

Appendix 5:

City Council Comments	Officer Response
<p>The Authority's reasons for proposing to make the above named Order(s) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.</li> </ul> <p>We oppose this reasoning on the following grounds: Cambridge City Council's Anti-social behaviour team have not received any reports of anti-social behaviour related to those living in caravans, motorhomes or vans on Riverside which would evidence any nuisance or danger to persons or road users. There seems a current lack of evidence that there is a demonstrable risk to safety. What evidence has been collected to build the case for this? How is it currently unsafe and for whom?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians).</li> </ul> <p>We oppose this reasoning on the following grounds:</p> <p>There is room for both cyclists and vehicles on Riverside, the cycle route into Stourbridge Common from Riverside has clear access, the only obstructions that our officers have observed to that route are pedestrians walking through the cycle path instead of the pedestrian gate from Stourbridge Common to the pavement. Whilst this may cause pedestrian and cycling congestion it does not pose a danger to any road users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property. Explanatory Note:- The</li> </ul>	<p>Vehicles parked on the southeastern side of Riverside impede visibility. Specifically, road users exiting Stanley Road site difficulty in viewing pedestrian / cyclist traffic coming from Stourbridge Common and vice versa. Vehicles, particularly high sided vehicles, parked perpendicular to the kerb on the northwestern side restrict visibility for adjacent vehicles and consultation responses have noted safety concerns and reported accidents associated with tow hooks protruding into the carriageway. Consultation response also note antisocial activity involving loud generators and rubbish and human waste disposal among other concerns. See 'Other Pertinent Comments' section in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Consultation responses evidence that this is not always the case and have provided photos and a video of a caravan blocking the access to Stourbridge Common to setup a roadside kitchen. Responses also note that the footway is not wide enough to support the pedestrian/cyclist traffic levels, so pedestrians often resort to using the carriageway. In this regard affording greater space lessens the likelihood of any accidents arising.</p>

waiting restrictions have been proposed to control unwanted parking near the entrance to Stourbridge Common, which includes overnight/residential motorhome parking. The proposals will also improve visibility of and for cyclists at the junction with Stanley Road.

We oppose this on the grounds of:

An Equality Impact Assessment has not been shared as part of this consultation to potential impact of the TRO on the Gypsy, Roma or Traveller (GRT) communities residing on Riverside. GRT people are a protected group under the Equality Act 2010 and any impact on this community needs to be considered as part of the Public Sector Equality Duty.

This area of Stourbridge Common has a number of houseboats, the existing character of the area is that of a mixed community of people who live in bricks and mortar houses and those who live in different types of homes such as houseboats, barges, caravans, motorhomes and vans – all peacefully co-existing and therefore current vehicular traffic is in line with the existing character of the road and adjoining area.

Under the Housing Act 1996, a Gypsy or Traveller is homeless if she/he/they do not have a lawful place to put their caravan or living vehicle. There are currently 8 motorhomes parked on Riverside and it is yet unknown if any of these residing here would self-identify as GRT. Should the TRO go ahead there is a risk that these individuals would face homelessness as a result. It is unclear if the County Council has not taken into account the impact of the TRO both under the Equalities Act 2010 or Housing Act 1996. Cambridge City Council's equality officer is happy to provide feedback on an equality impact assessment (EqIA) that takes into account consultation feedback.

It would be useful to understand the outcomes of any consultation directly with the residents directly impacted by the proposal. Consultation with residents impacted should also explicitly ask about equality impacts that a policy change may have.

Our enforcement officer has been consulted regarding the proposals and reported no Traveller occupants at the time of the consultation.

Consultation responses would argue against the claim of 'peacefully'.

The lack of ability to park in one location does not prevent parking elsewhere. As there is nothing to prevent such travellers from parking their caravan(s) on a different unrestricted section of carriageway, they cannot be considered homeless if parking is prohibited in this location.

Note, if this concern holds true, how is it that authorities are able to remove travellers from private land under section 61 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994?

Consultation feedback implies there to be majority support of the proposals. If limited to only consider the views of residents in the nearby area i.e. Riverside, St Bartholomew's Court, Stanley Road, Newmarket and Road, Oyster Row and other adjoining side roads) the result was 23 objections and 52 representations of support.

<p>There is a high likelihood that the proposed plans will trigger unnecessary homelessness or lead to unlawful encampments elsewhere in the area. This impact is disproportionate, we suggest time is put aside to work with the homelessness prevention team and residents residing in motorhomes to make arrangements.</p>	<p>When last assessed by our enforcement officer, there were no needy people living in the area. Those that were camping in the area, were doing so because it is cheap. Consultation responses compliment this, reporting a seasonal increase of visiting parties during the warmer months.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------