

# TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS - WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

20 March 2018 10:19

South Trumpington Parish Meeting considered the proposed parking restrictions at its meeting last night.

The Meeting did not support the proposal. There was significant confusion about the scheme, including the availability of spaces for residents (or residents permits) and enforcement. There was also concern about the high cost of visitors permits.

The meeting felt that the proposals were over the top given that the Park and Ride parking will be free from April and therefore commuters parking in the development is unlikely to be an issue.

The Parish Meeting felt that a more relaxed scheme would be more appropriate and recommend that the proposals are dropped and consultations with the local community groups take place to find an appropriate solution.

---

I am resident of x Charger Road, Trumpington Meadows. I am writing to file my reservations regarding the enforcement of new parking restrictions scheme for Trumpington meadows.

I want to highlight the fact that many residents in this new housing complex have only one allocated parking and they have to rely on the parking bays on the roadsides for parking the second car. It is usually the case where families often need two cars needed by both husband and wife in order to carry out daily routines like, office, school runs, etc. My reservation is that the residents should be allowed to use the additional spaces on the roadside. Or an alternative parking for the residents shall be provided in order to accommodate those having two cars.

When I bought the property couple of years back, I was told by Barratt that I can use these additional parking bays to park my second car. But with the introduction of this new enforcement, people like me will be left with no alternative. The block where I live in has 5 houses with 1 allocated parking space, but 3 of these 5 houses have 2 cars.

I, and many other residents who I have spoken with, believe that the enforcement plan should be revisited. Residents should be allowed to use the additional parking space on the roadsides. They can be given permits allowing them to be able to park their additional car on these bays. Or they should be given an alternative option.

Many residential areas in Cambridge, even near city centre, have relaxed parking restrictions. Trumpington meadows is not in the centre of the city and is a big residential area with many families living here. The proposed parking enforcement will disrupt the daily routines and the people needing to use these additional parking bays will be left with no alternative option.

I therefore request the council to reconsider the current enforcement plan and take into consideration, the problems it will bring for the residents.

---

Although your deadline 5 Jan has now passed (hence it won't make much difference I guess), the map you have online is still showing mistakes for Bead Road (missing), Piper Road, and missing Falcon Way. I informed you about these mistakes 15 Dec, which you had acknowledged at the time...

Graham Hughes/Gary Baldwin,

Please see attached more corrections that need to be made to your PR0393:

1. Your (revised) Public Notice refers to "Roads marked # contain visitor permit holder bays." This is incorrect. The "Roads marked # contain visitor bays". That is it. There is no permit holder system in place for these bays under Regent Parking.

Regent Parking operates a simple system (photos & pdf of wording attached). No permits involved in any way shape or form.

You won't find any permits on the cars' windscreens parked here in the bays today. I just checked Osprey Drive and One Tree Road, about 10 cars in bays this afternoon, none display any permit (of course not).

Your current wording is misleading, because it implies a permit system is already in place. It isn't.

2. You have failed to label Bead Road entirely, and Piper Road properly on the map. Yes, it is also wrong on Googlemaps.

If you or your team pop over for a visit (no doubt your team must have done so, to carry out an assessment of the parking situation, pointing to the 'problem' PR0393 purports to resolve), you will have known:

- (a) all the correct street names, that
- (b) nobody in bays displays any sort of permit, and

(c) that empty bays abound, no visitor has any problem finding a spot to park in.  
Hope this helps.

---

Hello,  
I am worried about the long hours i.e: 8am -6pm of parking restrictions.  
I live on the corner of Kestrel Rise and Huntsman Road I do not see any parking bays there, where will our visitors, workmen etc.. park I do not see any allocation of parking spaces for us. When I return home I always have to put the car in a very narrow garage door as I am not allowed to park on the road outside my own house.  
Would you please look into where we can have parking spaces for us please.  
Thank you,

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am unhappy with the proposed street parking and waiting restrictions order at the Trumpington Meadows development in Cambridge. I feel that Cambridgeshire County Council has not undertaken an appropriate consultation with the residents on this matter. I do not support the visitor permit scheme and its cost. The visitor parking should be made available for free and on first-come-first served basis. I am also concerned that uncontrolled on-street parking outside the restriction hours (6pm to 8am) would obstruct emergency vehicles, bin collection vehicles and other residents (e.g. blocking access/driveway/garage). Some of these residential roads were designed as shared space between pedestrians and vehicles and therefore not suitable for on-street parking.

