where similar schemes are in place)</p> <p>As for tradesmen and drivers!</p> <p>I also dislike the way it has become a political football in local elections setting neighbours against each other to garner votes on the doorstep.</p> <p>Please can you tell us the actual numbers?</p>
79	04/11/2024 17:47:04 +01:00	Resident	Other	Wholly Object	<p>I think the scheme is unnecessary and will make iife more difficult for residents without significantly reducing car use. Frequent and reliable bus services would do much more to reduce car use.</p>
80	03/29/2024 18:58:49 +00:00	Resident	Environmental	Wholly Object	<p>I think the scheme is unnecessary. It will spoil the look of the Hurst Park Estate and cause extra problems for residents without providing any real benefits that I can see. We need to discourage car use and increase the use of public transport and the money spent on this scheme could be used in better ways to do this, like improving the bus service.</p>
81	04/09/2024 14:55:40 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>This scheme is not necessary. It will cause difficulties to residents in terms of cost and inconvenience for visitors and contractors. The hours are unnecessarily long. 10.30- 2.30 would be sufficient to stop commuters and so free spaces for local parking. However a scheme such as that operating off Queen Edith's Way would solve parking. It involves use of single yellow lines with time restrictions and works perfectly to prevent commuter parking.</p>

82	10/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>1 I am concerned about the inadequate number of residents' parking bays; most houses on the estate have space for off-road parking but not all can increase this to accommodate tradesmen or visitors who currently park on the road. I assume that residents wishing to welcome visitors, tradesmen or carers will purchase visitors' permits, but they will also have to find a vacant parking bay! Currently, parking on both sides of Hurst Park Avenue (with the exception of the stretch of road close to the junction with Milton Road) slows the traffic, much more effectively than a "20mph" sign. It does not obstruct emergency vehicles nor bin lorries. I suggest that, instead of the proposed plan which allows parking on only one side of Hurst Park Avenue, residents' bays should be provided on both sides of the road as happens now. Each bay will bring in much-needed revenue for the Council in respect of residents' and visitors' permits.</p> <p>2 Irrespective of the adoption of the above measure, in particular I suggest additional sites for parking bays near the worst affected houses, which would not in any way interrupt traffic flow. Our house, [REDACTED] Hurst Park Avenue, [REDACTED]. As is clearly shown on your map, [REDACTED] have very restricted vehicle access to the front gardens. Uniquely on this estate this means that the front gardens of these properties cannot be adapted to allow for a visitor /tradesman parking space. Therefore your proposals would put these three houses at a significant disadvantage in comparison with the rest of the estate, despite space being available for additional bays which we or our visitors could use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is space to park a small car outside no 91 where, because of the wide road at the corner, such parking does not obstruct the traffic. I have inserted a photo which shows that a useful carparking space can be placed here without occluding either the garage drive [REDACTED] although I agree that there would not be space for a long vehicle. On your map it is marked as "no waiting at any time", which is unnecessary. • There is also plenty of room for a parking bay on the quadrant opposite, again without affecting traffic flow – currently this space is almost always in use by visitors or tradesmen. I have circled these two sites (very approximately!) on the third image. • also please note that your map seems to indicate double yellow lines going across all the driveways for [REDACTED] Hurst Park Avenue whereas I assume the driveways will be marked off as such with white bar markers in the usual way. <p>3 Thirdly I express my concern regarding Leys Road. The map shows it as the only road on the estate where parking bays will be provided on both sides of the road. Currently, parking on both sides of Leys Road, allowing only one car at a time to pass, means that vehicles approaching Arbury Road delay vehicles trying to turn off Arbury Road into Leys Road, which seems to me to be potentially dangerous. On every other road in the estate delays to the traffic flow are much less of a problem and indeed welcome, and yet on the other roads you have restricted the parking to one side only! I would be very interested to know the rationale for this; it seems counter-intuitive.</p> <p>4 Fourthly, I am concerned about the lack of short-term parking for customers of the shops on Milton Road, near the corner with Arbury Road. We value our local shops which we visit most days on foot or by cycle, and do not want to lose them! Could short-term bays be provided on Arbury Road or Highworth Avenue for example?</p>
83	09/04/2024	Business		Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to give my objection and reasons for objection to the proposed residential parking scheme (PRO 998) for Hurst Park Avenue, Cambridge.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A very large proportion of [REDACTED] patients need their cars to drive to their appointments [REDACTED]. A significant number of them are elderly and are not able to stand waiting for buses to and from the park and ride. 2. Most of [REDACTED] staff live outside Cambridge and many work late. Again, they do not want to be adding hours to their days taking buses to and from Park and Ride. There is no shortage of [REDACTED] jobs outside Cambridge, so they will not hesitate to leave if they are unable to park near to their work [REDACTED]. 3. If patients are unable to reach [REDACTED] and staff leave, there may be another lost business and healthcare provider in the area. 4. Most of the houses in Hurst Park Avenue already have garages and drives so I do not see the need for them to have on-street parking all to themselves too. I am hoping that there will be consideration made for the patients and staff at [REDACTED] and that something can be sorted out.
84	14/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>We are writing to strongly object to the Residents Parking scheme proposed for the Hurst Park Estate (Hurst Park Avenue, Orchard, Leys, etc).</p> <p>We object on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Hurst Park Avenue and the area does not need its parking protected during the hours of 9am - 3pm. Many have off-street parking. Those who drive to work have left by 9am and do not return until after that time. If it must be implemented, could the restricted hours be even narrower? Even 1 or two hours. (2) Restricting parking will adversely affect important services — the local dentist, child daycare centre, primary school, doctors surgery and other important services have people commuting and our neighbourhood welcomes their parking and walking to work in these local service businesses. Restricting this sort of flexibility makes it more difficult for people to take these jobs. (3) Unnecessary cost and admin - the council does not need to spend the money adding line markings, signs, etc, and homeowners do not need to spend unnecessary money and deal with unnecessary admin. This is not a good use of government tax money, nor is it proper care of your local community. (4) Negative aesthetic impact - the Hurst Park Estate and the area is a neighbourhood that takes pride in the "feel" of the neighbourhood. There are groups that care for common areas, weeding and planting flowers. Adding parking lines and warning signs throughout the neighborhood will negatively impact the feel of this historic estate. (5) Inadequate communication and consultation - we have not had an opportunity to hear the details of the initial consultation and to speak as a community. <p>We hope that you will take this feedback — and other negative feedback — seriously and avoid this parking scheme.</p>
85	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>As residents of Hurst Park Avenue [REDACTED] our household was NOT in favour of this scheme. We were told at a meeting last year that we would be "kept in the loop" of developments with the proposed scheme but have not had a chance to respond until now.</p>
86	11/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I do not want a residents parking scheme on Hurst Park Avenue. It will be of no benefit to me at all and I question who the real beneficiaries really are. It would be only an additional expense and hassle and also a deterrent to the vital visits from friends, family and tradesmen which I as an almost house-bound person increasingly rely upon. I have discussed it with neighbours and they agree. Please note my objection.</p>
87	03/22/2024 21:23:57 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This residents' parking scheme is unnecessary. This area does not have a problem. 2. The scheme will reduce the number of parking spaces in the area. 3. The scheme will involve residents in the unnecessary expense and hassle, of applying for permits. This is not fair on residents without driveways. (Here I speak of others. We are lucky to have a driveway). We will also have to apply for permits for guests, carers and workmen. Doubtless the costs will start low and then gradually go up, and up... 4. It will clutter up the area with more signs and restrictions and make it feel less relaxed. 5. Like all these schemes it will make the area feel much less friendly and welcoming to visitors and other outsiders, i.e. it will make the area more inward-looking. 6. It will cost money to implement, money that could be better spent elsewhere. Councils are always saying they are short of money, so they should not WASTE IT. The one thing that DOES need fixing is the POTHOLEs. 7. This is a pleasant area. Please leave it that way. 8. During implementation, the scheme will cause even more disruption than we have had to put up with for many months, with the Milton Road works!! 9. In short, if it ain't broke, don't fix it!

88	04/12/2024 11:33:11 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	I am against this proposal on the basis that there is no real need for it and it will have an adverse effect on local businesses. Parking restrictions will also have a negative impact on residents and their visitors, who will struggle to find parking places if it is implemented. If parking restrictions HAVE to be implemented they should be for a much shorter period such as two hours in the middle of the day – this would prevent commuter parking but have less of an impact for locals.
89	03/24/2024 11:44:42 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed introduction of a parking permit system in the Milton Road area. While I acknowledge the importance of managing parking effectively, I believe that implementing a permit system at this time is unwarranted and would have significant negative consequences for residents and the community as a whole.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to highlight that the current parking situation in Milton Road area is generally satisfactory. Residents and visitors have been able to find parking spaces without significant difficulty, and there hasn't been any compelling evidence presented to demonstrate a pressing need for a permit system. The new parking scheme reduces the number of parking spots and will likely create a parking problem. We lose our parking space on Orchard Avenue. It will be moved across the street to outside [redacted] Orchard Avenue. This is across their driveway. There will be no parking spaces that don't force [redacted] to cross the road to get to the house. This is on a blind corner where cars run at speed.</p> <p>Moreover, the financial burden imposed by the introduction of parking permits cannot be ignored. Many residents, including myself, rely on street parking, and the additional cost of purchasing permits would place an unnecessary strain on our finances. Calculations suggest that the annual expense of permits would be considerable, especially for those on fixed incomes or low wages.</p> <p>One of the most concerning aspects of the proposed permit system is the potential loss of parking spaces. Cambridge already faces challenges with parking availability, and reducing the number of spaces could exacerbate congestion and inconvenience for residents. Furthermore, businesses in the area rely on accessible parking for their customers, and any reduction in parking spaces could adversely affect their revenue and viability.</p> <p>Rather than implementing a parking permit system, I urge the council to explore alternative solutions to address any perceived parking issues. These could include, improving public transportation options, or incentivizing alternative modes of transportation such as cycling and walking.</p> <p>Additionally, it's crucial to consider the social equity implications of the proposed permit system. Such a system would disproportionately affect low-income residents who cannot afford the additional costs, exacerbating social inequalities within our community.</p> <p>Mulberry Close will stand to bear a heavy burden as they lose lots of spaces, whilst retaining their bays. These bays will be unpermitted. Therefore the only unpermitted spaces in the local area. Right next to the shops. These houses mostly don't have driveways. Parking will become a massive issue here.</p> <p>I also have concerns about the transparency and inclusivity of the public consultation process leading to the decision to introduce the parking permit system. It's essential that the voices of residents are heard and considered in the decision-making process, and I believe that there has not been adequate consultation on this matter.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly urge the council to reconsider the proposal to introduce a parking permit system in Cambridge. This decision has significant implications for residents, businesses, and the community as a whole. I hope that alternative solutions can be explored, and that the concerns of residents are taken into account.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objections.</p>
90	03/24/2024 11:45:16 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>There is no problem with parking in my local area. I do not understand why we need to implement a permit system. Overall we will lose the total number of parking spaces near my house and we will have to pay for permit parking. With current cost of living crisis, this does not seem smart and will greatly impact low-middle income families.</p> <p>I would urge the council to rethink this scheme and focus on solving rat running and speeding of cars in the area. This is a much bigger concern and I experience weekly near miss accidents while cycling.</p> <p>If the plans are to progress, please consider more bays and redesign. The current permit plans have parking mostly down 1 side of road - this will increase risk of speeding cars.</p> <p>Please reconsider or remove this scheme.</p>
91	03/18/2024 18:43:15 +00:00	Resident	Safety	Wholly Object	Leys road is already used as a rat run. Reduced provision for parking will risk increasing the number of speeding drivers in the estate. If it proceeds it must come with traffic calming measures as well.
92	04/11/2024 10:53:05 +01:00	Resident	Environmental	Wholly Object	<p>I object to the proposed resident's parking scheme on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From my perspective there is no serious parking issue in the estate. I live in Leys Road and parking is never a problem here even with a number of commuters parking during office hours, e.g. from the vets on Arbury Road. The locations commuters park that I can see are the end of Leys Road, the top of Mulberry Close and the bottom of Hurst Park Avenue. Of those, only Hurst Park Avenue is a problem which needs to be addressed. The solution is however not to impose a parking scheme on the entire estate. There must be a better solution for just this part of HPA, even if it's simply time limited parking restrictions in the part of the road. 2. The long term consequence of this scheme will be that all houses will use their front gardens for parking space. Front gardens will eventually all become paved which will result in a very significant loss of greenery, shrubbery and plants of all descriptions from the estate. This will adversely affect the unique character of the estate. The latter is of great importance to residents as exemplified by the determined opposition to planning applications that will have a negative impact on the estate. 3. Incorporating the proposed scheme into the Ascham Road scheme is not a good idea. Parts of the Ascham Road scheme are much closer to the city centre and are thus designed to stop shoppers etc. parking in the area. The two schemes target different types of parking and are too dissimilar to be combined. A measure that is beneficial for Ascham Road may for example be quite inappropriate for Highfield Avenue. The scheme would be too large to be effectively administered as one unit with the same rules across the entire area. If the scheme is introduced it must be a separate one in its own right. 4. A cynical view would be to class the scheme as a money spinning measure. Parking outside one's own house which was free will now cost almost £70 per year, with guests attracting more costs. It is an unnecessary scheme that will cost money to install and administer, the bill for which will be footed by resident's themselves.

93	04/09/2024 19:47:37 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed residents parking scheme on the grounds that:</p> <p>(a) there is no parking issue for residents that needs to be solved, especially since the marked reduction in commuter parking post covid</p> <p>(b) the number of parking bays planned is much lower than the current number of spaces used so the scheme will likely create new parking problems for residents</p> <p>(c) residents without a private drive are unfairly penalised with expensive permit fees to have tradesman and friends visiting as well as limits on the number of visitor permits.</p> <p>If the scheme does go ahead, please consider the following modifications to help residents without a private drive:</p> <p>1. Hours of Operation: the proposed hours of operation of 9.30-3.30 Mon-Fri will create a lot of inconvenience and cost to residents such as myself without private parking spaces (e.g. regarding tradesmen visiting to provide quotes). Operating hours of 10am-2pm would more than suffice to stop any commuter parking while making resident's lives much easier. I strongly urge you to reconsider this.</p> <p>2. Cost of Tradesman Permits: the cost of a current tradesman permit is excessive, especially for retired people on a pension. Furthermore, it seems that a tradesman coming to give a quote would not be eligible for the existing tradesman permit (as there will not be a job sheet to justify issuing a permit at that stage). Please reconsider this cost or reduce the hours of operation of the scheme.</p> <p>3. Insufficient Parking Bay Spaces Compared to Current Situation: the scheme will create parking problems for residents where there were none previously, since the number of proposed bays on Arbury Road and the Hurst Park Estate is vastly reduced compared to the number of spaces currently used. Given this scheme is supposed to benefit residents, it needs to provide sufficient spaces. We were told at the consultation meeting that the low number of parking bays near our house (on Leys Avenue near the junction with Leys Road is due to the need for them to be at least 10 metres away from a junction. However, Highway Code Rule 243 states that one cannot stop or park opposite or within 10 meters of a junction except in an authorised parking space. A resident's bay counts as an authorised parking space therefore it would be possible to increase the number of spaces by allowing leeway on this, especially since these are quiet streets with low levels of traffic. The 10 metre rule is not always applied in other Cambridge resident parking schemes (eg, De Freville scheme where bays are substantially less than 10 metres from a junction). Please reconsider this 10 metre rule on Leys Avenue near the junction with Leys Road and other junctions on the Hurst Park Estate. The area of road where we park our car (Leys Avenue near junction with Leys Road) will lose a third of its current spaces because of this unnecessary 10 metre rule.</p> <p>4. Individual Marked Parking Bays: please reconsider having individually marked parking bays in areas where more than 1 adjacent parking bay is planned. Instead, it would make more sense for the start and end of the parking zone to be marked, as this this allows for more cars to park (e.g. 3 small cars could potentially fit in an area previously marked as 2 individual larger bays). This would help create additional spaces which are badly needed</p> <p>5. Impact on Arbury Road/Milton Road Businesses: short-stay (e.g. 30 minute) free parking spaces on Arbury Road are needed near the junction with Milton Road for people using the local shops. We do not want to lose our local amenities due to lack of parking provision for their customers.</p>
94	17/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>We have no need for the Residential Parking Scheme, as we do not have any problems Parking in Leys Road and this is during the ongoing milton road cycle and restrictive pedestrian path ways that are being constructed, all I see is a problem at Hurst Park Avenue, this has always been a problem at the milton road end due mainly to the dental practice, and Parking for employees of city that have migration from the other residents Parking Scheme, if restrictions were imposed on the Parking at that end of Hurst Park Avenue there would not be any parking as RESIDENTIAL ACCESS ONLY as this should be from both Hurst Park Avenue and Leys Road to stop the rat run which also causes congestion? [which has been a problem of late with milton road cycle and restrictive pedestrian paths.</p> <p>I see the Parking Scheme as a tax gathering for the council, and will go a little way to stop the congestion as this Scheme will cost us as a house hold over £100 + ,and I will use my vote this May election to choose the party or independent who can represent us in the way that should be not imposing taxes for the council to waste on these Scheme as with the milton road project.</p>
95	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>COMMENTS AND OBJECTION</p> <p>I live at xx Leys Road, Cambridge [REDACTED] I write to make OBJECTION against the proposed traffic regulation order PR0998 with its associated map, affecting Leys Road, because they show a proposal to install two on-street car-parking places/bays where there is not enough room for them, outside the adjacent frontages of [REDACTED] Leys Road and the adjacent house [REDACTED] Leys Road.</p> <p>GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION</p> <p>The proposed two car-parking bays would at one end obstruct vehicular access to [REDACTED] open frontage and off-street parking at [REDACTED] Leys Road, while at the other end they would also obstruct access to the open frontage and off-street parking [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Leys Road. There is not room for two parking spaces outside [REDACTED] Leys Road.</p> <p>Therefore I object, and request amendment of the proposed TRO and map, to avoid making the obstruction described above that would arise from implementing the proposal as it now exists.</p>
96	25/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I am a resident living in Maio Road [REDACTED] which is close to Arbury Road. I am writing to object the captioned proposal - PR0998. Indeed, it will cause inconvenience to the residents and more traffic.</p>
97	03/19/2024 23:05:10 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>The rationale for this policy is not clear. The reasons given for the order being needed are not accurate nor relevant to the proposed scheme and appears to be a draconian attempt to manage a problem that is negligible and looks purely as an opportunity for the council to make extra money through another tax. A large majority of residents in the Milton Road area have off street parking. Where this is the case, residents do not need parking permits and such an order would only serve to give an affluent part of Cambridge such as Hirst Park Avenue a perk of keeping less affluent persons out of the area. These are also areas where much of the off street parking occurs due to multiple car ownership, not because of excessive visitor parking, so I don't believe the order would actually reduce the volume if cars currently parked. People in Cambridge have cars and should to be able to freely visit the area and park without fear of contravening excessive rules. Likewise trades people should be able to visit and work without resorting to complicated parking permits.</p> <p>There is a good argument that on main thoroughfares such as Arbury Road and near junctions on Milton road, parking restrictions should be in place as these routes should be kept clear for all road users. So I would argue that maintaining any off peak parking in the vicinity of Milton road , e.g., southern end of Arbury Road is a poor compromise. Keep the main thoroughfares and junctions free from parking and allow people to naturally park in other areas. I don't see this as an issue, if it even is an issue as one that is in need of such a drastic step. The consultation documents neither explain what the issue actually is, nor how the proposed outcome is going to solve it. Its not based on any evidence or at least none has been presented.</p>
98	03/21/2024 18:48:24 +00:00	Resident	Access	Wholly Object	<p>I stated in Category: Other because there are few of them: Parking / Traffic / Safety / Access / Disturbance / and environment in the area where I am living.</p> <p>The area where I am living already has many of those problems without adding new extra residents in Milton Road coming to use our parking / streets areas.</p>
99	03/18/2024 09:58:11 +00:00	Business	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>PR0998</p> <p>We [REDACTED] find the proposal ridiculous whilst all the works are going on on Milton Road. We would assume that nothing would be put into place until all the work was completed on the Milton Road work which has already inconvenienced us and the local area for many years. We use the top end of Mulberry Close for parking [REDACTED] (Mon-Fri) and have never had a problem with anyone at Mulberry Close. They in fact are very happy for us to park their and tell us when work is going on etc. [REDACTED] we would be happy to purchase parking permits etc for use. We feel that we are being pushed out of Cambridge [REDACTED] and are being forced to look into relocating out of the City.</p>

