

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 9th June 2020

Time: 4:30pm – 5:35pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Present: City Councillors: R Robertson (Chairman), G Bird, A Martinelli, N Massey, M Sargeant and D Tunnacliffe

County Councillors: L Jones (Vice-Chairwoman), N Harrison, N Kavanagh, I Manning, E Meschini and A Taylor

69. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN

It was resolved unanimously that Councillor Robertson be elected as Chairman for the municipal year 2020/21.

70. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN

It was resolved unanimously that Councillor Jones be elected as Vice-Chairwoman for the municipal year 2020/21.

71. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart (substituted by Councillor Bird).

There were no declarations of interest.

72. MINUTES – 25TH FEBRUARY 2020

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 25th February 2020, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

73. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

It was noted that one petition and four public questions had been submitted and would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda items.

74. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS ON VICTORIA STREET, CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report which detailed the objections that had been made to a proposed reduction to the length of a residents' parking bay on Victoria Street. The

Traffic Manager highlighted that the application for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was third-party funded.

Mr James Fournier, a resident of Victoria Street and the applicant for the TRO, was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee. Mr Fournier explained that planning permission to convert the property to a garage with a studio residence had been granted on 24th August 1984, since when there had been no further planning submissions or planning enforcements served by the Council for unauthorised usage. He noted that a dropped kerb ran the full length of the property and suggested that the construction of a parking bay in front of the dropped kerb contravened the Council's RPS policy. Arguing that he had a right to access his property and that previous commitments by the Council to resolve the issue had not been acted upon, he emphasised that both he and his wife required access to the garage in order to commute to work.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Sought clarification on whether the garage was in use when the TRO was installed and whether the applicant had objected to the installation, but officers were unable to provide confirmation on whether objections had been raised to the original installation of the parking bay.
- Noted that parking in front of a dropped kerb was illegal, which implied that the parking bay encouraged illegal parking.
- Argued that the applicant should not be required to pay for the TRO if it was predicated on an incorrectly installed RPS. The Traffic Manager informed the Committee that it was not possible to agree at the meeting to the Council covering the cost, although she undertook to investigate the possibility, were the TRO approved.
- Suggested that the requested 1.9m reduction would be insufficient, given that cars were permitted to overhang the end of parking bays by up to 0.5m. The Lead Technician confirmed that the proposals as published in the report had been measured and calculated, and that 1.9m would be a sufficient reduction.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Introduce the proposals on Victoria Street as originally published; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

75. CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN NEWTOWN AREA, CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report which detailed the objections that had been made to the proposed reallocation of parking spaces in the Newtown area of Cambridge. Noting that the Newtown RPS had been in place since 1992, the Policy and Regulation Engineer informed Members that funding for the RPS was provided by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), who required amendments to encourage more sustainable travel choices rather than simply provide more parking space for local residents.

A petition objecting to the proposals, which contained 189 signatures, was submitted and accepted by the Chairman, and is attached at **Appendix 1** of the minutes. The petition

organiser, Mr Keith Warburton was invited to introduce the petition to the Committee. Suggesting that residents who would be affected by the proposed changes had not been properly consulted, he said that the North Newtown Residents' Association (NNRA) had repeatedly dismissed their concerns and excluded them from discussions. He argued that vehicles that were not familiar to the area would be unaware of particular features of the neighbourhood, such as the presence of school children and garden gates opening on to the road. Suggesting that the proposed cycle racks were unnecessary and that moving the bays from one road to another was a waste of money, Mr Warburton called for the scheme to be paused until further consultations had been held and alternative options considered.

Ms Katie Maynard, a local resident of the Newtown area and Chairwoman of the NNRA, was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee. Indicating that full consultations had been held with residents across the Newtown area over a number of years and throughout the development of the proposals with Council officers, she informed Members that residents who held parking permits were often unable to park close to their properties due to overcrowding. She noted that residents had voted on the matter, with 73% voting in favour of progressing the scheme as part of the wider issue of parking across the whole area. Ms Maynard suggested that the petition had received support from people living outside the area and also welcomed the funding support offered by the GCP.