---

To whom it may concern

As a resident of Spring Drive, one of the roads affected by the proposed introduction of parking controls, I have serious concerns about the impact the changes will have on me as a tenant in one of the flats, which I share with a flatmate. I work near Newmarket whilst my flatmate is a final year medical student who is required to travel to various district hospitals across the region. Leading such different lives means we require two different cars. Although we are aware that each property is guaranteed only one allocated parking space, we picked this property because of the availability of the overflow parking spaces. I understand that the council is trying to reduce the traffic coming in and out of town, and from experience, I understand why. However, introducing the parking controls is not an effective way of doing this. We already own the two cars, and we will continue to require use of these two cars since the public transport in this area and in the areas we work is overpriced and lacking in direct routes.

I can understand that the proposal seeks to improve and control parking for visitors to the area, however please also consider the residents who need to use these parking spaces. On the basis that Trumpington Meadows is literally next door to the Park & Ride site, it would seem sensible to allow residents to use the overflow parking spaces and for visitors to use the numerous empty spaces in the Park & Ride, which was specifically designed as a parking area for visitors.

Forcing residents to pay for 100 visits to their own home seems harsh, particularly when this was not expected when residence was taken up. And what about the other 256 days in the year? Where do you propose we park our cars on these days, or will we be forced to move out of the area? For young professionals trying to start our careers, these parking restrictions will definitely decrease the attraction of Trumpington as a convenient place to live.

---

I strongly object to this proposal. I live in a flat on Spring Drive. It is going to cost me a lot of money to buy parking permits for friends and family visiting me given the exorbitant permit price proposed.

Why is it that only certain areas in Trumpington Meadows are being brought under the ambit of this proposed regulation and not others? There certainly seem to be some vested interests at play here.

If the Council goes ahead with the proposal it can expect a legal challenge .

Not a happy resident.

---

We have received a number of comments from residents at Trumpington Meadows regarding your proposed RPZ. In particular a number of residents are concerned that the scheme will only operate between the hours of 8am and 6pm and they are concerned that they will encounter difficulties parking outside these hours as non-residents will be free to park anywhere outside these hours. In addition will any provisions be made for disabled parking as part of the scheme? Will blue badge holders be able to park anywhere? Or will this be restricted to visitors bays? Will the use of visitors bays be free of charge to blue badge holders?

We would be grateful if you can please take these points into consideration during the consultation and provide us with feedback.

---

This proposal for Trumpington Meadows parking restrictions is as poor as it is divorced from reality and the needs of real people who live on the estate! Not only does it unnecessarily and unconscionably limit the freedom of parking near our own properties, but it also devalues the whole estate for prospective buyers thus not only being a waste of our own Council Tax, but also something that dips even deeper into our pockets by lowering the value of our properties.

This would be a point where I list the individual failings, but these are so numerous that I honestly believe the whole project should be shredded and started over (and probably done by a more capable contractor). The main complaint is virtual non-existence of options to temporarily park outside for the properties with garages and/or car ports, as well as ridiculous limit and price of visitors' permits. The latter pretty much means nobody on the estate can host any meaningful number of visitors, for free or otherwise! Let me also mention that some roads are mislabelled, some are omitted from the scheme altogether with no clear indication of what rules might apply, and many similar failings.

Finally, there is one lonely positive: at least Cambridge Council parking fines are lower than what is currently being charged by the private enforcement company at Trumpington Meadows - and may be enforced more fairly, too (a slim hope, maybe).

Therefore, please reject this proposal as wholly unfit for purpose and do another one, this time inviting views about the needs of residents, too. These views were noticeably not solicited for this proposal, or if they were either the respondents or their responses were cherry-picked - or ignored altogether.

Oh, and the decision to not inform citizens in a more proactive way (e.g., leaflets through the doors) that this sort of project is going on and may need commenting on is inexcusable at best and criminally negligent at worst.