100	04/04/2024 11:14:26 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>These are my views on the proposal. It is nothing more than a money grab, we have never had a parking problem on Milton Rd except for two days per year, Midsummer Fair Saturday and Strawberry Fair Saturday. We are now being subjected to the disruption and inconvenience of the seriously flawed GCP vanity project on Milton Rd which is not needed at all but gives the GCP a gateway for even more money to waste - scandalous!</p> <p>We are now expected to pay for any visitors that call [REDACTED] it will lead to even more isolation. As for trades people, I have been told by some that they don't need to take jobs in problem areas and that they won't carry tools and materials any distance. The few parking spaces that we had outside our properties on Milton Rd have been removed leaving only the roads opposite for our casual visitors to park on, we are now expected to pay for all visits, short or long, these visits are very often my older friends who visit for their own mental health support.</p> <p>If this scheme does go ahead then why should residents pay an annual fee or for every visitor every time they come? Give us free passes that last 5-10 years, saving you on admin and banking fees.</p>
101	04/12/2024 17:23:27 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>At present, residents in Mulberry Close can generally park ok! So this seems to be creating, rather than solving a problem. It is too far from the city centre for people to use as free parking so seems to be an opportunity to raise money through parking permits, rather than anything else!</p>
102	04/12/2024 22:56:33 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I object to the additional expense involved for residents at a time when there is a real cost of living crisis.</p> <p>I am concerned that there will be ugly street signage involved, which will mar the environment of Mulberry Close.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that the proposed scheme is unnecessary for Mulberry Close, as there is not really a problem currently here.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will mean that Mulberry Close will lose some of its car parking spaces.</p> <p>I am concerned that there will be an influx of cars being parked by non-residents of Mulberry Close, as other cars will be displaced from areas further afield.</p> <p>Mulberry Close is a private residential development, I am concerned that the private nature / status of Mulberry Close will be compromised by non local residents parking their vehicles here.</p>
103	04/12/2024 18:58:29 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Access for elderly residents unsatisfactory, especially late at night.</p> <p>Access for elderly visitors unsatisfactory</p> <p>Mulberry used as overflow parking is also unsatisfactory</p>
104	04/11/2024 13:38:45 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I am not in favour of the Milton Road area parking scheme because I believe it will cause more problems than it will solve.</p> <p>I am seriously concerned about the reduction of available parking spaces in Mulberry Close for residents, their visitors and trades people due to the introduction of the scheme and the excessive number of 'no waiting at any time' spaces. Currently drivers park in some of these areas safely and responsibly, leaving adequate access for emergency services and council refuse lorries. The reduction in parking spaces in this road and other roads in the scheme will make life very difficult for residents and their visitors in the evenings and at weekends because currently nearly every space is taken at these times. Many of these drivers vacate their spaces during normal working hours and these can then be utilised by people wishing to go to local shops and businesses and also by commuters who work in the city.</p> <p>I am also very concerned for the owners of the local shops and businesses as their clients will find parking more difficult than at present and may well take their trade elsewhere. The number of 2 hour free parking spaces on the plan will not meet demand.</p> <p>I am saddened that the introduction of the scheme will impact the beautiful green environment which we enjoy in our part of Cambridge with the installation of very obvious 'street furniture' in the way of signage and road markings. I am particularly disappointed that there will be double yellow lines along stretches of Mulberry Close opposite the private parking bays as no drivers park on these stretches, out of common sense and courtesy. Ironically, the 'no waiting at any time' section of Arbury Road, north of its junction with Leys Road, does not appear to be long enough for safety, particularly for drivers turning right out of Leys Road on to Arbury Road.</p> <p>I am very disappointed that no meaningful discussion was given to the operational hours being shorter, such as 9am-12noon which works well in areas such as Benson North, as this would have helped the Milton Road area shops and businesses, as well as residents having visitors and trades people at their properties. It appears that the 9:30am to 3pm time was set because the Ascham area already has that timing. I do not know the reason that the operational hours for Ascham could not have been altered.</p> <p>I object to paying for a residents parking permit and visitor permits as these are expensive and the fact that the number of visitor permits is limited per year is really disappointing because sometimes it is essential for residents to have trades people work on their property for several months at a time. As well as the additional cost for residents undertaking work to their property, due to having to purchase a high number of visitor permits, they could find that trades people simply do not wish to quote for work in areas of such stringent parking restrictions.</p>
105	04/10/2024 23:18:58 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>[REDACTED] The City council has just given her a disabled badge. But there are NO Disabled bays near her house. Everything about these plans and especially the Parking discriminates against [REDACTED] a vulnerable, chronic ill, [REDACTED] year old. This plans are unworkable. [REDACTED] will have not choice to park on a yellow line or block in someone else to taker her there. She will not be the only person in this situation in the area. In fact I know of two others in the same close. It is absolutely Crystal clear that no Councillors care damn about older people in Cambridge. THIS IS DISCRIMINATION. Parking in Mulberry Close currently works for all residents so why change it? Also, my mum has no driveway to park a car on so those without driveways will suffer additional discrimination if these plans go ahead.</p>

106	04/04/2024 10:12:28 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>We do not have a parking problem in Mulberry Close - any changes to the parking situation here would purely be a money making scheme by the council and would not reflect the interests of residents.</p> <p>Changing the parking to permit only would reduce the number of spaces available to Mulberry Close residents - thus creating a problem that currently does not exist. I do not feel that Mulberry Close residents have been fairly consulted in the process unlike residents from surrounding roads.</p> <p>If there are any commuters / visitors who park in this area - it's very few (if any) and does not affect us being able to park close to our homes. If these people do park on Mulberry Close to get to their workplace, for example the co-op on Milton Road, then they need somewhere to park. Preventing them from parking here would only cause them to park on a different residential road as there is not public transport that suits their early / late working hours.</p> <p>We are a respectful and responsible residential community who do not need to be told where to park our cars. I would be highly disappointed to see Mulberry Close have permit parking enforced.</p>
107	04/12/2024 17:15:14 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I'm really concerned that this proposal significantly reduces the available parking for residents of the close, including residents of Ellis House which is part of the close and has limited parking available.</p> <p>I'm unclear who benefits from this proposal or what current problem it seeks to address.</p>
108	04/12/2024 18:48:43 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>There has been no transparency to the consultation process and the full results (on a street-by-street basis) have been withheld.</p> <p>I will be financially impacted by the proposed scheme and, as there is never a shortage of parking spaces in the Close, cannot see any potential benefits.</p> <p>Further, I believe that signage and bay-marking will be a visual blight on the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I object to the scheme.</p>
109	04/11/2024 09:48:26 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I wholly object to this proposal (reference PR0998) in the Milton Road area.</p> <p>Please cancel the TRO Order parking scheme and use the funds to repair the proliferation of potholes throughout Cambridge, before a cyclist is killed as a result of hitting one.</p> <p>Following Covid-19 period, traffic and parking issues have reduced greatly in this area. There are noticeably few cars. People are working from home more than ever.</p> <p>Fewer cars are parked in Hurst Park Avenue, with less traffic congestion in that road as well.</p>
110	04/12/2024 20:49:25 +01:00	Resident	Other	Wholly Object	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am emailing in response to the Traffic</p> <p>I live in the Mulberry Close, within the Hurst Park Estate and feel strongly that a residence parking scheme never was needed in this area, parking is not a major issue in any of the street that make up the estate (Hurstpark Av, Highfield AV, Orchard AV, Leys Av, Leys Rd, Mulberry close and Arbury road). I regularly pass through the estate (by foot, bike and car) at different times of days and different days of the week and down different parts of the estate and at NO time are there ever a shortage of places to park. While the Arbury Rd end of Leys Rd can sometimes be full, this in my experience, is at evenings and weekends - so are residence cars, something the proposed parking scheme will actually make worse, not better. And while I can see that the Milton rd end of Hurstpark avenue can some times be full during the week, one only had to move up the road by a few car lengths to be able to find a space. The above remains true even with the disruption caused by the milton rd works currently and the impact on available parking.</p> <p>Furthermore, I don't believe the scheme has fully taken into account the nature and legal entity that is Mulberry close. The development of which was award winning in its time and built to nurture a community. By putting in residence parking, you will be pitting neighbors against each other, vying for the spaces on land that we own, which currently people simply use in a give and take way. Furthermore, I'm not at all sure those planning the residence parking have taking into account that the green is not council property - it is owned by the residence of mulberry close - and therefor it NOT somewhere you can simply just erect signage on - so I'm not at all sure how you plan to indicate the fact that it is residence parking.....</p> <p>It is my opinion, that the Hurstpark estate should NEVER have been included within the proposed residence scheme and that doing so has been done for some reason other than the need to protect residence parking. I therefor believe that the areas known as the Hurstpark estate (as detailed above) should be removed from the residence parking scheme. I believe it is also telling that the full breakdown of the consultation has never been provided despite being asked for. Instead an overall figure of over 50% in favor has been thrown around, but I'd be willing to be this was not made up of replys for the Hurst park estate.</p>
111	04/12/2024 18:57:04 +01:00	Resident	Disturbance	Wholly Object	<p>Public transport is not good enough to support this proposal for workers in the area. Residents don't need the spaces during working hours. Parking problem is more of a problem on weekends when people are getting to town or church.</p>
112	04/12/2024 17:27:17 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Like parking situation as it is. Concerned that my Dentist and his staff at Hurst Park Avenue will have nowhere to park and have to close. Request minimal parking restrictions if scheme goes ahead 9-1pm best.</p>
113	04/12/2024 17:16:45 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>are content with the parking situation in Mulberry Close and do now want change. Do not want to pay for friends/relatives to pay to visit.</p> <p>If this has to be please restrict hours to 9am-1pm</p>

114	03/26/2024 09:24:18 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>Ref : PR0998</p> <p>Opposed to scheme 100% Total waste of time and money.. presumably seen as a incoming revenue for council ? 1 Fewer cars entering area to park..post Covid many more people working from home. In Cambridge unlikely to change due to nature of work (software/ computer etc) 2 With ever increasing cost of car ownership some have reduced their fleet to one car and, presumably share rides. Uptake of Park and Ride schemes (accurate data required) 3 I would like to see the collated data relating to the assertion 'a majority was for the parking scheme'. How many were canvassed, which area/s, how many responded and the exact number of those who wanted the scheme.. This should be made available to all with absolute transparency.. Too much seems to be behind closed doors.. 4 Can an absolute guarantee be given that the cost of policing this scheme will never be passed on via proportion of rate increases. 5 Categorical written statement that none of council members, their families or friends have any vested interest in any part of this scheme ie shares in any company contracted to undertake any works associated with implementing said scheme etc etc Best solution. Drop scheme completely. Utilise the money earmarked for this schem for something really necessary that all ratepayers benefit from.. PROPER repair of potholes for example..cyclists are continually in danger of serious injury.</p>
115	13/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I [REDACTED] OBJECT to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order PR0998 moving ahead on the grounds detailed below.</p> <p>Should the Parking Zone proceed to implementation, will the officers involved in the next stages please consider and respond to the MITIGATION requests I detail after my objections.</p> <p>OBJECTIONS</p> <p>Objection: removal of amenity It is unclear to me from TRO PR0998 how the imposition of permits for residents parking might be a benefit to Mulberry Close residents.</p> <p>At the moment our residents, guests and visitors, carers, trade contractors, delivery vans, and customers of local businesses and shops, enjoy free unrestricted on-street parking.</p> <p>Does it make sense to make us all grapple with resident and visitor permits every day, if the supposed problem we're addressing is not felt here?</p> <p>TRO PR0998 offers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no provision for waiting, loading and unloading areas and time limits - for supermarket and other delivery vans; for visitors to residents living in the CHS Ellis House flats which is accessed from Mulberry Close. • very restricted, expensive provision for commuter staff of Prentis and other local businesses. • poor provision for shopper customers to the Milton Rd strand of shops, which benefit our community. <p>Objection: creates two classes of parking in the Milton Road Area Parking Zone The proposed TRO PR0998 will create two classes of parking for residents in the Milton Road Area Parking Zone: (i) residents and their visitors who rely on on-street parking and (ii) residents and their visitors who have access to private driveways and may park without paying. This split system would create potential for tension.</p> <p>Objection - creates new pressure on MCRS private parking bays In addition, proposed TRO PR0998 leaves MCRS Ltd to manage its private parking bays. This would exacerbate the tensions implicit in the split system between residents with private off-street drive parking and residents reliant on on-street parking, and leave us with difficult questions as to how we allocate the MCRS-owned capacity between us.</p>
116	11/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I live in the Mulberry Close, within the Hurst Park Estate and feel strongly that a residence parking scheme never was needed in this area, parking is not a major issue in any of the street that make up the estate (Hurstpark Av, Highfield AV, Orchard AV, Leys Av, Leys Rd, Mulberry close and Arbury road). I regularly pass through the estate (by foot, bike and car) at different times of days and different days of the week and down different parts of the estate and at NO time are there ever a shortage of places to park. While the Arbury Rd end of Leys Rd can sometimes be full, this in my experience, is at evenings and weekends - so are residence cars, something the proposed parking scheme will actually make worse, not better. And while I can see that the Milton rd end of Hurstpark avenue can some times be full during the week, one only had to move up the road by a few car lengths to be able to find a space. The above remains true even with the disruption caused by the milton rd works currently and the impact on available parking.</p> <p>Furthermore, I don't believe the scheme has fully taken into account the nature and legal entity that is Mulberry close. The development of which was award winning in its time and built to nurture a community. By putting in residence parking, you will be pitting neighbors against each other, vying for the spaces on land that we own, which currently people simply use in a give and take way. Furthermore, I'm not at all sure those planning the residence parking have taking into account that the green is not council property - it is owned by the residence of mulberry close - and therefor it NOT somewhere you can simply just erect signage on - so I'm not at all sure how you plan to indicate the fact that it is residence parking.....</p> <p>It is my opinion, that the Hurstpark estate should NEVER have been included within the proposed residence scheme and that doing so has been done for some reason other than the need to protect residence parking. I therefor believe that the areas known as the Hurstpark estate (as detailed above) should be removed from the residence parking scheme. I believe it is also telling that the full breakdown of the consultation has never been provided despite being asked for. Instead an overall figure of over 50% in favor has been thrown around, but Id be willing to be this was not made up of replies from the estate.</p>

117	18/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I deeply object to the proposed parking fees.</p> <p>For the most part I use the carpark at Ellis House, however occasionally (a couple of times a month) one has to park on the street.</p> <p>People in Ellis House are mostly retired and the few who can afford a car are struggling with the cost.</p> <p>Further, there are no issues with commuters parking in the Close.</p>
118	19/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I have managed to access proposed plans via FB page and would like my previous comments placed as my response to the proposals especially as I have just received this years council tax</p> <p>I am disgusted at management within the City Council who appear to be trying to push average residents from the city.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose the residents parking scheme for Mulberry Close and expect this and my previous email to be taken as my response to the consultation.</p> <p>I am very much against any parking scheme for the Hurst Park, Leys Road area as we are nowhere near the city centre.</p> <p>I feel this is just another means for local government to raise revenue as they are unable to properly manage the funds they already get from the our excessive council tax.</p> <p>I live in Mulberry Close, which is a private residential area and I already have to pay an annual amount to maintain the grounds.</p> <p>My understanding is that the existing parking bays are not owned by the council, this will result in major issues with parking for Mulberry Close residents.</p> <p>Lastly, I feel Cambridge City Council needs to expend their money, energy and time on managing the traffic chaos coming into Cambridge rather than penalising their residents further.</p>
119	04/11/2024 22:37:14 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposal for a Residents' parking scheme for the Hurst Park Estate as we do not have a problem that needs to be fixed in our street. The scheme would reduce the availability of parking in the area, occur unnecessary bother and expense for the council and residents. It would also spoil the character of the neighbourhood with markings, extra dropped curbs and street furniture. Ad-hoc parking also aids with traffic calming, protecting children and animals from speeding cars. Please do not implement this.</p>
120	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>With ref to PR0998 I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Fundamentally I do not consider it either necessary or worth the expense it will place on the public purse.</p> <p>As a regular user of all the roads involved I cannot see the requirement for introducing residents parking. The argument that neighboring roads that have lost their on-street parking and will be displaced into the proposed scheme area has already occurred (eg Milton Rd).. Nobody has been able to park on Milton Rd for months now, where have all their cars all gone ? Wherever it is it certainly doesn't seem to be causing any local problems and that's without the introduction of residents parking.</p> <p>Yes, people at the very end of Hurst Park Ave have a little more occasional non-residents daytime parking, but as a daily cyclist at various times of the day up Hurst Park Ave I have always been able to count an average of 5-10 minimum legal and considerate available parking spaces between Milton Rd and the bend a quarter of the way up. Beyond that there has never been an issue.</p> <p>Residents parking will certainly displace commuter parking and a substantial amount of the dentists parking as well no doubt. But everyone knows that ultimately if you want to effectively reduce city car use you're going to have to introduce congestion charging. The Hurst Park residents parking scheme will just displace the commuters to somewhere else.</p> <p>On a point of transparency in local government, I would like to know when the results (actual numbers) of the GCP's residents consultation survey that occurred back in Oct '22 (I think, its been so long) will be published and why this has not been done already?</p> <p>At the last public meeting (Milton Rd Library Nov 22?) the representative from the council was only able to state there had been a small majority in favour, but didn't have the figures to hand !. He and councillor Joscelyne Scutt promised at that meeting that these would be made public following the meeting. She did try with the GCP but they kept stalling eventually saying they would come with the final full report. This I understand is still some months off and we are now in 2024!! So much for local democracy !</p> <p>I do hope that when/if we are to learn by how many votes residents were "in favour" of the scheme it is a statistically relevant & substantial number of the what must be nearly 1000 affected homes (the seven roads in HPERA alone.have 700 homes) Anything less than a substantial survey response will be a travesty of local democracy and fuel my suspicions that residents are sleep walking into what is a done deal scheme through their own voting apathy.</p>
121	09/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I anticipate the introduction of the Milton Road permit parking zone with complete despair. I am a resident of the Springfield Road/ Herbert St. community with one car so am faced with the possibility of never being able to find somewhere to park and to have to pay for that privilege.</p> <p>We are facing a 60% reduction to the parking spaces currently available to residents, that is 40 vehicles, and there is no accommodation made in the expanded scheme that will be able to cope with this number of cars on a daily and more importantly nightly basis.</p> <p>Over the years we have proposed to the consultation several ideas that could mitigate at least a few of the worst affects for some of our community. These have included a small "woodland parking" area at the entrance to Springfield Road that could be residents only; new parking bays could be made at the co-op end of Herbert St. to take 4 to 5 cars and still leave place for three pointed turns to go back up Herbert St.: putting parking bays along the east side of Herbert St. would accommodate several more cars than on the west side. But for some inexplicable reason it has been decided have have bays on the east side only.</p> <p>This is really the most thoughtless solution, a total disregard of the residents of this neighbourhood who suffer the most if it goes ahead.</p> <p>This scheme should not go ahead until a more satisfactory solution is provided for the residents of Springfield Rd. and Herbert St.</p>

122	11/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>I object in the strongest terms against the utterly ill-conceived and punitive measures in your “plans” to restrict parking in my street, Springfield Road, and in Herbert Street. It is astonishing to me to read that your “scheme is intended to prioritise on-street parking for residents and, in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available” when it quite manifestly will do precisely the opposite. How can you cut the number of parking spaces so radically and expect to be helping residents, such as me, with my supposed current problem of “no off-road parking available”? The sheer absurdity of this justification leaves me gasping for breath.</p> <p>I have lived in Springfield Road, [REDACTED] In all that time I have almost always been able to find a parking space in the road or in Herbert Street— just occasionally, in the old days, I might need to use one of the painted bays on the pavement in Milton Road. The issue of non-residents coming to these two streets to park in order to work or shop is, in my view, largely imaginary: if they come to park, it is only after 9 when some of the residents have driven off to work themselves; by the time the latter return, the visitors are gone. The ebb and flow is manageable (has any research been done to show it otherwise?). Your scheme will just punish us all, [REDACTED] will have to pay for the privilege of parking in my own street— except, of course, that the chances of my finding a space in it or Herbert Street will now reduce by 75%, so it is hardly a benefit or a privilege I am getting from you. This is extortion on the one hand, stupidity on the other and dereliction of responsibility in-between.</p> <p>Consider, please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The disadvantages in your “scheme” to the vulnerable (young women, the elderly and the ill) are very considerable, given the walking distances from car to front door that you will be imposing. 2.Charging of electric vehicles will become impossible for owners who live on the no-parking side of Herbert Street, and switching to electric will be a choice denied to people on that side. 3.Proceeding with your “scheme” will render a community permanently aggrieved by creating constant worry, stress, inconvenience and additional expense for which you alone will bear responsibility.
123	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>It’s totally unfair that because approximately 25 houses either side of Hurst Park Avenue from Milton Road are affected by commuter cars, dentist visitors and local shoppers are inconvenienced for a short period each day 5 x a week that everyone in the Hurst Park Avenue Residents Association (350+ houses) will have to face the extra costs of residents parking and everything it entails from reduced on road parking and having to pay for the privilege of family/friends visiting during the restrictions.</p> <p>It would have been polite for the council to have published the actual number of replies and the statistics of the consultation from way back in either 2022/2023. Many residents feel it is a stitch up and frankly we don’t want it. The parking issue only affects Hurst Park Avenue which leaves 6 out of 7 roads having to be part of a scheme which in its self is too wide - 11-12.30 is good enough.</p>
124	16/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>This email is expressing my objection towards the proposed residents parking scheme in our area. [REDACTED] parking has never been a concern for us or the local community as we are respectful of each others properties and value the fact that everyone requires their own space for their cars. That being said, implementing this scheme would be unfair on the families who have multiple drivers and rely on the open space for parking. [REDACTED] I work long hours and highly appreciate the freedom to park in my area without having to worry about the consequences of receiving a ticket which is also why I reject this proposed scheme. I hope you consider my feedback when deciding on whether you will be implementing this scheme.</p>
125	17/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Object	<p>Firstly I’ve been on the website and can’t find any information, can you please advise? How much is this going to cost the residents? I do not want the proposed scheme in my area. I have no idea what the benefit is to anyone (other than a money making opportunity for the council). What’s the problem with some free parking for people who work in the area or city centre? Just leave well enough alone please as this is potentially an additional expense I just cannot afford.</p>
126	16/03/2024	Unknown		Wholly Object	<p>Please accept this email as my honest feedback on the proposed residents parking scheme in the cb4 area. As you are aware, the cost of living crisis has had a severe impact on families all over the UK and this is my main concern of implementing this scheme as residents will now have an additional cost to cover by purchasing a permit to park their car, which can have a financial impact on families who have multiple drivers in the same home. Alongside this, if you don’t have a permit this will lead to tickets being distributed along the community which is leading to more costs which they may struggle to pay for alongside the essentials of every day living. That being said, this email proposes my opinion of rejecting this scheme as it is unfair towards families who are struggling financially and will cause more harm than good towards the community overall.</p>