Mr Jasper Green, a local resident of the Newton area, addressed the Committee and noted that the streets in the area had been designed in the 19th century and struggled to accommodate modern levels of traffic, parking and pedestrians, while arguing that Newtown did not benefit from measures in other residential conservation areas. Highlighting that there were 13 schools in the area which drew in a large number of visitors, he argued that parking had been an issue for many years. He suggested that the NNRA had worked well with everyone involved, including the schools and parking enforcement team, to deal with traffic and safety problems in the area. Mr Green expressed concern over the objections and suggested that it was an indication that stakeholder engagement had not succeeded with everyone.

Ms Caroline Wood, a local resident of the Newtown area, was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee. Expressing thanks for the commitment of officers and local members to the scheme over the years, she argued that residents on Brookside had private parking at the rear of their properties and therefore were not reliant on on-street parking. She suggested that visitors currently often parked illegally in resident bays on double yellow lines and that the proposals would reduce such offences, while questioning whether either kind of parking bay could be considered safer than the other. Welcoming the proposed cycle racks and car club bay, Ms Wood emphasised that the scheme addressed the needs of those residents most affected by the parking bays, particularly older and disabled residents.

Councillor Jones spoke as the local County Council Member for Petersfield and emphasised the extensive consultations that had been held with the local community regarding traffic issues stemming from the growth of schools and businesses in the area. Noting that the County Council and GCP had been supportive of tackling the issue across Newtown, she pointed out that residents paid to access the RPS and argued it was not right that they had to search for spaces. She suggested that the proposals would increase safety by reducing the level of traffic penetrating deeper in to Newtown, while the cycle racks would reduce the number of bicycles currently chained to railings along the street. Councillor Jones welcomed the culmination of many years of work and paid tribute

to the efforts of her predecessor as County Council Member for Petersfield, Councillor Barbara Ashwood.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Acknowledged the extensive work that had been carried out on the scheme over the years and welcomed the financial support offered by the GCP.
- Sought clarification on how safety was considered to differ between pay & display bays and resident bays, with one Member arguing that resident bays involved less movement due to the longer periods of parking, thereby being the safer option. The Policy and Regulation Engineer considered the changes to be too minor to have a significant impact on safety or the speed of traffic, noting that the presence of on-street parking and a 20mph speed limit in the area provided natural restrictions to the speed of vehicles.
- Queried the geographical area of the petition's signatories and the reasons for someone signing the petition if they did not live in the area. The Committee clerk informed Members that all the postcodes corresponded to the local area of Cambridgeshire, although it was not possible to verify the exact location of each postcode or establish whether they corresponded to work places or places of residence. The petition organiser informed the Committee that some signatories were parents of children that attended schools in the area.
- Clarified that the petition organiser felt excluded by the NNRA from discussions, as opposed to feeling excluded by the local Members.
- Considered removing the recommendation relating to the conversion of resident bays to pay & display bays on Brookside, as described in section 2.3 of the report, thus increasing the number of resident bays overall, given that this would further alleviate the issue of residents' parking. One Member noted that the Council had initially been sceptical of the scheme due to the loss of income from removing pay & display bays, while the Traffic Manager observed that the pay & display bays would be used by visitors to the local businesses and were therefore an important feature of the area's parking facilities, especially given the previous removal of other nearby pay & display bays. The Policy and Regulation Engineer also informed Members that one of the requirements to obtain funding from the GCP was to not increase resident parking capacity.
- Expressed disappointment over the wording of section 4.4 of the report, noting that blue badge holders often found it difficult to find somewhere to park in the area, despite being able to park in resident bays, pay & display bays and double yellow lines. One member regretted that the proposals did not include a disabled parking bay, despite an urgent need for more across the city both for residents and workers. The Policy and Regulation Engineer noted that there was already a disabled parking bay in Pemberton Terrace.
- Recalled amendments that were made to the Morley RPS in order to add pay & display bays for visitors to a local school, including peripatetic teachers or people carrying heavy equipment. One Member expressed concern over the removal of similarly placed bays which would potentially have to be reconsidered in the future.