---

Trumpington Meadows is overpriced and with houses too close to each other. One of reasons we decided to go for the house at TM is because of promised good connections with London. Instead we live at place with crime in rise, not enough police to protect us, poor and overpriced guided buses connections, pathetic primary school with worst Ofsted report I have ever seen so I have to drive my child to different school, no nurseries in the area with free spaces and we when in need had to drive to Girton (I'm happy to pass you more details about all claims here) and on the top you now want to restrict how many visitors I can have per year and to charge me for that!!!

All proposals are ridiculous and feel like punishment for our decision to buy at TM!

We are both working parents, full time and in good employment. You can not otherwise afford to live in Cambridge and at TM. Proposals like this can only drive such people out from Cambridge and this makes me angry.

As house owner I require free cat permit for my house that I can use for additional parking we as family need. I also request you focus on increasing safety of my family and house and quality of schools and traffic in Cambridge instead of wasting my money and time on paying anyone to do as stupid a proposal as this one and that will have real people in mind.

---

With regard to the Visitor parking bays - residents (not Visitors) are parking more vehicles in the bays than were they were designed for. it is quite common for vehicles to be parked at 45 Degrees to the curb with half the vehicle sticking out into (and obstructing) the road. In some instances residents have decided to park at 90 Degrees to the curb in order to park twice as many vehicles in the bays and again the vehicles then block pavements and stick out into the road. As the roads are busy and often narrow, parking cars in this manner affects the safety of all road users and pedestrians.

It is recommended that visitor bays are marked to indicate where cars may park and eradicate dangerous and inconsiderate parking, which will increase the safety of residents.

In other areas of the development residents are permanently parking on( and completely blocking) pavements outside their houses. I often have to walk and push my Grandchild in a pram into the road to walk around these cars. As you can imagine this is dangerous and easily avoided. Please can you confirm that parking on pavements is going to be controlled.

I attended the meeting on Monday 23/11 at Trumpington School to hear your representative give more details of the proposed scheme, how it would work, how the parking regulations would be enforced, and most importantly allow residents to raise concerns that the proposal would create. This was to be the consultation between the residents and the Cambridge Partnership.

However your representative decided not to attend, Decided not to answer any questions , Decided not to give residents any information about the proposal, Decided not to enter into any consultation.

As no consultation has taken place - can you confirm when the consultation will take place - when this will take place - and where the venue for the consultation will take place.

As it stands now no consultation has taken place - and any attempt to force through the proposal will be met by legal challenge that the correct protocol has not taken place - and could delay the introduction of the proposal by many months.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email - and confirm when the consultation will be taking place.

I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-

Parking on the estate roads between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM is completely unregulated

The current proposal is that parking is completely unregulated between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM and traffic can park on both sides of Consort Avenue (the main spine road into and out of the estate) during this time - or anywhere else for that matter.

If the proposal is adopted the estate will become completely gridlocked and residents, emergency services and refuse collection may be unable to enter or leave the estate if residents park in an inconsiderate manner. Under the proposal blocking of the estate roads would be completely acceptable between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM and no enforcement action to prevent this would take place. I have first-hand experience of living on an estate where there was no parking enforcement took place on the estate roads. I sometimes have to leave for work at 7.00 AM and I was prevented from leaving the estate for over an hour as the main access road had been blocked by residents parking on both sides of the road leaving no space for a vehicle to pass. This is precisely what this proposal would lead to.

This proposal would lead to the estate becoming unsafe as Ambulances Fire or Police service vehicles would be impeded from accessing homes in the event of an emergency – this proposal could literally cost someone their life.

This aspect of the proposal is very short sighted and its potential consequences have not been thought through.

I remind you of the Grenfell tower block tragedy in which Council officials ignored residents legitimate safety concerns and subsequent loss of life occurred - you may well be held accountable if some dies as a result of this proposal. You have been warned - and I suggest that you take this concern seriously.

It is recommended that NO parking at any time is allowed on the main spine road (Consort Avenue) at any time. In addition NO parking at any time is allowed on any narrow roads where parking a car would block residents from accessing their homes or allocated parking.