127	17/03/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>As a resident of x Arbury Road, in my view and in the main I don't have a problem with parking near to my house from Monday- Friday 9:30 - 3pm. (I do not have a driveway to rely upon the limited pavement space).</p> <p>For the businesses such as the hairdressers and beauticians, introducing permitting will mean customers (or the business) have to pay extra money for a daily permit in order to access the business (a lot of these clients are elderly) which may hinder their profitability and cause extra strain on a local family business.</p> <p>What does cause an issue, and traffic, are the cars that temporarily pull up to visit Al Noor Groceries. This could be for 15-20 minutes at a time directly on the pavement outside blocking pedestrian access or on the double yellow lines which makes it difficult for cars to pass and causes congestion. Many of these are loitering vehicles and contribute to the unnecessary noise and emissions. I don't believe that residential permitting is going to help this particular situation or dissuade drivers to temporarily park on the road.</p>
128	04/10/2024 14:45:50 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>Re PR0998. I am [REDACTED] resident on Arbury Rd [REDACTED] I am dismayed to realise we are excluded from getting a residents parking permit or purchasing visitor parking permits under the proposed scheme. This is the part of the proposal I object to - we need to have at the very least visitor parking permits.</p> <p>The exclusion of "even number" residents seems like a decision made without understanding the actual use of the road and needs of ALL THE AFFECTED RESIDENTS.</p> <p>Even number residents, currently to have the option to park at the curb but as an unwritten protocol do not tend to park there even though it is legal. This is because it is generally unsafe. AS A RESULT - any of our visitors currently park across the road where Arbury Rd widens and there are almost always free parking spaces or further down Leys Rd .</p> <p>The proposed new parking removes this option for "even number" households having any guests park fairly near by. It effectively means [REDACTED] can not have friends, tradespeople, carers, elderly relatives, younger family members who might have their own car visit us!!</p> <p>[REDACTED] the "even number" residents, are asked to contribute to, or are being forced, into a solution to the terrible traffic problems of this end of Arbury Rd , without being offered any alternatives in the same way the residents across the road have been offered , yet [REDACTED] are actually more impacted with complete restrictions on [REDACTED] side of the road .</p> <p>By not including the even numbered Arbury Rd residents at the eastern end of the road in the parking permit scheme ,is a significant oversight is significantly unfair, shows a lack of understanding of the needs of ALL THE RESIDENTS IMPACTED BY THIS SCHEME.</p> <p>The even number residents must be offered access to residents and visitor parking permits.</p>
129	04/04/2024 16:44:10 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>Not enough resident parking. No parking area for the shops. Why is there no parking between number 15 Arbury Road and up? Will the tro be policed? We already have issues with shop users parking on the pavement and double yellows. This will be worse if not addressed.</p>
130	04/06/2024 18:03:46 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I am unhappy that no allowance is being made to provide short term parking (eg. 30 minutes maximum) for the shops at the Milton Road end of Arbury Road . These shops are vital services for local residents and should have the same off-street parking privileges that are being given to the shops on the main Milton Road parade. To take away their parking rights will effectively close the businesses.</p>
131	04/10/2024 20:09:40 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I am supportive of a resident parking scheme on Arbury Road but I am not in favour of the current plans. The number of bays provided between nos 7-25 Arbury Road is insufficient. No bays have been allocated outside numbers 15-25 which is a heavily used area for residents' parking.</p> <p>There seems to be an error in the plans, as they appear to show an existing flush curb outside 17-25, when none exists. Is this a proposal to install a flush curb? If so, for what reason? We need to keep the parking spaces that we already have, as many of us have very young children and so need the opportunity to park outside our houses for their safety. There are no problems caused by cars parking here currently.</p> <p>Until bays are allocated in the strip from 15-25 Arbury Road, including those already proposed outside neighbouring houses, I cannot support the plans as currently shown.</p>
132	03/18/2024 08:42:28 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>More bays are needed in the space between 27-1 Arbury Road - there is no reason why there are no bays planned there? The reduction of parking in that stretch would mean a very long walk for us [REDACTED] who visits by car sometimes. We [REDACTED] and need a bay in front of our home for parking (as we always and currently have). We would have to unload our shopping and [REDACTED] on double yellow lines with the plan you have circulated. or walk a long way (often one adult) with shopping bags and [REDACTED] who could run into this busy road (which will not have less traffic with this scheme)</p> <p>This is an unfair, undemocratic and unjustified removal of parking benefits from residents here of many years. I and all neighbors I have spoken to don't mind moving to paying scheme, but the same number of bays must be provided as now. Car reduction should not impact locals disproportionately just because we live on Arbury Road.</p> <p>If you want to make the road safer and reduce car traffic, make the road one-way or better still add a modal filter as has been requested by the overwhelming majority of residents for years. Listen rather than impose measures. We have been consulted dozens of times on this but have seen no action. Instead, you now are proposing to do something we have not asked for.</p> <p>[REDACTED] xx Hurst Park Avenue has about 6 bays planned Infront of the entire frontage of her house! (xx Hurst Park Avenue) She also has a driveway. We have none planned in front of ours at xx Arbury Road ! How is this fair?</p>
133	04/05/2024 11:36:31 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>No provision has been made for parking at the shops situated at the beginning of Arbury Road and without this businesses will be affected.</p> <p>Please provide a minimum 2 bay 30 mins only parking spaces outside this row of shops.</p> <p>Alternatively 2 spaces of pay+display as is being provided for shops round corner in Milton Road.</p>

134	03/18/2024 13:17:33 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>The proposed parking at the Southern end of Arbury Road is not satisfactory.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed allowance does not allow for even a single space per dwelling - each house is multi-bedroom and can be reasonably expected to own a vehicle 2. There is no reason for the significant gaps between the proposed residents bays - the road does not narrow and the gaps will not improve traffic flow or safety. The bays should be continuous to at least maintain existing provision. 3. The poor provision will simply increase pressure on surrounding roads (e.g. Leys Rd, Leys Av) and require residents on Arbury Rd (most of whom have no provision for off street parking) to leave their vehicles away from their property and increase difficulty in loading/unloading, especially for those with mobility issues 4. Enforcement will need to be significantly improved; the bulk of issues are caused by illegal loading and parking at the far Southern End of Arbury Road where the road narrows (next to Al Noor Grocery) and double yellow parking, pavement parking, kerb parking and illegal loading cause a pinch point and increase danger to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. <p>Provision should be made for each property at the Southern end Arbury Road without the opportunity for off street parking to have a space within 2 minutes of their property to park a single vehicle.</p>
135	04/02/2024 20:12:41 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>My discordance is the double yellow lines in front of the property that would not allow anyone [REDACTED] to park in the garage.</p>
136	04/12/2024 23:02:10 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I do not consider Arbury Road to be a road which has issues with parking, therefore I do not see the need to introduce parking restrictions. I do not own a car but whenever friends and family have visited they have never had any issues with parking on Arbury Road.</p> <p>As I do not own a car, I will not need to buy a permit for myself. However, I am trying to understand what needs to be done to allow friends and family to park on Arbury Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will I be able to buy a permit for visiting friends/family? - Would they be expected to buy a 5 days visitors permit? Or is that 5 days visitors permit for something different? <p>Either way this feels like an unnecessary cost to ensure friends/family can park on a road they have never had issues parking on.</p>
137	04/09/2024 11:42:05 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>As a resident of the north side of Arbury road, this scheme will negatively impact me. We use the free parking spaces that are currently available on the south side of the road. This scheme proposes we will not be able to park on our own road.</p>
138	04/03/2024 17:21:30 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no shopper parking on Arbury Road - we have useful shops at the Milton Road junction, but they will be disadvantaged by having nowhere for 30 minute shoppers to park legally. Already the butcher has closed, in part because of the parking difficulties arising from the Milton Road works. I personally have concerns that shoppers will increasingly use the parking for the betting shop and the flats at 147 Milton Road which is accessed via an extremely narrow driveway between Al Noor and no 1 Arbury Road making that a potential accident hot spot. 2. The map used in the TRO is out of date and is therefore misleading and difficult for residents and others to follow and make sense of. 3. I don't understand why residents of the holiday lets at Arbury View will be entitled to purchase residents' parking permits. 4. At no point during the consultation period prior to the production of the TRO were the residents informed that the RPS would only include residents on the odd numbered (south) side of Arbury Road. Although most residents on the north side of Arbury Road should have adequate parking, excluding them from the scheme means that they are unable to purchase visitor parking permits if needed.
139	03/18/2024 23:48:24 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I object to part this proposal as this is limited to odd numbers from 1 to 145 only. I stay on the south side of the road and there is no allocated parking space because of which the only option available to park is off-road which would be taken away if this scheme is implemented.</p>
140	11/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>1.PLAN WHICH INTERGRATES PARKING, CYCLING AND TRAFFIC CONTROL We have been informed that the scheme will focus solely on the parking issue, but at the same time there needs to be joined up thinking, taking into account: road safety, enhanced residential parking, pedestrians and cycling.</p> <p>It is difficult to consider the proposed scheme as residential in focus as its main impact will be to remove parking from residents. Uncontrolled speed and volume of vehicles is the real problem on the road rather than parking. The plan does not appear to have taken this fact into account.</p> <p>The north side of the road has been inexplicably excluded from the Arbury Road East scheme. There is however an opportunity to help correct this omission and combine adequate parking with measures to reduce traffic speed and volume. Parking bays could be installed alternately on the two sides of the road, with signage for vehicles to give way in turn. It would have an immediate impact on speeding and safety on the road, and maintain adequate parking spaces for residents. We need the planners to prioritise this issue, rather than focusing narrowly on parking, (or rather removing parking).</p> <p>2.CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS Arbury Road is listed as a "Signed Primary Cycle Network Road" - improved cycling should therefore be an integral part of the parking scheme. At the very least the proposed additional short length of further cycle lane should connect to the existing network. (It is difficult to believe it is not joined up in the plan, and also implemented as a proper cycleway). Unfortunately the eastern end of the road will become even more dangerous for cycles from speeding vehicles following the scheme. Removing parking opposite the Baptist church and other sections will encourage speeding and cause a problem rather than removing one. Also where on earth are the residents supposed to park?</p> <p>3.INADEQUATE MAPPING The many errors and shortcomings in the mapping for the scheme have been commented on elsewhere. They were prepared at a tiny scale, with a confusing key, designed to obfuscate. Our own house [REDACTED] provides a good example of the problems with the map where it shows an "existing access" going through our brick wall and ignores our dropped curb and that of our neighbour, which have been in place for many years.</p>

				<p>Between Milton Road and Leys Road 29 properties on the south side of the road will affected as follows:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Now</td> <td>with Scheme</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>On street parking</td> <td>15</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Double Yellow Lines</td> <td>4</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dropped Kerbs</td> <td>10</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table> <p>These numbers have been prepared by ground checking the current situation and using the map to show the "with Scheme" position.</p> <p>4.LACK OF PARKING FOR SHOPS There needs to be parking provision near the shops on the Milton Road, Arbury Road Corner.</p> <p>5.ERROR CORRECTION AFTER SIX MONTHS We understand that it is intended to correct minor errors after six months, but such an approach would certainly not resolve the basic shortcomings of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>6.GENERAL COMMENT years ago our road was comparatively quiet. We have witnessed a dramatic increase in traffic volumes, speeding and pollution in recent years. During this time the problems with our section of the road have been ignored by the Council. 20mph signs were once painted on the road, too far apart and now badly faded and completely ignored by a growing number of impatient drivers, intent of jumping the lights. As a road we have been sorely ignored. We hope that the Council will now take the opportunity to make a positive contribution to our road rather than pursue a poorly planned narrowly focused badly conceived scheme which in its current form will do more harm than good.</p>	Now	with Scheme		On street parking	15	9	Double Yellow Lines	4	19	Dropped Kerbs	10	1
Now	with Scheme															
On street parking	15	9														
Double Yellow Lines	4	19														
Dropped Kerbs	10	1														
141	18/03/2024	Unknown		<p>Partly Object</p> <p>I would like to object to the above-referenced TRO for the Milton Toad area parking scheme.</p> <p>While I understand the motivation for a parking scheme in this area, I object to the ways in which the scheme is being implemented.</p> <p>In particular, I object to the additional double-yellow lines proposed on Arbury Road outside the odd-numbered houses between Numbers 11 and 27. These houses do not have driveways and so residents rely on on-street parking. The double yellow lines will result in the removal of parking spaces outside these house that residents currently rely on.</p> <p>There is no benefit to these yellow lines - there will be parking bays outside No 11 and No 27 so the yellow lines will not improve traffic flow or permit a cycle lane to be built. However, there will be a significant impact on residents, particularly those with small children or the elderly, who face the prospect of having to park a long walk from the houses.</p> <p>If these yellow lines were replaced with parking bays for residents along the south side of Arbury Road I would be supportive of the scheme.</p>												
142	11/04/2024	Resident		<p>Partly Object</p> <p>I would like to feedback on a number of matters relating to the proposed scheme. I am at xx Arbury Road and granted permission for a dropped kerb so surprised to see a parking space in front of house. The dropped kerb work hasn't been done yet but is authorised.</p> <p>I am very concerned about :</p> <p>a) The lack of cycleway all the way down Arbury road. This seems such a wasted opportunity when it would join up segregated sections.</p> <p>b) The lack of parking bays overall on the street. With long sections of double yellow lines that could be parking.</p> <p>c) The lack of parking for the shops at the Milton Road end of Arbury Road.</p> <p>d) The lack of a proper consultation from 2022. The fact that the even numbers side of the road being outside the scheme only become apparent to many in the last week or so. The maps, links and information were very poor with a vague key / legend and on the feedback website the boundary line still is on the even side gardens so looks like they are included.</p> <p>It seems there is still some level of consultation after the TRO? Is this the case please?</p>												
143	02/04/2024	Resident		<p>Partly Object</p> <p>I would like some clarification please on an aspect of the resident parking scheme that is being proposed for Arbury Road I live at number xx Arbury Road part of a row of terrace houses with a variety of residents, including older people and young families. None of these houses have off street parking I was encouraged to see that the stated objective of the scheme is to prioritise parking for residents, particularly for those who have no off street parking However it looks like you are proposing to put double yellow lines here and that all the residents living in this stretch will lose their parking Please can you clarify if this is indeed the case and if so what is the reason for this I would appreciate a quick response as objections have to be lodged imminently</p> <p>In my opinion it is the volume of traffic using Arbury Road that causes the problems, but I will submit my objection and keep my fingers crossed.</p>												
144	04/11/2024 22:07:39 +01:00	Resident	Parking	<p>Partly Object</p> <p>The current plan and map shows a lack of parking with large sections of double yellow lines. Also a lack of parking for the shops near Milton Road on Arbury Road. It is also very disappointing that the Arbury Road bike lanes are not going to be continued when it is so dangerous for cycle users and pedestrians.</p>												
145	04/11/2024 12:57:58 +01:00	Resident	Parking	<p>Partly Object</p> <p>Chesterton Hall Crescent will become the overspill for Herbert Street as approximately 30 spaces are to be removed from them. This will not improve the position for CHC. Outside the restricted parking times it will make it very much worse as not only will we have shoppers for example all weekend we will also have approximately 30 cars from Herbert Street in addition and have to pay for the privilege. The hours of restricted parking are very short. Much shorter than the De Freville area which seems most unfair. The numbers parking at present on Herbert Street do not cause a problem so it seems bizarre to take away so many spaces. Without Residents parking the Council do not propose to reduce numbers parking!!!! The impact of those living on Herbert Street will be horrendous. Electric car charging will be reduced. The cost is so much greater not to charge at at home.</p>												

146	04/06/2024 15:58:29 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	Can you please ensure that provision continues to be made for residents on the north side of Chesterton Road (currently included in De Freville) Visiting trades also need provision nearby for their vans. Thank you
147	04/12/2024 15:30:39 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	Herbert St. Electric charging for every vehicle in the near future means that Herbert St must keep most of the parking on both sides. Find a code of practice for road layout or adapt one to allow parking on both sides.
148	04/11/2024 14:30:02 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	Visitors permits should be valid in adjacent RPS. I live on Chesterton Rd and my visitors / occasional contractors park in George St, 20m away. I am in the DeFreville RPS, but George St is in the new Milton Rd RPS. My contractors will soon have to park 200m away from me - and cross the busy ring road to access their van for tools and materials in the DeFreville estate. I want to see visitor permits shared across the two areas. Visits are occasional. Visits will not affect evening parking where pressure is most likely.
149	04/06/2024 16:39:20 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	I live at xxx Chesterton Road [REDACTED] and object to being placed in the de Freville residents scheme, and not this new one. It is utterly illogical - why would I ask elderly parents or visiting workmen to cross the main road and drive around the de Freville area looking for a parking space, when we and our visitors have always parked on CHC? This will reduce access to our house for us and for our visitors. I insist that you move our house into this new scheme.
150	04/06/2024 19:59:50 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	I live in xxx Chesterton Road which is currently not included in either the Milton or De Freville Residents parking scheme so would not be able to apply for a permit for any street around me and would not be able to park my car anywhere near to my [REDACTED] under this proposal. Please extend the Milton residents parking scheme boundary to be adjacent with the de Grenville boundary.
151	04/12/2024 10:01:57 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	The removal of so many existing spaces from the scheme - particularly those from Herbert Street and on Milton Road - will inevitably result in yet more parking problems for existing residents and is entirely unnecessary. I understand that the restrictions being imposed on Herbert Street are stricter than would be imposed on a new housing estate - a ludicrous and inflexible imposition.
152	03/28/2024 15:44:18 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	The reason for the existing Ascham residents' parking zone, as stated when its residents were asked to vote on it, was to avoid spillover vehicles from Herbert Street and surrounding area parking in the Ascham zone, should Herbert Street etc. get a residents' parking zone. Adding the area between Milton Road and Chesterton Road to the Ascham area would appear to defeat the purpose of the Ascham zone. Thus it would appear to make more sense to keep Ascham as a distinct zone, with Herbert Street etc its own zone. I have no relevant opinion whether the Herbert Street area and the Hurst Park Estate should be considered separate areas or combined (I understand that both of these were considered in their original consultations), as neither area is in my neighbourhood.
153	04/09/2024 16:38:36 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	Should have some free spaces for visitors, there will be none down hawthorn way after this
154	03/20/2024 12:21:16 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	I support all aspects of this scheme apart from the 3 car per household limit (mentioned in the Public Notice). In my opinion, this limit should be brought down to one car per address (perhaps with some consideration for exceptional circumstances). The new plan substantially reduces the total number of parking spaces available. I concede that this is unfortunate but necessary, considering the width of the roads in question, and I trust that the author of the proposal did their best to maximise the available parking. However, the proposal seems to provide fewer than one parking spot per house (this is most obvious on our street - Herbert Street, but seems to apply to the area as a whole). I believe that a majority of houses in the area own at least one car. I wonder why the limit was therefore set at 3 rather than one, which seems to be the standard for the rest of Cambridge, as outlined in the Cambridge City Council Parking Permit Scheme Terms & Conditions (see bottom of page 2 of https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/10459/residents-parking-permit-terms-and-conditions.pdf , under "Resident Permits", also attached as pdf). Please also note that the links in the Public Notice document (which I downloaded from the consultation website: https://consultation.appyway.com/cambridge/order/4e9da704-ed65-4aff-a58a-b1529856419f) don't work -- they are just blue underlined text that is impossible to click.
155	04/10/2024 15:42:32 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	The very significant reduction in parking spaces proposed for Herbert Street is both unnecessary and undesirable. Although modern highway standards would suggest Herbert Street is not wide enough for parking on both sides, we have to remember that this street was built over a hundred years ago and, like anything that pre-dates modern standards, flexibility is necessary when determining how those standards should be applied. Dogmatic application of generic policies is in nobody's interests, especially where those policies are working against the interests of the residents. Bin lorries and ambulances generally have no problems in navigating the street - the odd occasion where a bin lorry is unable to pass is usually caused by illegal parking on existing double-yellow lines on the bend at the north end of the street, or bad parking adjacent to it. The removal of such a large number of spaces is likely to create significant problems. Although in theory there are enough spaces across the combined residents' parking zone, in practice finding a suitable parking space is likely to lead to an increase in traffic on all zone streets as residents circle around trying to find a suitable space. Many residents use their cars infrequently, so it's likely that those residents will, when they do find a space on Herbert Street, leave their car there for a considerable period of time; it will be the regular commuters that end up using other streets. This will mean that spaces on Herbert Street rarely become free - this will make it very difficult for residents of Herbert Street to have trades-persons come to their homes because of the very low chance that a trades-person can park nearby. It's not practical for a trades-person to make multiple trips to and from a van parked several streets away (the "no waiting" markings would even prevent them from legally unloading before moving the van elsewhere for parking). I propose that Herbert Street continues to permit parking on both sides of the street (using some kind of flexibility or exemption), perhaps with small expansions of "no waiting" zones, such as at the bend, if absolutely necessary. Perhaps one side of the street could have a width restriction to ensure only regular sized cars park there?
156	03/26/2024 19:59:25 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	The map appears to show parking spaces on both sides of George Street. This is not physically possible on that road due to road width. Herbert Street currently accommodates parking on both sides of the road. It is essential that this is retained. Reason being that if parking is restricted to one side of Herbert Street too many spaces will be lost. As the plans for George Street (parking on both sides) is unviable the loss of spaces will be too much for the scheme to work.
157	03/27/2024 22:11:52 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	The main problem is the huge reduction in parking spaces for Herbert Street. Every space counts and it would seem that more spaces could be made available by parking on the east side of the road rather than the west side. There is also currently a space at the coop end of the road and I see no reason why this can't remain. The signage needs to be kept to a minimum and Herbert Street with Springfield road could be considered as a PPA with signs at the entrance to the streets and perhaps the junction where Springfield joins Herbert Street. There is an option for some additional discrete signs attached to walls of front gardens. Assuming that it is mainly commuters who are to be deterred the times of operation could be reduced to 10 -2pm . Herbert street is a much used by pedestrians (and cycles) and the pavements are difficult to use on bin day or wheelchairs find them too bumpy, so it is common for people to use the road. It will be important to limit the speed of vehicles who will now feel less constrained by the narrow width either with a speed limit or some other traffic calming device like points of slight narrowing (maybe including a flower bed or small tree).