- Acknowledged that there was local opposition to the proposals and suggested that the consultations had not been as comprehensive or as all-encompassing as they could have been.
- Observed that any decision to defer the recommendations would result in a lengthy delay, given the County Council's decision to pause work on RPS schemes for 12 months.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Introduce the proposed waiting restrictions as shown on the public notice and drawing shown in Appendices 1 and 2 as published; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Petition - Object to Installing Pay & Display on Brookside CB2

Statement

We the undersigned petition the council to Reject Cambridgeshire County Council's PR0551 Proposed Amendments to Parking Restrictions – Newtown area, Cambridge issued the 5th February 2020. We, the unsigned, object to the removal of Resident Permit parking and replacing it with Pay & Display parking on Brookside (Bateman Street to Pemberton Terrace section), where it is proposed to convert the northern and southern sections of existing Resident Permit parking to Pay & Display parking, in addition the southern section being extended southwards by 20 metres to provide an additional length of Pay & Display parking.

Justification

The section of Brookside between Bateman Street and Pemberton Terrace is a narrow, one-way street with the front gardens of schools and residents across the road, and with schools at the beginning and end of the road. This section of road is currently only Resident Permit parking, which is always occupied, and the section at the southern Bateman Street end (outside MPW and the Stephen Perse Foundation) has double yellow lines or zigzag SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR lines. Removing the Resident Permit parking and installing Pay & Display parking will increase risk of serious injury to:

- School children (Heritage School, Stephen Perse Foundation, and MPW) arriving to school, leaving school during the day for activities, or when crossing the road to front gardens. This risk is particularly acute outside of Heritage School, which has over 200 pupils, half of which are aged 4-10 years old, where the line of sight is most compromised by parked cars,
- Resident children crossing the road to their gardens,
- Resident senior citizens walking in the area or to their gardens,
- Cyclists going the wrong way down Brookside,
- Visitors to the Botanical Gardens who walk down Brookside, often entering resident gardens.

Installing Pay & Display will create additional foreign traffic turning off Trumpington road, into Bateman street and then left into Brookside to try and find parking. These drivers will not be local people with local knowledge of risks to children or residents or of others who cycle or walk the wrong way down the road. The turning into Brookside is almost blind as the railings and plantings obscure the view of the driver. Front garden gates often swing into the road. Local residents and business users are aware of these factors and drive slowly.

A particular concern is line of sight down Brookside for residents, school children and other users wishing to cross Brookside. This problem is particularly acute at the northern end of Brookside outside Heritage School. There is a serious risk of injury to school children crossing Brookside, as they are unable clearly to see a car approaching up Brookside due to parked cars. This same risk applies to all cyclists and pedestrians crossing from Pemberton Terrace to the pedestrian bridge across Hobson's Conduit to Trumpington Road. Heritage School reports numerous 'near misses'; poor line of sight at the northern end of Brookside is a serious accident waiting to happen.

Installing Pay and Display parking on Brookside will make matters worse.

There was a proposal to install two-way cycling on this section of Brookside. However, after a report it was concluded that this was a safety concern. See paragraph 4.4 of Cambridge Traffic Management area joint committee report dated 24th April 2006.

Additionally, removing residents parking from this section will cause residents to drive around the local one-way system creating a greater environmental impact.

It is proposed to remove the Pay & Display from Pemberton Terrace and replace it with Residents Permit parking. Pemberton Terrace is a two-way street on what is effectively a single lane road, given the current parking on the north side of Pemberton Terrace. This parking is not much used

for much during the day. With all spaces potentially full of Resident Permit parking throughout the day there will be no space for drivers to pull in to let others pass, leading to more frequent bottlenecks, including when lorries or delivery trucks drive down Pemberton Terrace from Brookside. Regardless of how parking bays are distributed on Pemberton Terrace, consideration should be given to making Pemberton Terrace one way from west to east.

Residents, schools and other business users of Brookside have not been consulted on this proposed scheme. We, the undersigned, given the objections stated above, demand that this scheme be sent back to consultation. This will allow residents, schools and other business users to have their say so that a more appropriate scheme can be created, one which balances various needs and serious safety concerns more effectively. Under the current proposal, the safety of residents and school children will be compromised further by encouraging more foreign traffic on Brookside.

(189 signatures)