158	03/23/2024 19:31:32 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I have serious concerns about the effect of the scheme on Herbert Street and Springfield road.</p> <p>More than half of the residents will be paying for the privilege of parking much further away, mostly Gurney way , rather than in Springfield or Herbert Street as we now do.</p> <p>I think it is essential to respect that by minimising the loss of spaces as much as possible. I think parking on the east side of Herbert Street would enable more spaces and we need to retain the space at the Chesterton Road end adjacent to the cycle lane.</p> <p>As the aim is to avoid commuter parking ,rather than limit residents from having visitors or plumbers, the hours of operation need to be adjusted to achieve this goal and 10am to 2pm would be preferred.</p> <p>Signage is a real issue and needs to be kept to a minimum , especially where the pavements are already very narrow. It is vital that (like George street) Herbert street and Springfield road are treated as a PPA for this reason . This would be perfectly feasible as they are not a through road on the way to anywhere ,so signs at the entrance to Springfield road on Mitcham's corner one way system and to Herbert street entrance on Milton Road would be adequate for any driver .</p> <p>Herbert Street has a high footfall as it functions as a route to the shops on Chesterton Road and in to town . Many people choose to walk down the middle of the road in both Herbert Street and Springfield as the pavements are very bumpy for wheeled trolleys , pushchairs and wheelchairs ,are often obstructed by bins. this has been safe up until now as the vehicles are forced to drive slowly by the narrowness. I am concerned that with a wider road , vans will drive too fast and a 10mph speed limit painted on the road would be sensible.</p>
159	04/11/2024 16:28:20 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>The scheme is disproportionately very unfair to the residents of Herbert Street with the reduction of about a 50% of parking places both within the confines of the street and on the surrounding streets. It also introduces a danger of making our road into a race track for speeding cars by removing parking from one side thus increasing the road width. Despite not being a full through-road, there is bottom access through Springfield Road. The imposed limitations on parking alone is likely to have a serious effect depressing property values compared with surrounding streets if Herbert Street is seen as extra-problematic for car-owners and getting tradesmen access. Despite the fact that our daytime parking space is frequently taken up by out-of-town "day-trippers", this is something we have been living with for years; the proposals under review would make matters much worse for residents rather than improving them. I think the majority of householders would rather retain the status quo for our street and have Herbert Street excluded from the current proposals.</p>
160	04/10/2024 17:46:24 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I do not see the necessity to restrict parking in Herbert Street (HS) to one side only. This will effectively reduce the number of parking spaces available by 50%. HS is a Victorian street but the proposed parking arrangements will be stricter than those required for a new housing developments.</p> <p>Further, such restriction will make it impossible for residents (particularly those on the evens side) to charge electric vehicles at home. This will be a huge discouragement to switch to electric vehicles which the government wants us to do as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Also the proposed arrangement will allow for much increased travel speed due to there being an increased running width. The existing 20 mph is not always observed even now.</p> <p>Please allow parking to remain on BOTH sides of HS with maybe just a small extension to the double yellow lines at bend near to its confluence with Milton Road to provide better access for delivery and other larger vehicles.</p>
161	04/10/2024 14:15:03 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>We are submitting a second objection for this household to ensure that this is treated both as parking and environmental objections.</p> <p>We object to the TRO on both environmental and parking grounds.</p> <p>Parking grounds: I and other residents researched and wrote and submitted a 32 page report in 2018 researching the parking numbers and proposing a variety of ways that more parking could be retained on Herbert Street. There was never a response of any sort to the report from the authorities. Residents of Herbert Street do not want the parking removed down one side of the street, and removing it will harm elderly residents and greatly inconvenience residents all over the new parking zone, with 25-30 cars forced to park on adjacent streets. The county council would be quite capable of bending the policy on road width in this one instance, but the GCP's unwillingness to compromise on this due to county policy (which they treat as set in stone) effectively amounts to maladministration. There is no legal reason why the parking arrangement on Herbert Street can't be left in its current configuration as part of a parking scheme, as the county quite happily allows other zones created before the current policy to continue operating even though they would not today comply with policy. The new parking arrangements on Herbert Street exceed those required even in new build, where the fire engine access rules in Approved Document B would allow parking on both sides of the street at the South end of the street. It is totally unreasonable that we are forced to live with this new layout. At the very least, I expected that by now we would have some meaningful lessening of the parking removal (not just playing with which side of the street would have all the parking removed).</p> <p>An even more serious environmental matter has now arisen however, as it's become clear since this process was started many years ago that the future of cars is very much electric, and that electricity prices are set to stay high. A solution for many will be to fit solar panels and/or to charge cars on cheap and green night-time electricity at home (costs are about 8p per kWh). By contrast, to charge at the public charger by the Old Spring, the cost is (I believe) around 10 times higher, something around 70p per kWh. At this sort of charging price, buying an electric car is for the wealthy and extreme enthusiasts only.</p> <p>As things have stood up until now, charging an electric vehicle at home has seemed like a realistic possibility on Herbert Street, with concerns over cable routing and trip hazards looking entirely solvable. Parking near home on the street is also currently workable almost all the time. If this TRO goes ahead, around 30 houses will find it effectively impossible to charge with no parking outside their home, and the other 30 will find it a challenge because getting a space near home will be a rarity. You will effectively be strongly discouraging 60 households from moving to electric cars for as long as they are able. The environmental impact of this change will be significant.</p> <p>Not everyone can afford to sell up and move house, at a personal cost of around £30,000 in stamp duty and other costs, plus whatever loss in value their house undergoes as a result of the unsuitability of Herbert Street for owning an electric car.</p> <p>I strongly believe that these impacts are completely out of proportion and that the authorities have repeatedly failed to listen to the residents whom they are supposed to serve. Once this layout change is made, it is very unlikely ever to be reversed. I therefore object in the strongest terms to the Herbert Street parking layout proposed in the TRO, both on environmental grounds and due to the unnecessary loss of parking.</p>

162	04/10/2024 14:13:13 +01:00	Resident	Environmental	Partly Object	<p>I object to the TRO on both environmental and parking grounds.</p> <p>Parking grounds: I and other residents researched and wrote and submitted a 32 page report in 2018 researching the parking numbers and proposing a variety of ways that more parking could be retained on Herbert Street. There was never a response of any sort to the report from the authorities. Residents of Herbert Street do not want the parking removed down one side of the street, and removing it will harm elderly residents and greatly inconvenience residents all over the new parking zone, with 25-30 cars forced to park on adjacent streets. The county council would be quite capable of bending the policy on road width in this one instance, but the GCP's unwillingness to compromise on this due to county policy (which they treat as set in stone) effectively amounts to maladministration. There is no legal reason why the parking arrangement on Herbert Street can't be left in its current configuration as part of a parking scheme, as the county quite happily allows other zones created before the current policy to continue operating even though they would not today comply with policy. The new parking arrangements on Herbert Street exceed those required even in new build, where the fire engine access rules in Approved Document B would allow parking on both sides of the street at the South end of the street. It is totally unreasonable that we are forced to live with this new layout. At the very least, I expected that by now we would have some meaningful lessening of the parking removal (not just playing with which side of the street would have all the parking removed).</p> <p>An even more serious environmental matter has now arisen however, as it's become clear since this process was started many years ago that the future of cars is very much electric, and that electricity prices are set to stay high. A solution for many will be to fit solar panels and/or to charge cars on cheap and green night-time electricity at home (costs are about 8p per kWh). By contrast, to charge at the public charger by the Old Spring, the cost is (I believe) around 10 times higher, something around 70p per kWh. At this sort of charging price, buying an electric car is for the wealthy and extreme enthusiasts only.</p> <p>As things have stood up until now, charging an electric vehicle at home has seemed like a realistic possibility on Herbert Street, with concerns over cable routing and trip hazards looking entirely solvable. Parking near home on the street is also currently workable almost all the time. If this TRO goes ahead, around 30 houses will find it effectively impossible to charge with no parking outside their home, and the other 30 will find it a challenge because getting a space near home will be a rarity. You will effectively be strongly discouraging 60 households from moving to electric cars for as long as they are able. The environmental impact of this change will be significant.</p> <p>Not everyone can afford to sell up and move house, at a personal cost of around £30,000 in stamp duty and other costs, plus whatever loss in value their house undergoes as a result of the unsuitability of Herbert Street for owning an electric car.</p> <p>I strongly believe that these impacts are completely out of proportion and that the authorities have repeatedly failed to listen to the residents whom they are supposed to serve. Once this layout change is made, it is very unlikely ever to be reversed. I therefore object in the strongest terms to the Herbert Street parking layout proposed in the TRO, both on environmental grounds and due to the unnecessary loss of parking.</p>
163	03/19/2024 20:22:02 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I am in favour of residents parking in my area and also in favour of the combined zone with Milton Road, Gurney Way etc, that makes total sense. The purpose says 'The scheme is intended to prioritise on-street parking for residents and, in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available.' However for Herbert Street, the detail of the proposed planning of spaces on the street means we would lose the vast majority of our capacity to park cars on the street and even when the removal of non-resident cars from the equation is taken account of there will be much insufficient parking on the street for the number of residents with cars. So far from meeting the aim of prioritising on-street parking for residents, you are in fact proposing removing long held parking opportunity from Herbert St residents. I understand that this might be because the size of standard bays the council uses cannot be fitted on both sides of the road, but we need a pragmatic solution that adapts to the Victorian street dimensions. Residents do not need bays and we are very used to parking efficiently with cars close together which would allow us to fit more cars in. Also I understood from the fire service in previous iterations of the consultation that safe access for emergency vehicles (which was one of the early concerns of the council) can be achieved with a solution that just extends the double yellow lines to remove a few spaces at the pinch points, it doesn't require total removal of parking down one side. If needed it would be easy and cheap to replace permanent bollards near the coop end of the street with ones that could drop down to allow an emergency vehicle in that way. Lastly I would add that the bin lorry regularly gets all the way down to number 8 Herbert Street in reverse from the top so access by large vehicles is possible now, although I agree would be facilitated by removal of a few spaces on the even numbers side of the street.</p> <p>All in all I feel the removal of spaces altogether on the even numbers side of Herbert Street is overkill, creates a bigger problem than it solves and will create major practical problem for residents, particularly those who need to be able to park somewhere near their house because they have poor mobility (and there are several people who are in that category through illness or age on the street even if they are not blue badge holders) or who have young children [REDACTED] the impossibility of carrying shopping bags in from the car while keeping hold of the hand of the youngest and directing the older one if [REDACTED] couldn't find a parking space anywhere near to the house. The only way to do it safely without leaving kids alone in the house or the car was to make 15 one-handed trips back and forth to the car with both kids. If I had to park on another street I had the safety problem of trying to cross a street with [REDACTED] while carrying shopping bags. So it might seem no problem on paper if Herbert Street residents have to park several streets away but the kind of practical problems I described which will undoubtedly be created by the current layout are very real. In addition I fear the current planned reduction in parking spaces will impact on house prices in Herbert Street relative to now as having reliably available parking on a street is important to potential buyers, so I feel that Herbert St residents will bear an unfair economic penalty not borne by residents on other streets within the scheme.</p> <p>I am keen that we have residents parking and we want to remain part of this larger scheme, but the current fine scale planning of spaces on Herbert Street is not fit for purpose, it is imposing modern parking bay design appropriate for a newly built scheme onto a Victorian road without proper consideration of better adapted solutions to achieve adequate emergency access. As currently designed the Herbert Street arrangement of spaces is going to impose an unfair toll on Herbert Street residents who have raised all of these concerns during the protracted and various consultations and feel we have not been listened to.</p> <p>Lastly I would add that I could not find a working link to the Public Notice document to 'permanent traffic regulation orders' so I had to do some google searching to find the right web address in order to view the more detailed information needed to understand the implications of the scheme at street level. I would hope for greater transparency in a public consultation process so that there are no barriers to people understanding what is proposed and responding.</p>

164	08/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>I wanted to express my objection to this parking scheme.</p> <p>I am [REDACTED] on Herbert Street, and while I don't object to the idea of a resident parking scheme in general, planning on leaving less than half the number of parking spaces to houses on the road by having parking on me side only will inevitably create more problems than it solves for residents.</p> <p>It seems clear that many will have to seek parking away from the street that they live on, and the potential competition for limited spaces raises the possibility of friction and disputes developing between neighbours.</p> <p>I have seen other successful resident parking schemes where parking spaces are not restricted but you can only park with a resident or visitor permit, therefore pushing unwarranted parking away and improving conditions for residents not wilfully making things harder for them. I wonder who would pay for a permit that they would not be guaranteed to be able to use when they need it?</p> <p>Additional spaces freed up with a system that prevents unwanted parking without removing options for residents could improve accessibility for emergency vehicles too. Even without these additional spaces we managed to manoeuvre and park two removal vans on Herbert Street without problem just this week to move into our new home.</p> <p>I believe further benefit could be created for local residents by considering fitting car space sized 'bike hangers' in some spaces freed up by the resident parking scheme, allowing those without room in these small properties to securely lock and protect their bikes on road. This was very successful at our previous address in Walthamstow in London.</p> <p>I hope you will listen to what Herbert Street residents have to say on this matter and not push forwards despite objections like mine, and that you will continue to consult those of us effected by plans like this to find a more suitable solution.</p>
165	08/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>I'm writing to object to the proposed residents parking scheme, specifically as it will impact Herbert Street.</p> <p>Although I do not object to a residents only scheme, the current proposal to have parking bays on only one side of the street will leave less than half the current number of available parking spaces. This will make the parking situation worse as at least half the residents on the street will not be able to park on the street.</p> <p>I do not understand why parking bays cannot be kept on both sides. I have recently moved from London, and there was enough space for the removal vans to pass through, and there is clearly no issue for rubbish removal either.</p> <p>I hope the council will listen to the concerns of the Herbert Street residents and reconsider these plans.</p>
166	11/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>The available parking proposed simply will not accommodate the needed parking spaces for residents of the local area.</p> <p>Residents of Herbert Street and Springfield Road see our spaces cut from 76 to 36.</p> <p>I also spot error in your drawings on nearby George street which assumes parking on both sides of the road. This is not available and the road is far narrower than Herbert Street where you are proposing parking on one side only. In fact many residents of George Street currently use Herbert Street to park on when they can't find parking.</p> <p>These plans are therefore unworkable, and need serious reconsideration.</p> <p>I can understand the need for residents parking to dissuade non residents from driving in to town, but this is not practical or workable for actual residents who live in the area.</p>
167	04/05/2024 10:37:58 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>Far too much proposed new street furniture and signage. No need for individual parking bays to be marked. Proposed restricted hours are still far too long especially compared to other comparable schemes in the city. Still no sight line through bend in Hurst Park Avenue which is dangerous for both cyclists and motorists. Add more short term parking bays near shops.</p>
168	04/12/2024 22:03:09 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I support the idea of a resident's parking scheme but feel this current proposal is too invasive and creates some additional problems and dangers while trying to address the objective of providing parking for residents. I feel the hours are too long and only need be 2-3 hours during the working day to discourage commuter parking. I think on Orchard Ave and Highfield Ave the spaces should be staggered on either side of the street to discourage the inevitable speeding which will occur on each half of the street endangering residents and their children. I think there are far too many signposts and the delivering the information about parking restrictions can be achieved with less signage and still respect the character of the neighbourhood.</p>

169	04/11/2024 22:31:38 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I live within the area proposed for the Milton Road parking scheme, in the Hurst Park estate. I am not wholly in favour of the scheme as it is proposed at present, and am surprised to find that most of the comments that were made by residents in this area at the consultation in autumn 2022 have been ignored. I also question why we have not seen any of the results of that consultation, 18 months after it was completed. Why not? The whole process appears to be deeply flawed.</p> <p>My specific objections to the scheme are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plans appear to show an absurd and unnecessary number of signs advising drivers of the scheme - 96 new posts in the Hurst Park estate alone! When coupled with yellow lines and white lines marking bays, this will change the character of the estate. I would like to see signs at the entrances to this estate only (Hurst Park Avenue junction with Milton Road, Highworth Avenue junction with Milton Road, and Leys Road junction with Arbury Road), such as those in Newnham and Victoria Park. It is not necessary to ruin our quiet and clutter free estate with dozens of posts and signs. - The operating hours are excessive and unnecessary. They appear to have been set to tie in with the existing Ascham scheme. However the issues faced by residents of that area are entirely different to those of residents in this estate, which would be easily addressed by having much shorter operational hours to dissuade commuters and shoppers from parking here. 11am - 2pm would do this, and reduce the inconvenience to residents and their visitors, as well as shoppers. I have heard it suggested that it is not possible to have different times of operation within the same scheme, but I know there is in fact a precedent for this elsewhere in the city, so I fail to see why it can't work here. - No attempt appears to have been made to accommodate shoppers who use our much-valued local traders on Milton Road. Presently many of their visitors park for 30 minutes or an hour in our estate while visiting those businesses, as there is very limited parking on Milton Road itself (and this is now reduced even further as a result of the road works). We positively want our local shops to thrive, and we understand that they need shoppers from further away who need to travel by car. Why has no attempt been made to introduce short term parking for shoppers on Highworth Ave or Leys Road? We note that the only short term parking is on Hurst Park Avenue, but this is only a few spaces and appears to be designed for visitors to the dentist, not the shops. <p>For these reasons I am not in favour of the scheme as it is currently designed, and I cannot support it. Please take on board the feedback of residents and come up with a better scheme.</p>
170	04/12/2024 11:27:11 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I understand that the desire of the residents' parking is to discourage commuters from parking in the streets for the whole day. I would therefore urge the Council to consider shortening the hours so that it prevents people from parking at the beginning of the working day (for example, 8.30 - 10.30am or 8.00 - 10.00am). This will stop commuters being able to access day long parking while also allowing residents with elderly or disabled family members or visitors, contractors, businesses, to park more flexibly without the added financial burden on residents to provide parking permits for them.</p> <p>It is important that parking provision is made for any businesses in the area. We are one of the few areas in Cambridge where independent businesses are sited and we do not want to risk them going out of business.</p> <p>I do want to state that I fundamentally disagree with the concept of residents' parking whilst the public transport provision is both so expensive and unreliable. It penalises those who cannot afford to live in Cambridge, often in vital but poorly paid jobs. It pushes the problem onto adjoining streets (the areas where it is being introduced in this plan have suffered from increased on street parking because of residents' parking being introduced in the De Freville area and then subsequently Ascham Road/ Gurney Way areas.</p> <p>The Council needs to make better provision for what is an increasingly busy city which has made no allowance for its growth and therefore the pressure on public services. Free park and ride provision along with a Council owned bus service where the profit is put back into the service as in other metropolitan areas such as London needs to be considered as a priority. Running a public service for profit and charging extortionate fares is not effective. For too long, Cambridge residents' willingness to bicycle has allowed public transport provision to be ignored.</p>
171	03/19/2024 21:35:07 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>Error on drawing: 17 Highworth Avenue has a dropped kerb. No car parking space is possible there.</p> <p>The proposal includes a lot of signage. If it is not a legal requirement, please consider a reduction of signage and posts.</p> <p>Will the shops on Milton Road and Arbury Road have parking? If not, reconsider this to support local shops.</p>

172	04/04/2024 18:35:41 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I would like to object to one particular aspect of the resident parking scheme proposal. The scheme currently proposes that individual parking bays should be marked on the street. Where there is a marked bay, any resident may park and non-residents may not (with some exceptions for visitors, tradesmen etc.). Where there is NO marked bay, NO-ONE may park.</p> <p>The marking of individual bays has some problems and, as far as we can tell, no benefits. Residents are permitted to state whether a parking bay should or shouldn't be marked across their driveway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If a resident chooses to have a bay across their driveway, any resident is allowed to park there, making the driveway inaccessible to the owner. - If a resident chooses NOT to have a bay across their driveway, NO resident is allowed to park there, including the owner of the driveway and any visitor or tradesman visiting the address. <p>By individually marking out parking bays in this way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents have to choose between losing the right to park in front of their own property (for themselves and any visitors), or losing access to their driveway. 2. The total amount of space for parking is significantly reduced. The streets in this area are already used for parking by residents who live on other streets within the area, due to the lack of parking in front of properties on Milton Road. 3. The scheme is more expensive and difficult to establish, as the bays need to be negotiated, painted and maintained. 4. The scheme is more expensive and difficult to police, as parking inspectors have to check not only whether vehicles are displaying valid permits, but also whether they are properly within the lines of a marked bay. <p>The fundamental purpose of the Residents' Parking Scheme is to ensure that non-residents do not park on the designated streets between the designated times. This purpose is equally achieved if individual bays are NOT marked on the street. In this way, the total area for parking is not reduced, driveways remain accessible, and non-residents are prohibited from parking, which is the only point of the scheme.</p> <p>On a separate point, the map showing the proposed parking bays seems quite inaccurate; the alignment between bay boundaries and the properties and driveways doesn't seem correct.</p>
173	03/18/2024 14:01:01 +00:00	Resident	Financial	Partly Object	<p>I object to the scheme on the basis of cost to the residents. I cannot afford the extra £67 per year. At the moment I occasionally use on-road parking outside my house (for visitors, lodgers, tradesmen etc). The cost of buying a permit to do so is unattractive.</p> <p>Suggestion: much of the concern by my neighbours relates to a possible increase in street parking problems caused by new developments and loss of existing spaces caused by the Milton Road GCP changes. Perhaps the new developments could subsidise the residents' parking schemes via Section 106 grants.</p> <p>Suggestion: houses could be given "free of charge" vouchers to allow for occasional on-street parking. More palatable than having to pay £67 per year or worry about buying a weekly visitors' permit.</p>
174	04/12/2024 15:38:12 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>Please consider reducing the timing of the parking restrictions to 10.00-12.00, Monday to Friday. I believe this would still be long enough to discourage commuters from parking in the area, but would significantly reduce the inconvenience for residents and local shoppers.</p>
175	04/12/2024 08:58:51 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>The parking time restrictions should be reduced significantly. I suggest between 10am-12pm to reduce inconvenience to residents as much as possible. The number 1 priority of the scheme should be to stop commuters snarling up the Milton Road end of Hurst Park Avenue so it's safer for cyclists and children going to school. Aside from that, parking should be open and free to limit inconvenience to residents and those visiting businesses as much as possible, so a very minimal intervention is needed. I also think there needs to be a rethink about the amount of parking available to Arbury Rd and Mulberry Close residents.</p> <p>The biggest issue the estate has in terms of cars is short cutting at speed between Arbury Road and Hurst Park Avenue and vice versa. Driving is often anti social and dangerous from people using it as a rat run because they don't want to wait at the traffic lights. Is there a way to stop this taking place, again without significantly inconveniencing residents?</p>
176	04/11/2024 17:21:35 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I am concerned about the layout of the parking spaces at the Milton road end of Hurst Park Avenue. They are likely to cause the same problem that we currently have - namely only allowing one car to go in one direction and it is a lottery as to whether or not you have to reverse in order to allow the cars to come from the other way. This is frustrating for all and is dangerous for cyclists too. It will also impact the pedestrians at the Milton road end.</p> <p>These spaces are there because they are replacing the ones lost on Milton road and other streets such as Herbert street yet will impact Hurst park residents who are mostly fortunate in having a least one off road parking space.</p>
177	10/04/2024	Business		Partly Object	<p>I am writing to give my views regarding the above proposed scheme. I must say that I cannot support the scheme for Hurst Park Avenue.</p> <p>██████████ Prior to being ██████████ the building was a ██████████ so having a health care facility on Hurst Park Avenue is nothing new. I realise that there have been issues with parking recently, but it has only been since parking restrictions in nearby streets that it has really been a significant problem.</p> <p>There are a number of points that I would like to make.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The vast majority of residential properties on Hurst Park Avenue have adequate parking on their driveways. It is strange how so many choose to park on the road rather than on their own driveways. I have personally witnessed a resident moving a car onto the road from their driveway to prevent others parking. 2. Most of the staff at ██████████ live outside Cambridge and arrive at the practice early and may leave quite late. ██████████ arrive before 7.30am and rarely leave before 5.30pm. Using the park and ride would require allowing another hour to many of the staff with regard to travel time at both ends of the day. Those staff who, in addition, have child care arrangements may find that this added burden make their own situation un-workable. 3. Loss of the ability to park in the general area of the practice; not necessarily close to the practice, will make accessing ██████████ for very many people very difficult. For many of ██████████ elderly patients; the demographics of ██████████ patient base tends to be of the older age groups, access would become virtually impossible. 4. If access for the staff and patients becomes difficult or impractical, the viability of the practice as a whole may well become such that it closes and the provision of ██████████ and, what is, a true excellent practice, would cease. 5. I can understand that some local residents would feel it would improve the situation in the area, albeit at an added cost to them from the permits required. It would also benefit the city council with a noticeable income with little outlay on their part, although this would surely not be a reason to implement such parking restrictions. 6. ██████████ we are entirely sympathetic to the concept of the idea, but would like to think that consideration would be given to allocation of parking for staff and patients. ██████████ when all said and done, been in this same location for very many years and have caused no issues with regard to parking in the past. We have not make this a problem, but will suffer as a result of possible actions taken to resolve it. <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this and I sincerely hope that any solution, should one be considered necessary, will be sympathetic to our cause and to the benefit of the area ██████████</p>

178	10/04/2024	Business		Partly Object	<p>As you are aware from Xxxx Xxxx's letter, the practice has [redacted] members of staff, however, about [redacted] people would be working at any one time within the [redacted]. [redacted] have six parking spaces within the property, of which one is designated for disabled use.</p> <p>Not only do [redacted] patients travel from afar to see [redacted] with special interests such as [redacted] but [redacted] team members travel to work from afar, [redacted] [redacted] have children, who they drop off at childcare facilities on route to work. This would not be possible using the unreliable bus service and would result in many team members being forced to leave the practice as a result. In their current form, these parking restrictions would have a detrimental impact on the livelihoods of [redacted] staff and on the practice's ability to best serve the local and wider community.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Council need to introduce measures in order to deal with the issues around parking in the locality, I respectfully request that you consider a compromise that would reduce disruption and allow the practice to work in harmony with the residents.</p> <p>I fully support Xxxx Xxxx's suggestions in his letter dated 2nd April 2024 -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled bays adjacent to the practice. • Sufficient bays where parking is restricted to 2 hours. This would deter commuters and people working locally from parking in the Avenue all day. However, it would allow our patients, friends of the residents, workmen and carers to park for a reasonable length of time. • Ideally, we would also like business parking permits for the staff. <p>I believe such schemes have worked well in areas such as Newnham and also close to home in Ascham Road where a 1-hour restriction exists outside the Registry Office.</p>
179	02/04/2024	Business		Partly Object	<p>[redacted] the property at Hurst Park Avenue. [redacted]</p> <p>The practice has [redacted] however, about [redacted] people would be working at any one time within the [redacted]. [redacted] have six on-site parking spaces of which one is designated for disabled use.</p> <p>You will be aware that since parking restrictions were introduced in the adjacent streets. The overflow of parked cars into Hurst Park Avenue has caused disruption and resentment for residents. This was not the case prior to the restrictions when [redacted] patients had no significant effect on parking in the Avenue.</p> <p>The practice serves the local community, [redacted] estimate that about 35% of [redacted] patients live locally. Most of these attend on foot, by bicycle or in some cases public transport. However, much [redacted] [redacted] patients travel from across the county for [redacted]. [redacted] estimate that 90% of these patients travel to the [redacted] by car.</p> <p>[redacted] when patients find it challenging to use the park and ride and other public services, they forgo attending the practice, [redacted]. It is also the case that many are elderly, lack mobility and find the process of attending stressful enough. If it were the case that unsympathetic parking restrictions were imposed these patients simply would not attend. This would be disastrous for the practice and the service [redacted] as well as the general impact on public health, especially in light of the fact that many patients are already anxious about attending a dental practice, [redacted].</p> <p>[redacted] cannot see that the practice will survive if strict residents parking restrictions are introduced in the area.</p> <p>I accept that any requests to not introduce parking restrictions are unlikely to succeed. Therefore, I would ask you to consider a compromise that would reduce disruption and allow the practice to work in harmony the residents.</p> <p>My suggestion would be along the following lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled bays adjacent to the practice. • Sufficient bays where parking is restricted to 2 hours. This would deter commuters and people working locally from parking in the Avenue all day. However, it would allow [redacted] patients, friends of the residents, workmen and carers to park for a reasonable length of time. • Ideally, [redacted] business parking permits for the staff. <p>I believe such schemes have worked well in areas such as Newnham and also close to home in Ascham Road where a 1-hour restriction exists outside the Registry Office.</p> <p>As a public body you are aware of the current crisis in the availability and access to good [redacted] practices, the impact of imposing strict parking restrictions is insurmountable not only to the practice but also the community.</p> <p>[redacted]</p> <p>similarly, I would be very grateful if you could find time to talk over this matter with me.</p>

180	11/04/2024	Business		Partly Object	<p>I am writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed permit parking in our area, specifically its potential negative impact on [REDACTED]. As a vital part of the community, [REDACTED] relies on the accessibility and convenience of parking for both our staff [REDACTED]. Implementing permit parking would create significant challenges for our staff, many of whom rely on personal vehicles to commute to work.</p> <p>The additional financial burden of having to pay for parking permits could force some of our valuable team members to seek employment elsewhere, disrupting our operations and affecting the quality of service [REDACTED]. Furthermore, the possibility of [REDACTED] facing difficulties finding parking could result in a decline in business, ultimately jeopardizing the sustainability of [REDACTED].</p> <p>We have built our lives around this job and are deeply invested in the well-being of our business and the community it serves.</p> <p>We understand the need for parking regulations, but we urge you to consider the unique circumstances of our situation. Many of our staff members reside outside of Cambridge and have irregular work hours, making public transportation impractical. Additionally, childcare arrangements further limit our flexibility in commuting options.</p> <p>Considering these challenges, we kindly request that sufficient parking permits be allocated to our business to ensure that our staff can park conveniently and affordably. This will not only support our team members but also contribute to the continued success of our business and [REDACTED].</p> <p>We appreciate your attention to this matter and welcome the opportunity to discuss potential solutions further.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our concerns and the impact of the proposed permit parking on our business.</p>
181	04/12/2024 10:49:20 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I am against the implementation of more parking restrictions and permit holder parking bays in Leys Avenue as I do not believe it is necessary. It will also impact on local shops and services in the area.</p> <p>Please consider reducing the hours when permit holder permits need to be displayed in parking bays to 11-2.30 (9.30 -3 is excessive).</p>
182	03/25/2024 19:37:01 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I accept that we will be going to see a Residents' Parking Scheme in the Milton Road Area. However I am opposed to the proposed scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The time restrictions are much too long. This goes against one of the Statements of Reasons for the scheme is: For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs. It seems to be punishing the everyday lives of residents, when a lighter touch scheme could prevent the commuter parking but allow people to be able to have visitors during the rest of the day. The reason I have been told is that it makes it easier for the traffic wardens to patrol if they have a long period to do it in. So it makes it easier for them but very hard for residents. Benson North has 9-12. Could we have the same or 10-12 or 11-1pm say. If it is a long period people will simply risk parking on the assumption that they are unlikely to get caught on the once-a-day visit from the warden. 2.The junction of Leys Road and Arbury Road is extremely awkward and dangerous. The double yellow lines need extending to enable cars to exit and enter Leys Road safely. 3.The road surface on Leys Road is appalling with constant and dangerous deep potholes. Will the road be resurfaced before they come along with the paint to mark out the parking bays? 4.For a long time there has been concern about the safety of road users and cyclists in particular on the bend in Hurst Park Avenue where visibility is poor. Double yellow lines there would allow for better visibility. A site visit at 8.30ish on a weekday morning when children are cycling to school would make the problem clear to planners. 5.The shops and businesses on Milton Road and Arbury Road will be badly affected. Could a few short-term spaces be added that would allow for users to park. Has any consideration been given to those who work in the shops who won't be able to park nearby? 6.Cambridge is a city that is renowned for its innovative technology. Why can't the parking permit be done online as it is on many places. In Brent, London, residents can just book and pay online for a visitor's parking place on the day. It would save everyone a lot of time and frustration and it would save money on the administrative posts currently required.
183	04/12/2024 19:37:02 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I would like the council to consider changing the restricted times to between 10.00hrs and 14.00hrs. This would have the same deterrent effect on people parking all day, with less impact on residents.</p> <p>I would also like the council to ensure that conspicuous signage should appear only at the entrance to our estate, with perhaps one or two extra signs further in.</p>
184	04/12/2024 19:34:42 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>I would like the council to consider changing the restricted times to between 10.00hrs and 14.00hrs. This would have the same deterrent effect on people parking all day, with less impact on residents.</p> <p>I would also like the council to ensure that conspicuous signage should only appear at the entrance to our estate, with perhaps one or two extra signs further in.</p>

185	04/12/2024 19:28:31 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>OBJECTION, TRO PR0998 proposes to obstruct vehicular access to property in Leys Rd [REDACTED] (Milton Road Area, Cambridge)</p> <p>COMMENTS AND OBJECTION I live at xx Leys Road, Cambridge [REDACTED], where I am [REDACTED] I write to make OBJECTION against the proposed traffic regulation order PR0998 with its associated map, affecting Leys Road, because they show a proposal to install two on-street car-parking places/bays where there is not enough room for them, outside the adjacent frontages of my house No.xx Leys Road and the adjacent house of my neighbour who is [REDACTED] at No.xx Leys Road.</p> <p>GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION The proposed two car-parking bays would at one end obstruct vehicular access to my open frontage and off-street parking at [REDACTED] Leys Road, while at the other end they would also obstruct access to the open frontage and off-street parking of my adjacent neighbour at No.xx Leys Road. There is not room for two parking spaces outside [REDACTED] Leys Road.</p> <p>Therefore I object, and request amendment of the proposed TRO and map, to avoid making the obstruction described above that would arise from implementing the proposal as it now exists.</p> <p>(I note that my neighbour of xx Leys Road, has already sent in an objection against the same pair of proposed car-parking spaces on similar grounds to these. I support her objection.)</p> <p>NOTE: Refusal of unlawful duress. This response webpage has imposed on me an unlawful condition for submitting my objection: namely it requires me to agree to a 'Privacy Policy' before it will accept this response. The 'Privacy Policy' is spread over a number of information pages and is practically indigestible. More importantly, my rights to comment and object are not by the general law conditional on any such forced 'agreement' as the one that has been imposed. I have crossed the box in order that the system will accept my consultation feedback, but I have done so under the unlawful duress represented by the unlawful condition that without this box-tick my response will not be registered. I do not agree to be bound by this forced element of my response, and I agree only that my details may be used to the extent required by the general law and no further.</p>
186	04/10/2024 18:07:18 +01:00	Resident	Financial	Partly Object	<p>Already during the COVID lock-downs, those lucky enough to have access to property with vehicle parking were able to declare their vehicles as unused via SORN, whereas those whose only option is on-road parking had no other option than to keep paying vehicle tax. Now this residents' parking scheme, as detailed, can only be seen as another tax on smaller properties. Unless all vehicle parking within the boundary - including that on private land - is equally charged-for, then this is simply a stealth-tax upon the less property-rich, and it cannot be seen as any form of disincentive to private vehicle ownership, as it doesn't apply to all households or vehicles equally.</p> <p>But it doesn't have to be this way - grant every household (without a driveway) at least one parking permit at no cost, and allow further permits to be acquired at an escalating cost: this wouldn't eliminate the unfairness compared to properties with driveways to park on, but at least it throws a lifeline of sorts to the most needy.</p> <p>There is also the issue that properties with driveways have the option to charge electric vehicles via preferential home-tariffs or even for free with solar panels and storage batteries. Residents who park on the street are already denied this option, and commercial charging options are magnitudes more expensive.</p> <p>Cambridge lacks the Public Transport infrastructure to support families abandoning their cars entirely, and these schemes simply increase the costs for less well-off residents in more meagre housing, which makes people on the whole be more likely to be unable to afford to upgrade to vehicles which are non-polluting during their active lifetime. To resolve this I would like to see any residents' parking scheme be required to fulfil:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Free permits granted to each household without a driveway for at least one vehicle, preferably two; * An accelerating cost per permit for further permits (beyond 3 or 4?) for households without a driveway, but with a note that this is still inherently unfair given that properties with driveways are not required to pay anything - and so permits for properties with a driveway should be chargeable initially with no free options and could be potentially charged at a higher overall rate; * For the restrictions placed upon vehicle parking being imposed on those without driveways and to make-up for the inconvenience and any cost of the scheme, provide EV charging infrastructure with is subsidised or otherwise price-controlled to encourage residents without driveways to also upgrade to rechargeable vehicles with the confidence that they will be able to keep them charged. <p>Otherwise, all that this scheme achieves is to partially address a relatively inconsequential issue (of non-residential day-time parking) at enormous expense and inconvenience to residents without driveways who will suffer an effectively mandatory stealth-tax on more modest properties: as such - one which will hit the least able to pay the hardest whilst the already wealthy with large properties (offering plenty of parking options) will not be impacted at all. Clearly, this is unfair, unjust, and not something that any participant in a modern civilised society should be considering.</p>
187	13/04/2024	Business		Partly Object	<p>I am a [REDACTED] that lives within the proposed parking scheme area and [REDACTED] at xxx Milton Road. I am responding on behalf of myself and fellow traders who are members of the Milton Road Business Group.</p> <p>We believe that the proposed scheme will be detrimental to the 40 local businesses on Arbury Road and Milton Road which are within the parking scheme boundary and object to the proposals in the current form because there is a lack of any mitigation to the impacts in the form of new Pay and Display or 30 minute bays.</p> <p>The GCP are claiming that shops are "outside the scheme area" because there are no residents bays directly in front of them and because some have private off road parking bays. In fact, shops will be directly impacted both by loss of parking spaces for customers on neighbouring streets and also displacement parking by commuters and others into the shops private parking areas to avoid the parking restrictions from the scheme.</p> <p>A significant cause of concern is the lack of any mitigation to these impacts in the form of new Pay & Display or 30 minute parking bays. Such bays have been shown to be beneficial where implemented on other parking schemes in Cambridge e.g. Ascham Road, De Freville area etc. Local customer parking is frequently of short duration and under 30 minutes, so does not cause the congestion of long term commuter parking – this needs to be catered for</p>

					<p>We note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All on street free parking on Milton Road has been lost owing to the Milton Road Scheme, this loss of spaces is already causing huge pressure on the small number of private parking bays belonging to shops The on street 30 minute bays serving the 15 shops/businesss between 109 and 147 Milton Road have been reduced in number to only 6 to 7 spaces by the Milton Road improvement scheme (currently under construction). These shops typically have forecourts with either 1 or 2 off road private parking spaces which serve customers and shop staff. Of these 15 businesses, 13 do not have any rear access so that forecourts also need to be kept clear for deliveries. Private forecourts will be outside the residents parking scheme but will become seriously congested due to the loss of neighbourhood parking and displacement of commuters from neighbouring streets who can no longer park due to scheme restrictions. The 20 businesses between no. 1 and no.36 Milton Road are only directly served by 7 x 30 minute bays in front of the shopping parade Currently, customers visiting 5 shops at Nos 1A to 1E Arbury Road and the Arbury Road Vets (32 Arbury Road) all park on Arbury Road. These shops have very limited forecourts, so that all customers currently park on Arbury Road would no longer be able to park under current scheme proposals,.This will lead to increased pavement parking near 1A to 1E Arbury Road and create a very serious safety issue. The new 2 hour bays proposed on Hurst Park Avenue are principally located to serve the neighbouring dental practise and are not adequate extra provision for the 40 shops and businesses which are located within the overall scheme boundary. We would like to request the provision of new pay & display bays in locations such as Arbury Road, Hurst Park Avenue, Highworth Avenue and Leys Road. We suggest that there is space in these streets to have Pay & Display Parking because many residents have off-road parking on private driveways New Pay & Display bays could be located outside nos 1 to 7 Arbury Road – these would be heavily used by the neighbouring 20 shops on Arbury/Milton Road and Veterinary practise New Pay and Display bays could be located near the Junction of Leys Road and Arbury Road (parallel with gardens of 61 and 63 Arbury Road). These would be heavily used by shops and Vets practise as noted above New Pay and Display bays could be located in front of 6-10 Highworth Avenue and serve all 35 shops on Milton Road
188	04/09/2024 10:48:38 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking schemes involve costs for resident and visitors permits and inconvenience in using visitor permits. Some roads don't have a problem with commuter parking, at least not yet, so there is only a downside for them. The visitor permits are not a solution for houses with a lot of visitors (this includes care workers and NHS personnel) and workmen etc. as there is, apparently, a limited number of permits that can be purchased.. There would be a loss of available parking spaces as the permitted spaces will be fewer than the number people currently use. This could mean fewer spaces than cars in some places like Leys Avenue and especially Mulberry Close. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is likely that the scheme offered would be the same as the Ascham Road scheme and combined with Ascham Road, The Triangle and Arbury Road East. This would mean there could not be a scheme with, say, "parking banned for 2 hours at midday" which would be easier for visitors and would stop the commuter traffic that is the only problem. The proposed scheme does not take into account the very particular nature of Mulberry Close that is a Ltd Company. Mulberry Close has three private bays that will be difficult to 'police' to ensure commuters don't use. Will the Council do this on our behalf? No, of course they won't! The Grass banks entering Mulberry Close, right and left, are Private Property , owned by Mulberry Close, as is The Green. You do not have permission from our residents to put any 'street furniture or signage' on this land. Please be ABSOLUTELY AWARE of this and do not 'trespass'. The time you are suggesting for the Residents Parking are unnecessarily long. We only need (if we need it at all) a couple of hours during the day to stop commuters. <p>Sadly, I doubt if you will take any notice of this as residents are aware of the strategy of continual 'consultations' that wear down all of us because you keep on going until you get the answers you want. The old adage of 'save your breath to cool your porridge' come to mind.</p> <p>Resident are also beyond annoyed that the City Council apparently have no teeth and we are totally governed by the County who have no remit to look after City residents at all.</p>
189	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>Mulberry Close has functioned well and I certainly am not happy about the scheme coming to our street.</p> <p>I especially dont like the restriction to our visitors.</p> <p>I am racking my brains for a solution as am told cars from outside areas will use our spaces unless we restrict them somehow. Is the main problem people going to work in Cambridge? In which case restrictions 9 to 1 MONDAY TO FRIDAY may be enough to discourage I have been unwell but wish that a bit more time allowed to see what other towns do in England and other countries</p>
190	15/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>I previously responded in the 2022 consultation about the parking scheme, which, as was recently explained to me, was in fact interpreted as a referendum on whether the scheme should be taken forward.</p> <p>A concern with that is, that at least some of our neighbours did not submit their own response, thinking that it was sufficient that someone — anyone— would raise issues, and knowing that representatives of Mulberry Close Residents Society¹ would be responding. This misunderstanding of the process may have skewed the responses and the outcome, and I would be grateful if you would make the committee aware of this possibility. I hope the committee will agree this was a reasonable misunderstanding: it was after all called a consultation —not a referendum— suggesting that any objections would be judged on their merit, and not primarily on the sum of popular support.²</p> <p>Secondly, I note that the Statement of Reasons for the TRO sets out that it is intended to benefit “in particular, those with little or no off-road parking available.” This would suggest that we’re perhaps undertaking this scheme particularly for the benefit of a street like Mulberry Close (where there are many such homes without off-road parking), more so than for most other streets in Hurst Park Estate (where most homes do have a driveway), where —we suspect³— support for the scheme may have been stronger. I would, on this basis, like to submit that it would not be out of order for the committee to give special consideration to the opinions of those residents that are the stated main beneficiaries of the scheme.</p> <p>Thirdly, I’m afraid I need to object to us advancing to the TRO stage now, before having discussed the implementation issues⁴. The fact that MCRS didn’t receive feedback on its response to the consultation, although we indicated that there were multiple concerns about the impact of the scheme on Mulberry Close, makes that we worry whether we’ll be able to get our concerns addressed at the implementation stage. I would therefore like to ask for time to have that dialogue first, and to see the results reflected in the plans attached to the TRO, before we move to the implementation stage.</p>
191	04/05/2024 09:50:25 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>Please include some visitor parking bays for the shops on Milton road. I greatly enjoy visiting the greengrocers there, and often buy things bulky enough to require driving.</p>

192	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>There are many problems with the plans as currently published including bays across driveways and limited access to driveways if bays are put into place. We understand that there will be tweaking of the final plan before implementation.</p> <p>Serious issues have been flagged re: short-term parking for patrons of the shops on Milton Road, specifically on Arbury Road, Leys Road and Highworth Avenue. These businesses are already suffering major cash-flow and access issues because of the traffic situation created by the Milton Road scheme. It is essential that these vital parts of our local community are able to continue their business, both for them and us.</p> <p>The timings proposed for the Residents-only parking on a daily basis in the Hurst Park Avenue and associated area seems to be far too restrictive. We understand that the timings have already been eased for the Ascham Road scheme to allow tradesmen to work conveniently. Many of us rely on regular visits from carers and home support who need transport and the current restrictions will make life very difficult for many residents. Restrictions between 9-1.00 or 10-2.00 will help with this and stop the commuter parking.</p>
193	04/08/2024 10:11:07 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Object	<p>In principle, I have no objection to improving the ability for residents to park in the Springfield Road Area. However, I feel that this particular approach is short-sighted for a number of reasons:</p> <p>(a)The major parking limiting factor on Springfield road (and similar roads around here) is simply one of physical constraints – it is only possible to park on one side of this (Springfield) road, which necessarily means that 50% of residents will not be able to park on this street at any given time. This is further exacerbated by the fact that the Victorian terraced houses are generally narrower (for example, my house is approximately 3.7 meters wide) than the average modern car (which, according to the AA (https://www.theaa.com/breakdown-cover/advice/parking-space-size) is >4 meters). As such, it is never going to be possible for every resident in this street to park in this street concurrently if they are using on-road parking, even if one were to assume that every resident has only one car.</p> <p>(b)The driving force behind the imposition of restrictions appears to be the assumption that parking space is limited by rail commuters parking in residential spaces. I think that this to be unlikely to be the case for two reasons:</p> <p>(1) This area is 2 miles from both stations. No-one (sane) looking for parking to commute using a station is parking a 40-minute walk (8 minutes less than the total time it takes to travel from London -> Cambridge by rail!) from the station.</p> <p>(2) My experience of parking in the area is that it is most competitive on weekends and evenings, and generally freer during the day. This leads me to conclude that the majority of the cars parked in the area are those of residents, who then drive their car to work during the day, before returning in the evening.</p> <p>(c)Even if I am incorrect in either of the two above points, and the parking issues in this area are caused by commuters or non-residents parking in the area, thereby preventing residents from parking, it does not logically follow that the solution to this problem is to charge residents the rather substantial sum of £63 for the privilege of parking in their own street. If the council would like to reduce the number of visitors and commuters parking in this area (something I have no objection to in principle), I feel the cost should be incurred by the visitors or commuters in question rather than by putting the cost onto residents. One example of how this could be achieved would be to introduce time-limited, pay-and-display parking for visitors and issue free permits to those who live here. The statement “we would like to ensure that only residents are parking in this street during the hours of 09:30 -> 15:00 by requiring cars parked during this time to be in possession of a permit assigned based on street residency” logically does not need to be followed by the conclusion “to do this, we will charge those eligible for a permit, for said permit”. Were the permits to be issued for free, I still maintain my position that it would do little to improve the parking situation in the area, and so be a relatively pointless and ineffectual endeavour, but I would be happy to be proven wrong, and would no longer object the scheme</p> <p>(d)Fundamentally, if the council would like to improve parking in this area, I feel this is only practically achievable by increasing the physical capacity. One example option (which I would not be hugely supportive of but is the reasonable logical solution to the stated aim of the council to increase the ability of residents to park in the vicinity of their houses) would be to investigate the scope of building a carpark, e.g. by re-developing the area on Milton Road Roundabout which is currently occupied by disused commercial/office buildings).</p> <p>(e)Finally, I would appreciate clarification as to the proposal for the assignment of permits – will each house have (e.g.) three permits that they can then put in the window of the car they would like to park, or will the cars be pre-assigned when applying for permits? At the very least, I would strongly encourage the latter option – I appreciate being able to have either my partner (resident in the Cambridge area) or family visit, or indeed have the ability to have workmen and then use the permit assigned to my house for the visitor (e.g. partner, family, tradesman) I have at the time, rather than having to pre-determine in advance which cars I would like to make eligible.</p>
194	08/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>I am writing on behalf of [REDACTED] to object to the planned parking scheme TRO Reference PR0998, Milton Road Area, Cambridge.</p> <p>Fundamentally, we think residents parking permits for the area is a good idea. We now work from home regularly and it is evident that the parking in the area is heavily used by commuters who work nearby, which makes it busier and makes parking difficult for the residents here.</p> <p>However, our objection is based on the plans shown in 'PR0998 Drawings'. The suggested layout of the bays will not work for residents. It looks as if there will only be parking on one side of the road on Herbert St, going from roughly 60 spaces to 25, and also fewer spaces on Springfield Road.</p> <p>In your document entitled 'PR0998 Statement of Reasons' you say:</p> <p>The Authority's reasons for proposing to make the above named Order(s) are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). 2.For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs. <p>I believe neither of these are valid reasons. Having lived here for [REDACTED], we know that in relation to point one, cars and small vans can pass down the road with no problem as long as they are considerate drivers. Larger vans will have an issue whatever, particularly on Springfield Road where they cannot turn into Herbert Street anyway. We have never had an issue, companies are aware some roads may be inaccessible for their vans and have ways of dealing with this. Amazon deliveries make up a significant proportion of small van traffic, and from experience, damage to cars. In order to reduce number of vans and traffic, residents can use alternative post sites e.g. Coop (of which there are 2 less than a 3 minute walk away) or OneStop (a 10 min walk), which also reduces the environmental burden. In relation to point 2, there are no 'amenities' in the area, only residential housing, and we all saw what the road was like when we decided to move here. Finally, by removing obstacles in the road (i.e. the parked cars in this case), it is likely vehicle speed will increase, leading to more noise for residents living on a quiet street and danger to pedestrians and cyclists. This therefore hinders both points 1 and 2.</p> <p>The reduction in spaces will be problematic as many residents will no longer be able to park, and lots of us have cars for valid reasons, where it is unlikely we contribute to general congestion in the area. I am willing to provide more detail on my own personal circumstances if required.</p> <p>We are happy to work with you to find an alternative option for resident parking (and are also fine with how things are now).</p> <p>Many thanks in advance for your consideration,</p>
195	04/04/2024 10:44:16 +01:00	Resident	Safety	Partly Object	<p>It feels like this will make Union Lane even more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists due to increase traffic just outside the parking restriction zone. I would like to see Union Lane either made at least one way or better yet closed to traffic before this is implemented. At the very least Union Lane should also be covered by resident parking.</p>

196	11/04/2024	Resident		Partly Object	<p>It is not clear to me that there are free short term parking bays to service the Milton Road and Arbury Road shops, also the Dental practice at the end of Hurst Park Avenue. I think it is important some provision is included.</p> <p>At an earlier consultation meeting, and in a previous submission, I pointed out that the inflexion in Hurst Park Avenue is a dangerous pinch point when there are cars parked on both sides of the road, because forward visibility is greatly restricted. I think that the layout of bays on this stretch needs to be reviewed with this in mind.</p> <p>The hours that the scheme is active are too long and too restrictive. The objective is to discourage commuter parking, I think 10:00am to 12:00am would be sufficient.</p> <p>Double yellow lines between the bays are also too restrictive and prohibit parking in the evening and at weekends when there is not a problem. Why not single yellow lines that are enforced only during the parking scheme hours?</p> <p>It would be far preferable for the Hurst Park streets (Hurst Park Avenue, Orchard Avenue, Highfield Avenue, Leys Avenue, Leys Road) to be treated as a PPA. There are only two points of access at present which could easily be clearly marked. I do not see the problem with this, it would save the expense of street markings and reduce the number of signs required.</p> <p>A lot of new posts are proposed for parking signs. Please minimise these and use more of the existing street furniture.</p> <p>Park and Ride service need to be improved to remove parking pressure on residential streets. Why not charge for parking but not for the bus to encourage car sharing?</p>
-----	------------	----------	--	---------------	--

197	18/03/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>Further to the below, there seems to be a huge amount of parking between 15-27 Arbury Road removed in the proposal if my understanding is correct. These are all houses without their own driveways. I suggest that this needs to be revisited, as we will have more cars fighting for fewer spaces and having to pay for the privilege of doing so.</p> <p>As a resident of Arbury Road, in my view and in the main I don't have a problem with parking near to my house from Monday- Friday 9:30 - 3pm. [REDACTED].</p> <p>For the businesses such as the hairdressers and beauticians, introducing permitting will mean customers (or the business) have to pay extra money for a daily permit in order to access the business (a lot of these clients are elderly) which may hinder their profitability and cause extra strain on a local family business. What does cause an issue, and traffic, are the cars that temporarily pull up to visit Al Noor Groceries. This could be for 15-20 minutes at a time directly on the pavement outside blocking pedestrian access or on the double yellow lines which makes it difficult for cars to pass and causes congestion. Many of these are loitering vehicles and contribute to the unnecessary noise and emissions. I don't believe that residential permitting is going to help this particular situation or dissuade drivers to temporarily park on the road.</p>
198	11/04/2024	Residents Assoc		Neutral	<p>One of the stated aims of ARERA is to: "Improve safety on our road and pavements – especially for pedestrians and cyclists as our most vulnerable road users", https://arera.org.uk/about-arera/mission-statement/.</p> <p>One of the stated objectives of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Active Travel project is: "creating safe and easy routes for walking and cycling: all our infrastructure schemes integrate active travel", https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/sustainable-transport-programme/active-travel-projects</p> <p>Given the alignment of ARERA's aim and the GCP's objective, it ought to be easy for the GCP to engage with ARERA to discuss improving pedestrian and cyclist safety on Arbury Road east.</p> <p>This is especially so since this stretch of Arbury Road connects two nodes in the County Council's Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure plan, see the Node map with links for the Cambridge area, Cambridgeshire's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, 2023 revision, page 13, https://cccandpcc.sharepoint.com, attached.</p> <p>And this engagement should be pressing because, as the County Council's map of cycles routes shows, Arbury Road east is part of a LWCIP route that has yet to be completed, see https://cccandpcc.sharepoint.com, attached.</p> <p>Sadly, this is not the case.</p> <p>For five years, since its inception in 2019, ARERA has struggled in its attempts to engage with the GCP about the work that needs to be done to complete the Arbury Road East Section of the LWCIP's designated priority cycle route.</p> <p>However, in the plan accompanying the TOR for the Milton Road Area Residents' Parking Scheme, the GCP now shows the introduction of a very short stretch of cycle path on the north-side of Arbury Road east. This will run from outside No. 106 just to where Arbury Road east narrows outside No. 88.</p> <p>In its request for additional information for what is being proposed for Arbury Road east under the TRO for Milton Road Area, ARERA asked the CCC: "What does the CCC expected cyclists using this new designated cycle path to do when they reach the end of it: a) ride on the pavement or b) ride on Arbury Road east along its most congested stretch down to the Milton Road junction?"</p> <p>The County Council asked the GCP to respond to this question.</p> <p>It failed to do so.</p> <p>The County Council should challenge the GCP to answer this question since its answer concerns the safety of all of the cyclists, pedestrians and motorists who use this very narrow, congested, polluted and dangerous section of the LWCIP cycle route.</p>
199	31/03/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>My parents live at xx Arbury Road and are aware of the proposed changes to parking. As even numbers, under the new system they would not be able to purchase resident and guest parking at leys road and the surrounding area. [REDACTED] Will there be any leeway given for their situation? This move would encourage them to dig up the garden, getting rid of green space and a haven for wildlife.</p>

200	26/03/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>who lives in the CB2 area. then need to get to him asap.</p> <p>If I am parked 10 minutes away this could have serious implications as each minute is very important in case It might seem no problem on paper if Herbert Street residents have to park several streets away but the kind of practical problems I described which will undoubtedly be created by the current layout are very real. In addition I fear the current planned reduction in parking spaces will impact on house prices in Herbert Street relative to now as having reliably available parking on a street is important to potential buyers, so I feel that Herbert St residents will bear an unfair economic penalty not borne by residents on other streets within the scheme.</p> <p>I am keen that we have residents parking and we want to remain part of this larger scheme, but the current fine scale planning of spaces on Herbert Street is not fit for purpose, it is imposing modern parking bay design appropriate for a newly built scheme onto a Victorian road without proper consideration of better adapted solutions to achieve adequate emergency access. As currently designed the Herbert Street arrangement of spaces is going to impose an unfair toll on Herbert Street residents who have raised all of these concerns during the protracted and various consultations and feel we have not been listened to.</p>
201	12/04/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>I have already put in a comment on line about the fact you have marked double yellow lines across our drive which needs correcting. I have also noted the lack of parking bays near the houses on the corner - This will cause a significant problem particularly if we need work doing on our house as workmen will not be able to park nearby. Currently, there is room for a small car between our property and number xx and also on the other side of the road, without disrupting traffic flow. I hope you will consider this in your revisions</p>
202	07/04/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>I am writing about the proposed Resident Parking Scheme for the Milton Road area. Two points and one question. 1. Much shorter hours would serve exactly the same function as the proposed hours, and be much less inconvenient for residents. I suggest 11.00am to 1.00pm is quite enough. 2. The Hurst Park Estate is becoming horribly urbanised. Please could we NOT have signs all over the estate, but simple clear and obvious signage only at the two entrances to the estate ie where Hurst Park Avenue meets Milton Road and where Leys Road meets Arbury Road. This would also be cheaper for the council, as well as being more pleasant. 3. Will visitors be able to display a parking permit for a full day so that they can take a day trip out with the person they have come to visit, without having to return midday to put another permit in their vehicle?</p>
203	10/04/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>We have experienced that when a car is parked outside Hurst Park Avenue we cannot access our driveway without driving on the grass verges and it is very difficult to reverse from our driveway on to the road. We therefore welcome double yellow lines on the south side of H.P.A.</p>
204	04/12/2024 13:17:21 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Neutral	<p>It would be better if the parking restrictions just prevented commuter parking and caused as little inconvenience to residents and their visitors as possible. The restricted times could be 11am to 2.30pm to allow for this.</p>
205	25/03/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>First I would like to say that after a year of the up to date plan not being made available it seems that the bulk of the suggestions made during the November 2022 consultation have been completely ignored. This includes parking being allocated across driveways, such as with No. Highfield Avenue. There should have been feedback listing the suggestions and why they had been accepted or rejected. Could we please have these now and produce them for this round of consultation? If people provide suggestions in good faith and they are just ignored it destroys any trust in consultations and people will just berate councillors directly about all of it? Is that what councillors would prefer.</p> <p>These are my specific comments at this stage: LocationIssueSolution Arbury Road at Leys Road junctionLack of visibility on exit with large vans parkedExtend yellow lines in arbury road to provide adequate visibility. This is essential for safety and is jsut an accident waiting to happen on a road with 2 fatalities in recent years. Highfield Av, driveway of Leys AvDriveway blocked by parkingPut parking on the opposite side of Highfield Av, just leaving a gap will waste parking space Highfield AvParking space on corner reduces visibility and puts traffic from both directions in the middle of the road. This is particularly dangerous for cyclists.Remove parking space Disabled parking space in Leys AvThis already exists and is not on the planAdd disabled space to the plan Highworth av near milton roadLack of parking for shoppers etcAdd short term or pay and display parking for shoppers etc All of HPEDifficulties with visitorsChange time of parking ban to 12:00 to 14:00, there are different times in Benson RPS, This is the most feasible change which would soften objections to the scheme. The use of this in Benson destroys the arguments against it. Also, Although HPE is in the Ascham scheme now it is clearly a separate space.</p>
206	03/29/2024 09:41:50 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Neutral	<p>I am concerned that the parking bays proposed directly outside my house are too numerous (3) and will either overlap my drive or be so close to it that it will become impossible to enter or leave the drive safely due to poor visibility as a result of parked cars.</p>
207	04/02/2024 12:58:22 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Neutral	<p>I have noted the number of new posts which would be installed on pavements to carry information on the residents parking restrictions. The number of posts is excessive and likely to have a visually detrimental effect on the public realm. Around 6 will be immediately visible from my front door. Can the number of posts not be reduced.</p>

208	02/04/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>As a resident of Leys Road, Cambridge, I am replying to the consultation about the proposed residents' parking scheme. I should be grateful if you would consider the following points.</p> <p>1. Time of restrictions. I think that the period on Mondays to Fridays during which restrictions operate could be shorter without undermining the objective of deterring commuter parking. Outer London restrictions in roads adjacent to Tube stations with which I am familiar achieve that objective with shorter (often much shorter) periods of restriction, e.g. Woodford 2pm-3pm, Chingford 10am-11am, East Finchley 1pm-2pm and Epping 10.30-2.30. A shorter period would significantly reduce the inconvenience to residents and to tradesmen with business at residents' houses. It would also help local shops. If it is policy to discourage extensive driving in and around Cambridge, then it is essential that local shops should flourish. The Milton Road shops have already been adversely affected by the lengthy road works on that road. If local parking is severely inhibited, people will tend to drive longer distances to areas with large car parks such as the Newmarket Road shopping centres, with further negative effects on trade at the local shops. I therefore suggest that the hours during which restrictions apply should be at most 10am until 2pm and preferably shorter still.</p> <p>2. Signage and road marking. I understand that over 90 extra signposts are intended. I urge you to follow the precedent of the Newnham residents' parking scheme and have far fewer signs, concentrating on conspicuous signs only at the entrances to the relevant areas. The more you have, the costlier the scheme, at a time of intolerable pressure on local government funds. Apart from the cost, the appearance of so many signs will be very detrimental to the general appearance of the area. I am not sure, as the map is so small, but I believe you intend to mark out individual bays even in stretches of road where there is room for more than one car. If this is so (and I might of course be wrong) it again adds to the cost. It also adds to the cost of maintenance; it is already impossible for the relevant highways authorities to keep road markings in good condition and easily visible to the motorist, so it seems unwise to add further work unnecessarily. In any case, to mark individual bays seems not to take account of the different size of vehicles.</p> <p>3. Road conditions. The first part of Leys Road from the junction with Arbury Road continues. to be little better than a farm track. Occasional patching has been useless, with potholes opening up again within weeks of 'repair'. Those of us who live in this road would be very grateful if it could be properly resurfaced before the residents' scheme is introduced.</p> <p>4. Date of introduction. Given the continuing serious disruption caused by the Milton Road works, which, inter alia, severely affect the reliability of the bus services on that road and cause extra traffic in the Hurst Park Estate area, I urge that nothing is done to implement the residents' parking scheme until those works have been fully completed.</p> <p>I very much hope that you will pay serious attention to these comments and to all others which you receive on the scheme. I think many residents share my view that citizens are not properly listened to and are adversely affected by decisions made remotely without full understanding of local conditions.</p>
209	04/11/2024 16:59:16 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Neutral	<p>Mitcham's corner (or the city end) of Milton Road has some shops and a dentist. BUT no disabled parking bay at all, and never had contrary to the statement. Please could you incorporate at least 1 disabled bay for resident and disabled people shopping or going to the dentist. The dentist on Milton Road. Many thanks</p>
210	13/04/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>I am writing to provide feedback on the proposed residents parking scheme in our area. While I appreciate the efforts to improve parking management, I have several concerns that I believe need to be addressed before implementing any changes.</p> <p>1. Limited Public Transport: Our area suffers from a lack of reliable public transport options. Many residents rely on their cars for commuting, especially during peak hours. Implementing a parking scheme without considering this limitation could disproportionately affect those who have no alternative means of transportation.</p> <p>2. Shopping Traffic: The proposed times for the parking restrictions coincide with peak shopping hours. A significant number of people visit this area for shopping, and restricting parking during these times may discourage shoppers from frequenting local businesses. This could have a negative impact on our local economy.</p> <p>3. Post-COVID Parking Trends: Since the easing of COVID lockdowns, there has not been a perceived strain on parking availability. It is essential to consider the current situation and avoid unnecessary restrictions that may hinder economic recovery.</p> <p>4. Business Employees' Parking Needs: Employees of nearby businesses heavily rely on street parking. Restricting street parking could create undue stress for these workers. This situation may lead to recruitment and retention challenges for local businesses.</p> <p>5. Equitable Consultations: I am concerned that the management of the proposed scheme has not equally involved all stakeholders, including residents, businesses, and community organizations. Transparent and inclusive consultations are crucial to ensuring a fair and effective parking solution. I urge the council to carefully consider these points and engage in further dialogue with all affected parties. A well-thought-out parking scheme should balance the needs of residents, shoppers, and businesses while promoting sustainable transportation options.</p>
211	12/04/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>I am not objecting against but wish to record my request for derogation in order to save some parking spaces. There are two turning areas for large vehicles next to 29 and 33 Mulberry Close and another at the garage court behind 19 Mulberry Close. I request not to double yellow line those areas because the turning areas have not been used for over 20 years. Bin Lorries have always reversed to 13 Mulberry Close and 33 Mulberry Close. Those unmarked areas have been used to park 4 cars overnight in total for as long as I can remember. However I welcome all other parking restrictions on corners and the curve opposite 42 - 43 Mulberry Close. This would increase safety for all. Parking spaces ought to be marked in standard length to prevent wasteful parking of cars over 2 spaces. Commercial vehicles, one flatbed lorry and huge vans often parked overnight should use the entrance road from Leys Road to 1 Mulberry Close.</p>

212	23/03/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>I live at xx Springfield Road [REDACTED] I have two comments/queries on the proposed scheme, which of course particularly affects residents of Springfield Road and Herbert Street.</p> <p>1.The plan of the proposed scheme does not show the existing disabled parking place that was laid out 2-3 weeks ago opposite No. 12A Springfield Road. Given this additional facility, should one of the planned disabled parking spaces in Herbert Street be turned into a normal parking space?</p> <p>2.Currently there are spaces for 5 cars at the northern end of Springfield Road (near Springfield Terrace), but on the plan this has been reduced to four by not having a parking space opposite No. 34 Springfield Road, by the redundant secondary entrance to Whichcote House, the apartment block opposite Nos. 34-42. The entrance to Whichcote House parking for its residents and for all deliveries (as it always has been ever since I moved to Springfield Road in 2018) is at the end of the road opposite No. 42 by Springfield Terrace. I urge that the parking space is reinstated, so that there remain the 5 spaces in this section of Springfield Road. For obvious reasons every appropriate parking space matters in the Springfield Road/Herbert Street part of the scheme.</p>
213	22/03/2024	Resident		Neutral	<p>Please add provision for the businesses on Milton Road and Arbury Road. Perhaps some 30 minute free parking bays could be included at the end of Arbury Road to serve the shops and other businesses and discourage pavement parking?</p> <p>I believe that changing the hours to 10am - 2pm would still allow the scheme to be effective but not be so disruptive.</p> <p>I'm alarmed by the number of sign posts that have been proposed. This can be of distraction to motorists. Please could you consider more conspicuous signage so that it is used at the entrances to the estate only as is the case in Newnham and Victoria Park?</p>

260	04/11/2024 08:24:52 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	are in full support of the residents parking scheme being brought in to the Chesterton Hall Crescent area. We have needed, and have been trying to get, a resident parking scheme here for years so we very much hope that this time it will go ahead.
261	03/23/2024 11:49:54 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Get it done. A long overdue scheme.
262	03/28/2024 13:21:02 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Residents parking in Chesterton Hall Crescent has been an issue for many years. There have been several changes to proposals and broken promises. Please can it be resolved properly this time.
263	03/25/2024 21:32:22 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I wholly support this proposal. Some suggestions: 1) Herbert Street number of parking spaces should be reviewed and maximised; 2) Signage posting seems excessive and could create an eye-sore; should be minimised; 3) There are several garages in Chesterton Hall Crescent which are too small for holding a car; therefore 'no parking lines' are inappropriate for these spaces and should be replaced with extra car park spaces on the road.
264	03/25/2024 21:32:43 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I fully support this proposal. Some considerations for improvement include: - Several garages in Chesterton Hall Crescent are too small or short to park a car in , therefore dropped curve no parking lines should be kept to minimal amounts to maximise parking spaces on the road - Herbert Street should be reviewed to ensure machining number of parking spaces are achieved -large number of proposed signage posts should be reconsidered in terms of quantity (too many) and preferably conspicuous signage placed at entrance to estates as done in Newnham and Victoria Park.
265	04/09/2024 20:33:42 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Parking bays need to be added outside the new property next to Sayle House on 31 Chesterton Hall Crescent One parking bay should be available to the right of 40 Chesterton Hall Crescent (currently marked "No waiting at any time")
266	03/21/2024 14:54:11 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I am fully supportive of the scheme as I has become more and more difficult to park in our road. With commuters bringing folding bikes in their boot and camping vans and camping vans staying for weeks without moving residents often can't find a space. Please make sure you maximise the number of spaces by reviewing whether some of the drop are still in use.
267	03/21/2024 13:15:23 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	There are some white H lines in Chesterton Hall Crescent for historical drive ways now no longer in use (as extensions have been built in driveways or garages). Could these be removed if the owners prefer to use the on road parking? I think there are 4 spaces that could be reclaimed.
268	18/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Support	Thank you for your letter dated 15/3/24 about the proposed permanent TRO for residents' parking on our street, Chesterton Hall Crescent. We are delighted to finally be having residents' parking on our street - not just for us but also for the safety of cyclists, pedestrians and school children who use our street and also part of a plan to reduce congestion/pollution in Cambridge. Could you advise on the timescale for implementation? (Which cannot come soon enough!) On a separate but related matter we are very much in favour of Chesterton Rd being made a 20mph road. We regularly observe cars clearly speeding up after coming from Victoria Rd and clearly driving at 40mph down Chesterton Rd which is highly dangerous being in such a residential area with plentiful cyclist and pedestrians using that road too. We are very much in favour of all roads in the city centre being 20mph (including Milton Rd too). I understand from one of the Councillors who visited us recently that there is a consultation on this. Could you let me know where I can complete the consultation and will other people in the local area be advised of it? Thanks very much
269	04/11/2024 13:09:43 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	At last. Residents only parking in Hawthorn Way. There are times I cannot park within a half a mile of my house which makes things very difficult as I have a
270	04/10/2024 15:40:23 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I'd like to support the parking proposals
271	03/25/2024 17:00:21 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Regarding the specific plans for our street (Herbert Street) I welcome the long overdue change to residents parking with bays down one side only. It has been a major concern that fire engines are nor able to access houses throughout the street due to the over-narrow roadway.. It also makes it much safer for the many cyclists who use Herbert Street (many going to and from Milton Road school) who at present have to risk dangerously squeezing between parked and oncoming cars. It is also an environmental gain to reduce vehicle traffic and will encourage more cycling.
272	03/21/2024 09:03:27 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I welcome this proposal as Herbert street is not wide enough for cars to park on both sides. Some companies refuse to deliver in our road., and ones that do are continually getting blocked in by badly parked vehicles. I realise that there will be less parking for residents of the road, but for most, owning a car is a luxury, not a necessity as we are well served by public transport (at least during the daytime). More car clubs might help.
273	03/23/2024 11:15:48 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I fully support the proposal to install Residents Only Parking in Herbert Street. It will ensure that residents only can use the street for parking and exclude commuters and shoppers who should be using Park and Ride or cycling. It will ensure that it is a safer route for cyclists. It may also encourage some residents to cut back on the number of cars they own, thereby making it easier for residents who own only one car. It will enable fire engines and ambulances to access houses in the case of fire or health issues. It will also enhance the environment by enabling pedestrians to enjoy the qualities of the late Victorian streetscape rather than looking at what is essentially a carpark!
274	12/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Support	I would like to record my strong support for the proposed residents parking scheme which will include our street. With parking on both sides of the narrow street, for too long we have had to live with the fact that fire engines cannot access a large part of the street with the serious risks that involves to life and property.. Herbert Street, with its current parking on both sides also represents a serious danger to the many cyclists who use it daily, including parents and children travelling to and from Milton Road School who are forced to squeeze into narrow spaces between parked cars to avoid collisions with oncoming cars. Much of the parking in out street has been caused by day commuters looking for free parking who take up many of the spaces that local residents with cars are then denied access to. The new proposed scheme will also eradicate that problem.

275	08/04/2024	Resident		Wholly Support	<p>I have received notice of a petition from residents in Herbert Street regarding the proposed new parking scheme for Herbert Street. Some residents are gathering signatures for a petition opposing the proposed scheme to introduce Residents Parking on one side only.</p> <p>I would like to register my opposition to this petition. I have set out below my comments which I provided for the public consultation two years ago in support of limiting parking to one side only. I hope you will take into consideration these comments against those who think that parking on both sides should be retained.</p> <p>I would strongly back the proposed scheme for Herbert Street parking which would mean having single side parking with double yellow lines down the length of the other side. I would point out that a number of Herbert Street residents do not own cars at all so this would not impact them. Furthermore enabling car owners to park as near as possible to their homes encourages car ownership in the cramped city centre streets.</p> <p>FIRE ENGINE ACCESS : I have spoken to a representative of Cambridge Fire Service who confirmed that the fire service are not able to provide a functional rescue service with the current parking situation. I was told that 'in the event of a fire midway along Herbert Street, there would be a delay in the crew's ability to get to it, as they would have to spend time running out hose, significantly delaying life-saving action.' This is because their vehicles cannot access the street and have to park at either the top or the lower end of the street.</p> <p>AMBULANCE ACCESS: A recent entry (6th November) on the Nextdoor messenger website stated that ' An ambulance taking a suddenly seriously ill friend to Addenbrooke's became stuck on Herbert Street last week. He was taken on to A &E but this meant one ambulance was unavailable for others while it was extricated.' Surely more evidence that double yellow lines are needed in Herbert Street.</p> <p>ACCESS FOR CYCLISTS: Herbert Street is used by cyclists all and every day and, with parking as it is on both sides of the road, cyclists are constantly putting themselves at risk. Every time a car approaches cyclists are forced to get off their bikes and squeeze between 2 parked cars to allow the car to get by. It is particularly difficult for those who use cargo bikes with children on board. The government has recently updated the legislation set out in the Highways Code to give priority to cyclists: Rule H3 sets out when car drivers should give way to cyclists, rather than cyclists always having to give way to car drivers as is currently the situation in Herbert Street. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/the-highway-code/introduction I would suggest that both the city and county council, along with the GCP, have a responsibility to prioritise the needs of cyclists over and above the desire of car owners to have a parking space outside their house.</p> <p>POLICY AND STRATEGY STATEMENTS Here are statements from the latest policy and strategy statements: From Cambridge City Council vision statement - https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/our-vision:- 'A city where getting around is primarily by public transport, bike and on foot.' From Greater Cambridge Partnership Transport vision - https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport:- 'The Greater Cambridge Partnership aims to develop a sustainable transport network for Greater Cambridge..... to make it easy to get into, out of, and around Cambridge by public transport, by bike and on foot.' From Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Strategy - https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/cambridge-city-and-south-cambs-transport-strategy 'What we are doing in Cambridge: Encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport for journeys into, out of and within the city; Prioritise pedestrian, cycle and bus trips across the city and make these methods of transport more convenient than using a car'.</p> <p>It is to be hoped that decision makers can find a way to ensure that car parking in Herbert Street is reduced to one side only, allowing the free - and safe - movement of emergency service vehicles, as well as cyclists in this narrow street. The new scheme proposed will ensure that Herbert Street residents will have access to residents' parking in the surrounding zones including Ascham and Hurst Park, as well as the Triangle.</p>
276	03/21/2024 15:10:46 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	There has been a significant increase in commuter parking in Hurst Park Avenue during the last couple of years, particularly after the Ascham Road residents parking scheme was introduced, so it is good that a scheme covering a wider area is now planned. Please note that commuter parking has not just been from cars, but includes several different people who park large vans and then unload a bicycle from the back of their van to cycle away, but on a few occasions those vans have damaged trees in the street because they are so tall.
277	04/07/2024 15:51:27 +01:00	Resident	Safety	Wholly Support	Traffic and the number of cars parked in Hurst Park Avenue has been steadily increasing over the past few years to an unacceptable level. Cars are parked either side of our access entrance making it unsafe to pull out onto an increasingly busy road. Aside from visitors to the dentist and the Catholic church more cars are now parked all day by people going into the city centre for work, some even park and then cycle into town. I completely support the proposals in the hope it will reduce the volume of traffic and improve safety for all residents.
278	04/06/2024 19:05:11 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I completely support this proposal. The available parking in Hurst Park Avenue is currently being overused by non-residents and makes getting in and out of my driveway dangerous.
279	03/19/2024 20:30:02 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Parking along the bottom of HPA is full with parked commuter vehicles so I can understand how that would inconvenience residents at that end, so imposing resident parking makes sense along that bottom stretch and in fact the entire road so that the problem isn't pushed further along the street. The road is narrower past Orchard Ave junction near our house so parking both sides would cause an obstruction, so no parking at any time one side also makes sense.
280	03/18/2024 12:13:40 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I look forward to the residents parking scheme as parking at the eastern end of Leys Road is frequently difficult.
281	03/21/2024 11:26:11 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Permit parking will improve the nature of the streets and support more active travel use through the area. Longer term I would also support a modal filter at the junction of Leys Avenue and Leys Road to prevent rat running through the estate.
282	04/09/2024 14:07:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	Managing parking should mean residents can park - but not other people simply looking for a convenient space - and reduce the number of cars using the back streets and hence the pollution/noise/risks associated with speeding traffic in residential areas.
283	03/18/2024 16:46:52 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I support this proposal
284	03/18/2024 16:45:56 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Wholly Support	I support this proposal
285	21/03/2024	Resident		Wholly Support	<p>I would just like to say that I strongly welcome the implementation of a residents parking scheme in Hurst Park Avenue and Orchard Avenue in the Milton Road area. [REDACTED] and over the last few years, our streets have become choked with parked cars. It's so bad that it has become difficult to get out at the start and end of the day and it's also frustrating residents and causing safety concerns for cyclists and pedestrians by added congestion and frustrated drivers.</p> <p>The sooner the scheme can be put in place the better!</p>
286	12/04/2024	Unknown		Wholly Support	<p>I support the proposals for the traffic scheme.</p> <p>I have a preference for the hours to be 10am - 2pm. This would allow more freedom for residents whilst deterring commuter parking</p>

214	04/09/2024 12:56:15 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	1) Not sure why parking between 15 and 25 Arbury Road is designated as "no waiting at any time". This should be residents parking.
215	04/09/2024 12:47:30 +01:00	Resident	Disturbance	Partly Support	1) High speed and weight of trucks especially at night causing severe physical shaking of the houses along lower end (East) of Arbury Road. No enforcement of 20 MPH limit means trucks travel at speed especially at night when no traffic is there to slow them down. Request ban of HGV's between 2200 hrs and 0700 hrs as is in place on Gilbert Road. There are much better, wider and more suitable roads for HGV's than Arbury Road between A14 and centre of town. 2) Need some limited parking for shops at Milton Road / Arbury Road junction perhaps waiting limited to 30 mins or 1 hour. 3) Not sure why Residents Parking is not in place between 15 and 25 Arbury Road. 4) Some drop curbs between 37 and 43 Arbury Road seem to be missing from consultation map.
216	03/22/2024 16:54:04 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I'm a resident of Chantry Close which I understand isn't included in the proposed scheme (ie Chantry Close residents will not be able to buy either resident or visitor parking permits). Not everyone in Chantry Close has a parking space, and some properties only have one space allotted to them. There are six garages [REDACTED] but they are too small for most modern cars; it is possible to park in front of the garage but this means there is no parking space for visitors. [REDACTED] At present, there is space on Chesterton Hall Crescent for the cars of Chesterton Hall Crescent residents (many of the houses have drives too) and visitors, as well as visitors to Chantry Close. Because of these facts, I request that Chantry Close residents are able to buy at least visitor permits, although being eligible for resident permits and visitor permits would be preferable.
217	03/22/2024 20:05:24 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	The hours could be 10am - 3pm
218	04/04/2024 10:04:48 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I support the proposal but would like the council to consider extending the period to include Saturday. Saturday is as equally busy as a weekday with people working in local shops and businesses, including the Grafton centre, taking advantage of the nearest free parking, as well as the local B&B/airbnb weekend visitors. This would align with the neighbouring Defreville scheme which does include Saturday.
219	04/11/2024 20:02:12 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	While I welcome the introduction of residents parking in Chesterton Hall Crescent and surrounding streets, it should be extended to include Saturday. Saturday is at least as difficult a day as week days for parking as a resident in our area. Every Saturday our road fills up with people driving into town for shopping from mid-morning so if we drive anywhere and return it is often impossible to park in the area until late afternoon when shoppers start to go home.
220	04/06/2024 17:29:12 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I live on Chesterton Rd. Where should I park? Currently I only drive the car to go shopping once every two to three weeks, It's unacceptable to cross the extremely busy chesterton Rd to park elsewhere, currently we have a single car and we park down chesterton hall crescent with out any issues. I have lived at this residence [REDACTED] and can always park. It seems totally bizzare that the concil will not allow us to park in street 20 yards away. I thought that the council worked for the people not the reverse. Also am I no longer able to load my car in front am my house to load or unload shopping? Sometimes [REDACTED] I need to pick [REDACTED] up from outside the house? Is that possible? CCC has not informed us at all of these changes.
221	03/20/2024 21:15:22 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	Overall I think this is a sensible approach to some of the parking difficulties residents have in the area covered. Although, speaking as a Hawthorn Way resident, I have not found parking to be a big problem. However, I have a few comments: 1. The proposal appears to be missing an existing disabled parking space outside number 59 Hawthorn Way. Is this space being removed? 2. There is currently a lack of enforcement of the existing parking restrictions, particularly around the Chestnut Grove/Hawthorn Way junction, and also airside the Spar shop. What measures are being put in place to ensure that the restrictions are enforced? ANPR cameras? 3. Hawthorn Way is used by a lot of cyclists both as a through road and by residents. However, there are no dedicated cycle paths. It would be sensible to consider if it would be possible to include these in the above proposal. 4. The designated car parking space outside number 59 Hawthorn Way appears to encroach onto their dropped kerb.
222	03/19/2024 12:07:08 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	Please could the council consider extending the operational hours of the Milton parking scheme to 9am to 5pm Monday to Sunday so that residents are able to find somewhere to park during the weekend?
223	03/20/2024 14:45:52 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	It would be more beneficial to have parking on the even numbered houses side of Herbert Street instead what is currently proposed (shown on the diagram as parking on the odd numbered houses side of the road). Changing parking to the opposite side of the street would be appreciated and provide a few more much needed spaces for parking.
224	04/08/2024 21:54:41 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	[REDACTED] There is a [REDACTED] in line with my boundary. This makes turning or exiting hazardous. Importantly, 2 parking bays are proposed under the scheme and these are directly opposite my property and the pole. The combination of the [REDACTED] and parked cars opposite, plus moving traffic on my side of the road would render my drive unsafe and extremely difficult to use. Currently I park safely in front of my house. Under the proposed scheme I would not be allowed to park here either. [REDACTED]
225	03/23/2024 10:54:37 +00:00	Resident	Safety	Partly Support	The spaces on the south side of the road opposite my house (Highfield ave) will make it difficult for me to reverse off my drive. If they were on my side of the street it would not be a problem for anyone. No one reverses on the other side due to the arrangement of our driveways. Please move them to be on the north side of our street. Why not put all the spaces on one side of the street? There also seems to be a huge number of signs proposed, is this really necessary?
226	03/18/2024 10:47:29 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	Regarding Residents Parking on Highworth Avenue. Could the landscaped intersection between Highworth Avenue and Leys road be made smaller, to allow for an additional (two or three) parking spaces on the Highworth Avenue side at that location?

227	04/04/2024 13:44:40 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	It would be more helpful for visitors staying overnight, and perhaps still be effective to prevent clogging up by commuters, if the restriction started later in the morning, say 10.30 am ? But overall I agree we need a residents parking scheme for Hurst Park estate and for the "triangle" on far side of Milton Rd, and cannot see how the latter could reasonably be achieved without Ascham Rd etc and Hurst Park Ave etc (inc Mulberry Cres and bottom of Arbury Rd), all be involved as well.
228	04/04/2024 12:38:23 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I think allowing parking on both sides of Leys Road will still mean it is difficult to drive down that road, likewise with Hurst Park Avenue. As the main purpose is to prevent commuter parking could the time you are not permitted to park without a permit be reduced to say 12-2 Monday to Friday
229	03/23/2024 19:48:24 +00:00	Resident	Other	Partly Support	9.30 or 10.00 - 2.00 would be much better restricted hours for residents to allow them to have friends/groups for meetings in their homes in the afternoon. Otherwise residents will be unable to have friends visiting during the day. The number of signage posts is far too many and will be very detrimental to the beauty of the environment. Please reduce the number to essential ones only The day visitor permits (@ £3.20 per day purchased in packs of 5) must be allowed to be carried over to the next year if not used
230	04/09/2024 15:36:35 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I am concerned that the planned parking bays on Hurst Park Avenue close to the bend in the street restricts visibility along the highway. This is especially concerning for the many young children that cycle on Hurst Park Avenue to and from school.
231	03/20/2024 09:25:40 +00:00	Resident	Other	Partly Support	I have a few observations so have selected 'other': 1. I am in favour with most of what is proposed 2. I don't understand why George Street is being treated separately from the whole scheme (parking) 3. The amount of signage proposed is excessive and would be detrimental to the overall appearance of the scheme. Suggest lampposts only and signage at entry to each street as per Newnham. (Environmental) 4. I'm concerned at the amount of double yellow lines proposed. Could white lines be painted in front of drive entrances as with other schemes? (Environmental)
232	04/01/2024 17:57:59 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	the main problem is commuter parking making it unsafe with poor visibility for getting out of drives and children crossing roads. The hours of operation of 9.30-3pm seem a bit excessive to prevent this, probably just 10am-2pm would be sufficient.
233	04/10/2024 11:09:33 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	re PRO998: whilst accepting the need for a scheme of some kind, I do not see the need for it to operate for so long each day (09:30-15:00). The purpose of the scheme is to deter commuter parking, and any, short, period would work just as well for that purpose. The long period has a huge impact on residents (in terms of visitors etc). I am told that the period is long in order to allow the area to be policed. However why not police just a randomly chosen selection of streets each day - say half? For example, dividing the area into four quarters and policing two random quarters each day would maintain the deterrence but halve the time needed for policing, so hugely improving the lives of residents.
234	03/18/2024 18:16:19 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I wonder why the residents-only parking areas omit the space outside my house (xx Hurst Park Avenue). Please see the attached file for your proposal overlaid on the Google Satellite view to see the 'missing' segment. The other breaks are for dropped kerbs. But outside [redacted] and [redacted] Hurst Park Avenue looks like an oversight. Also, I'd like to know the likely cost of temporary parking permits for guests.
235	04/12/2024 11:10:43 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I am broadly supportive of this measure, but I would like to suggest some changes. It is not clear to me why restrictions need to be in place from 9:30 until 3:00 in order to deter commuters. The same objective could be achieved using a much shorter window. A relative in outer London has restrictions for just one hour in the middle of the day, which is enough to stop commuters from parking, whilst making it easier for residents who have genuine visitors or tradesmen at their houses. What is the arrangement for carers visiting residents? I am aware that many people living in this area are elderly, and some require carers to come to their house several times a day. Finally, I am concerned about the amount of signing proposed. I understand that some other areas have been able to have far fewer signs - please could this be considered? As well as reducing the impact on the visual environment, it would also reduce the cost of setting up the signs (and maintaining them).
236	03/28/2024 21:37:51 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	We are emailing as the owners of xx Hurst Park Avenue, Cambridge [redacted] which is to be part of this parking scheme Please note that your map still does not show our driveway and instead has a double yellow line across our drive - we pointed this out in 2022 at the last consultation. I have attached the map annotated and a screen shot to show you where this is. Please can you note our driveway access
237	03/28/2024 21:36:32 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	We are emailing as the owners of [redacted] Hurst Park Avenue, Cambridge [redacted] which is to be part of this parking scheme Please note that your map still does not show our driveway and instead has a double yellow line across our drive - we pointed this out in 2022 at the last consultation. I have attached the map annotated and a screen shot to show you where this is. Please can you note our driveway access

238	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	<p>I am generally in favour of the scheme but with the following caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impact of signage poles on the character and grass verges of the Hurst Park Estate (Hurst Park, Orchard, Highfield, Leys and Highworth Avenues, Leys Road and Mulberry Close). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do poles have to be erected immediately behind all parking bays? Is the risk of driver abuse really so great that this is absolutely necessary in all cases? This could be tested by implementing the scheme at the outset with a lighter touch regime and then reviewing the situation in light of actual experience over a six month period. Can some signs be put on road-facing garden walls where the house owner is in agreement, as is the case in De Freville and Newnham? Can more areas in the RPS have PPA status, as proposed for George Street? The network of streets mentioned in 1. above has either one or, at most two, entrance/exit points which should enable clear signage to be placed to give adequate warning to drivers who are about to enter. This lighter touch signage regime could be implemented at the outset and then reviewed in light of six months experience. Access and short-term parking for local shops and businesses between Arbury Road and Highworth Avenue is important for their continued viability and the valued services they provide to the local community and beyond. Can short-term/pay-and-display bays be provided at <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-7 Arbury Road 6-14 or 11-17 Highworth Avenue Leys Road approaching its junction with Arbury Road? Safety for cyclists in Hurst Park Avenue could be improved if a small number of parking bays could be removed on alternate sides of the road at the 'S' bend. This would improve sight lines for road users and provide gaps for on-coming vehicles to pull in and allow other motorists and cyclists to pass through in safety. <p>Additional Points - Enforcement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> will old and worn yellow lines that already exist within the proposed RPS be repainted during installation of the scheme? will the highways authority also use this as an opportunity to refresh the worn 20mph speed limit markings on the road surfaces? will additional officers be recruited to patrol and enforce the rules in what will be quite a large new area?
239	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	<p>Hello - first, I'm strongly in favour of the parking scheme proposals for this area. But there are details that need attention.</p> <p>It has been difficult to find the most recent info on the proposals (you ought to make it easier!), but attached is a response on one point . I could only find one pdf map with the proposals, and it needed to be magnified by about 50 to be able to see the details.</p> <p>██████ has told me she's seen another map with a different layout in our immediate area, but we cannot now locate that version. As I said, all this ought to be made clearer, and easier to see what is proposed.</p> <p>Were our two local libraries supplied with maps? There was no mention of this in publicity material sent out.</p> <p>One of my immediate neighbours - ██████ has sent in a very detailed response, and her comments are very worthwhile.</p> <p>Residents have been assured by a recent Labour Party circular and by previous responses that there will be plenty of opportunity for consultation about the exact position of parking bays, and I'd like further reassurance on this point.</p>
240	04/09/2024 17:28:54 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	<p>I approve of the proposal to remove parking restrictions outside Nos 14 & 16 Leys Avenue.</p> <p>However, I am concerned overall that the number of residents' parking places has been unnecessarily reduced. For instance:</p> <p>At the northeast end of Orchard Avenue, currently cars can park on the south east side (up to 4 cars). It is now proposed to remove parking here, and instead have parking on the north west side opposite. However, because of existing driveways, only 2 cars will be able to park there. Given that there is a disabled parking bay further along on the south east side, it would be sensible to allow parking just on the same south east side, from the disabled parking bay right up to the junction with Leys Avenue</p>
241	03/21/2024 17:14:42 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	<p>RE Resident Parking for Hurst Park Estate...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the parking on Arbury Road north of the junction with Leys Road is too close to the junction and obstructs view on exiting Leys Road. One bay fewer would be helpful. the timing of the scheme could be reduced to between 10am and 2pm. This would still deter commuter parking, while making life easier for residents.
242	04/04/2024 14:41:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	<p>The plans appear to include an unnecessary amount of signage. Can this be reduced to PPA or more limited signage?</p> <p>The restricted hours seem quite long. I would support 10.00 - 3.00 or 2.00.</p> <p>The plans appear to show a parking place that could overlap my drive (██████ Leys Road). There is space, as previously illustrated, for a good parking space ██████ without overlapping either of our drives.</p> <p>The links in the consultation documents did not appear to work, so I am unclear about the position for tradesmen/companies undertaking necessary home and garden works.</p>
243	04/12/2024 15:55:53 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	<p>Proposed residents parking scheme, Hurst Park Estate. I support this proposal. However, having viewed the plans there are a few changes I would like to be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The spaces in front of number ██████ Leys Road, are not central to the houses. ██████ and the current plan would make reversing out of our driveway very tricky. Moving the marked bays to a more central position across the front of both houses, would not inconvenience anyone else so far as I can tell, but would make a huge difference to us. The bottle-neck created by parked cars at the Arbury Road end of Leys Road currently makes it very difficult to enter Leys Road and can result in dangerous backing up of queuing cars on Arbury Road. Please could double yellow lines extend further into Leys Road to prevent this happening? The Highworth Avenue end of Leys Road is currently a dangerous blind corner: cars parked on the bend of the road result in a hazardous situation where bikes and electric scooters coming from Highworth Ave (often at speed) meet oncoming cars which have been forced onto the wrong side of the road. Please put double yellow lines on that corner to allow safe visibility to oncoming traffic. When the parking bays are implemented, may I request that a white 'STOP and give way' line be marked at the junction of Leys Avenue with Leys Road. Bikes and cars often swoop out of Leys Ave onto Leys Rd without stopping or slowing, often on the wrong side of the road due to parked cars - particularly dangerous when line of vision is blocked by parked cars too close to the junction.

244	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	Regarding the proposed residents parking scheme, Hurst Park Estate. I support this proposal in principle. However, having viewed the plans there are a few changes I would like to be considered: 1) The spaces in front of [REDACTED] Leys Road are not central to the houses. [REDACTED] and the current plan would make reversing out of our driveway very tricky. Moving the marked bays to a more central position across the front of both houses, would not inconvenience anyone else so far as I can tell, but would make a huge difference to us. 2) The bottle-neck created by parked cars at the Arbury Road end of Leys Road currently makes it very difficult to enter Leys Road and can result in dangerous backing up of queuing cars on Arbury Road. Please could double yellow lines extend for further into Leys Road to prevent this happening? 3) The Highworth Avenue end of Leys Road is currently a dangerous blind corner: cars parked on the bend of the road result in a hazardous situation where bikes and electric scooters coming from Highworth Ave (often at speed) meet oncoming cars which have been forced onto the wrong side of the road. Please put double yellow lines on that corner to allow safe visibility to oncoming traffic. 4) When the parking bays are implemented, may I request that a white STOP and give way line be marked at the junction of Leys Avenue with Leys Road. Bikes and cars often swoop out of Leys Ave onto Leys Rd without stopping or slowing, often on the wrong side of the road due to parked cars - particularly dangerous when line of vision is blocked by parked cars too close to the junction.
245	31/03/2024	Resident		Partly Support	I am supportive of the proposed measures. However, would the council please consider removing parking bays near the corner of Ascham Road and Gurney Way close to the entrance of Milton Road Primary School. The school discourages parents from driving to school to encourage safe walking and cycling to school. St Laurence's Church have allowed parents to park there instead for drop off and pick up. Most of the parking bays on Ascham Road and Gurney Way are used only for school drop offs and pick ups and they are mostly empty outside these times. Removing parking bays close to the Ascham Road school entrance would support the school's efforts to discourage driving to school and support safer journeys to school.
246	04/12/2024 21:03:11 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I live at xx Milton Road. The redevelopment of Milton Road has removed all residential on-street parking. I do not have off-street parking and am reliant on on-street parking. During the Milton Road consultation, we were assured that alternative parking provision would be available in the nearby streets leading off Milton Road. The introduction of the Ascham scheme removed the option to park on Ascham Road as my property is not in the boundary of that scheme. The proposed Elizabeth Triangle scheme was unworkable - significant analysis was conducted that established that with the removal of the bays on Milton Road and the removal of the bays on Herbert Street, the area would be vastly oversubscribed. I am therefore fully supportive of this current proposal, in that it joins up Ascham, Hurst Park, Elizabeth Triangle into one scheme - as I believe it is the only workable scheme that will enable local residents to park relatively near their homes now that all the Milton Road parking bays have been removed. I would vehemently oppose any scheme that does not join up all the schemes. I would strongly request that the number of bays be maximized. I note that there is an area at the bottom of Hurst Park Avenue where there are not bays on both sides of the road. Please consider introducing bays on both sides. Equally, the removal of bays on one side of Herbert Street will mean that residents will need to park in other streets. I know that there has been considerable argument put forward by residents of Herbert Street to maintain parking on both sides of Herbert Road as has been the case for years and I fully support their argument to maintain bays on both sides to maximize the space available.
247	04/08/2024 20:58:36 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I understand the need for Residents Parking in many of these streets so I do support this as an overall plan. Is it possible to create in any of these streets (where possible) a few spaces for Free parking for a limited time ie 2hours? (Attached are 2 images showing suggested areas in green with an X) The reason for this suggestion: Many elderly/sick/carers use Mulberry Close to park during the day in order to go to the Pharmacy / Co-op and other shops along the Milton Road section. From what I have observed they usually take less than an hour. I value all the shops along that section for bringing diversity & a safe quick local pick up from a wide variety of local stores. Each store provides goods and services to local residents. My concern is if "non residents" cannot have a few places to park for a quick nip to the shops, the shops will lose customers and close down. These are some of the local shops employing people to provide for the surrounding area. Asian & Fish n Chip take aways, Chesterton Carpets, Wilko, 121 Cafe Each Charity Shop, Cam home & garden, Wilko, Chesterton Carperts, Nail Salon, Coop, Interflora, Arbury Road Butchery, Cherry Corner Hair Salon, Al Noor International Shop etc. I thank you for your time reading this and hope it can bring ideas on how to provide for the resident permit holders but also make allowances for "non residents".
248	03/20/2024 08:05:49 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	1. I would like the time of parking restrictions to be 9.20-2pm so that we older folk can have afternoon visitors and still deter commuters 2. Less signage Just at the entrance to Hurst Park Avenue, Leys Road and MulberryClose would be adequate 3. Parking bays for shops in Arbury Road
249	04/10/2024 09:18:59 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I support the parking scheme with the following suggestions: 1 Could the restricted hours be much shorter - a two hour window would restrict all-day parking to residents 2 It is crucial that people can still park to visit the local shops which provide an important facility. Pay and display for one or two hours at the bottom of Highworth Avenue as well as Arbury Road and Hurst Park Avenue (access to dentist also needed). There is some parking outside the shops but very little and not enough to sustain the businesses. 3 Longer yellow lines at the junction of Leys Road and Arbury Road (it is very difficult to get in and out here at present - a taxi drove into us trying to reverse to let someone through) 4 Limit the number of signs throughout the estate to just those necessary 5 At the moment Orchard Avenue is a rat run with cars speeding down at 40 mph. I noticed parking bays are on alternate sides. Is it possible to alternate the parking sides more so cars don't have a clear run, e.g. right side, left side, right side, left side assuming this will still allow emergency vehicles through?
250	03/31/2024 17:21:27 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	I note that there are 3 parking bays noted outside my house [REDACTED] Orchard Avenue). We do not believe this is possible as our driveways is wider than that shown on the drawing. We also note that a number of other driveways have been widened since the drawing was completed. Please update the drawing to take account of these errors. We also think some 30 minute free parking bays could be included at the end of Arbury Road to serve the shops and other businesses and discourage pavement parking. We also think the number of sign posts provided is excessive - both in terms of cost, environmental impact of the materials used, the time taken to install and the visible impact of additional street furniture. Perhaps signs at the entrance to the Hurst Park Estate may be more suitable and a few other specific locations.

251	04/09/2024 16:07:40 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	<p>I am overall 'neutral' to 'in favor' of the proposal for a residents parking scheme in this area. However, I just wanted to raise one point of detail. The parking on Orchard Avenue is currently split with all parking bays on the west end of Orchard Avenue upon the south side of the road and all parking bays on the east end of Orchard Avenue upon the north side of the road. However, I think it would be neater if this was switched because there is already one fixed disabled bay parking on the east end located on the south side of the road, making that parking bay perhaps more vulnerable to being clipped (as the only one on the alternate side of the road to the rest of the parking bays) and creating a bit of a slalom route for all other vehicles around this anomaly.</p> <p>I also would be strongly in support of some sensible traffic calming, pedestrian, child and cycle friendly measures on Orchard Avenue- perhaps some pinch points in the road/ passing points with additional trees/ green buffers, a speed camera or even a one way system to distribute the weight of traffic down the street. There is a lot of speeding down this street, with drivers taking it as a shortcut/ through route cutting the corner at Arbury Road and Milton Road. It's supposed to be a 20mph street and is so well used by locals as a walking and cycling route, but I have been so surprised at the reckless speed many vehicles take despite this (routinely over 30mph, anecdotally some say upwards of very dangerous 45mph+ too).</p>
252	04/12/2024 08:05:42 +01:00	Resident	Other	Partly Support	<p>The proposed order includes an awful lot of signage. We'd like to see this reduced to a minimum to help preserve the character of the estate as much as possible.</p> <p>We'd also like to see a reduction in the hours of operation to make the scheme less of an inconvenience to residents whilst maintaining a sufficient deterrent for commuter parking, say from 10am to 2 pm.</p> <p>We'd also prefer to see no spaces, or at least only on one side around the bend in Hurst Park Avenue to make cycling safer.</p> <p>We'd also like to see more provision of free short term parking around Milton Road and Arbury Road to support local businesses.</p>
253	03/18/2024 11:29:57 +00:00	Resident	Safety	Partly Support	<p>In Orchard Avenue I would prefer to see the parking spaces alternating from one side to the other in the half of the street nearer Hurst Park Avenue. This would be a speed-reducing measure as a straight run encourages people to break the limit. The disabled person's space at approx number 40 will have that effect at that end of the street. This would apply in Highfield Avenue, too.</p> <p>I was initially surprised to see parking on both sides of Hurst Park Avenue. This would appear to embed the sort of 'canyon' effect that the commuter parking has and that is particularly dangerous for cyclists, so it's a problem for all residents, not just those of HPA. On reflection, given the amount of off-street space, I suspect this space will be empty a lot of the time. However, I would like to be assured that this has been considered.</p>
254	03/18/2024 10:03:09 +00:00	Resident	Parking	Partly Support	<p>Orchard Avenue (a major cycling route for schoolchildren) is a speeding rat-runner's paradise, despite our regular Speedwatches. Currently cars in rush hour (in one direction only) average one per minute. Speeding can reach a level of 50% of vehicles. Parked cars do slow rat-runners down. I would be grateful if the parking places in our road could alternate more, e.g two spaces on one side, two on the other etc, which would discourage the speeding.</p>
255	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	<p>I am in broad support of the parking scheme.</p> <p>However, I am aware there would be even more support for the scheme in the area if the hours of restriction were less, say 10am to 2pm would deter all-day commuters but enable friends and family of residents to park more easily. This would be much better than 9am to 3pm. It would still give enough time for the wardens to police the scheme over the whole area</p>
256	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	<p>I reside at x Orchard Avenue, Cambridge, within this proposed scheme, [REDACTED]. Broadly speaking I support the scheme, but feel it is prudent to raise a potential issue at this stage regarding the proposed 2 parking spaces immediately outside [REDACTED] Orchard Avenue.</p> <p>I note that some disabled spaces have recently been marked in the area. [REDACTED] because I have a driveway which I am currently able to park our one car in [REDACTED].</p> <p>That may change in the future, [REDACTED] which I suspect could be difficult for me to manoeuvre to park in my driveway with the proposed resident bay so close to my driveway. Accordingly I felt this was the time I should at least register this with you.</p>
257	12/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	<p>I support the need for a parking scheme especially to reduce traffic in Cambridge by preventing commuter parking which can only get worse if nothing is done.</p> <p>I propose hours of 10am -2pm as this would have widespread support of residents by giving them more freedom whilst still achieving the objective of stopping commuters clogging our streets.</p>
258	02/04/2024	Resident		Partly Support	<p>I am writing about the consultation on Resident Parking Permit in the area of Milton Road, specifically in Springfield Road.</p> <p>We are very pleased to hear that the Council will introduce Resident Parking Permits in our area. We live in number xx Springfield Road. We are concerned about the future availability of spaces in our road specifically, given the fact that the parking in the next street (Herbert St) will be cancelled on one side of the road due to the impossibility of fire engines entering Herbert St.</p> <p>As it is at the moment, is difficult to get a parking space in Springfield Road and we wonder whether it is feasible to allow more than two resident parking permits per household, as there will be a higher demand for spaces in Springfield Road because of the cancellation of parking on one side of Herbert Street. In addition there are eight terraced cottages in Springfield Terrace that use parking space in Springfield Road.</p> <p>Also, we have noticed that though the apartment building, Whichcote House, has their own parking space, this does not seem enough at week-ends, when there are big cars and minibuses coming to the building and parking demand spills over to Springfield Road. We wonder whether some of those flats are used as AirB&B.</p>
259	04/04/2024	Unknown		Partly Support	<p>I write in support of the introduction of a residents parking scheme in the Milton Road/Arbury Road area.</p> <p>Further suggestions to the council are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to be more ambitious to achieve the County Council's LTP by reducing the number of proposed residents parking spaces marked on the roads. This should be considered specially where provision could be made for cycle routes in place of the parking spaces or where properties already have off road parking available. 2. to include a clause within the Resident Parking Scheme policy to allocate a minimum number of car club parking spaces in each resident parking scheme tranche. CoMoUK may have experience from elsewhere in the UK to advise. 3. to make sure that any provision for electric charging points is made within the roadway and not on the footway. As referenced in clause 2.1 and 10.30 of the Resident Parking Scheme policy the Council are introducing residents' parking schemes to maintain a safe passage for people walking or wheeling on the pavement. Living Streets, the charity for people walking, does not support the installation of pavement-based charging units.