Visitors Parking Bays use between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM is completely unregulated

When I purchased my house the deeds to my property included specific legal covenants pertaining to the visitor parking bays, which were included in the deeds of all properties sold on the estate. Barratt Homes Ltd inserted a covenant (or legal agreement) that the visitor parking bays were to be used exclusively by VISITORS only and they were not to be used by

residents. The properties were sold on the basis that residents were allocated two parking spaces each and any addition parking that residents require should be off the estate and not in VISITOR parking bays. The current proposal would mean that residents can block the VISITOR parking bays between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM. This is completely unacceptable as all residents have been allocated their own parking. The effect of this proposal would be that VISITORS would not be able to park bays between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM, even if visitor permits were purchased. It is recommended that the Visitor parking bays are reserved for VISITORS only not residents as originally intended.

It is recommended that no parking at any time is allowed on the main spine road (Consort Avenue) at any time. In addition no parking at any time is allowed on any narrow roads where parking a car would block residents from accessing their homes or allocated parking.

It is recommended that the Visitor parking bays are reserved for VISITORS only not residents as originally intended.

---

We would like to oppose the proposed changes to parking restrictions PR0393. As has already been identified in southern fringe meetings etc., these spaces are often used by residents which restricts visitors being able to park and this is not what we are disputing. However, the proposal does not put forward alternative arrangements for residents who currently need to use these spaces.

It may be argued that properties in the area are sold on the condition of a single allocated parking space; but, how does this fit in with the modern aims of multiple members of a single household participating in work? In our house, one person works in Stow-cum-Quy, whilst the other works at various district general hospitals. The public transport network is not adequate to provide transport for numerous reasons, as follows:

- 1) The park and ride is expensive at 3 pound, before even considering subsequent journeys needed to be undertaken to reach either Stow-cum-Quy or district generals.
- 2) The park and ride is prohibitive for shift workers (both of us) who operate outside of the operating times of the park and ride.
- 3) Public transport to places of work significantly increases commuting times in comparison to car, despite traffic.
- 4) The busway is not adequately lit, or monitored to ensure night-time safety of individuals cycling along it.

We put this to the council. We completely support the thinking of reducing the number of cars both in Trumpington Meadows and the Cambridge area as a whole. However, to implement these severe restrictions would make it impossible to keep the required second car, and doing this whilst the public transport network is not fit for purpose will force us to move away from the area. Indeed, as a young people in our early 20s, why is Cambridge attractive anymore? House prices are soaring. The public transport network is outdated, overstretched and overpriced. The removal of the ability to park my own car outside my house feels like the last straw. I strongly urge the council to reconsider its proposal, which once again skews the advantages to those who can afford higher standards of living. Indeed the price proposed for visitor permits is just extortionate (how is anyone justifying £3.00 per a visit, this is more than some centre of town parking!!!). My boyfriend regularly visits via car, and these proposals are effectively a tax on him doing so.

It is difficult enough as it is to find spaces in which to park, mainly due to the terrible design of 'designated parking spaces'. There is significant ground space which could be utilised in better ways for this purpose. Therefore, it is clear that the only reason the council are proposing these changes are because they want to force households into possessing one vehicle, regardless of whether the residents work in separate locations and therefore need access to two vehicles. This is a very weak argument indeed. If the transport network was sufficient, we would use it voluntarily. As it stands, all this proposal will do is push young talent out of Trumpington Meadows, and considering the lack of affordable housing within Cambridge itself, outside of the local area. Until public transport links and prices are improved, it is premature to push these parking restrictions through.

---



Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF  
29 December 2017

Gary Baldwin  
Policy & Regulation  
Cambridgeshire County Council

submitted online

Dear Gary,

**Trumpington Meadows Parking Order**

Having consulted our members, the Trumpington Residents' Association objects to the proposed Parking Order for Trumpington Meadows.

There are a number of factors which give a context to our objection, including:

- the streets in the development are in either the City or the District or both, with a risk of confusion if different regimes apply in the two areas
- work is continuing on the construction of streets in the southern and western part of the development;
- the homes in the Trumpington Meadows development were designed with limited off-street parking provision within the properties. In practice, a number of residents may be using up their available parking spaces, with more cars than they expected to need, due to issues such as the need to use schools in other parts of the city and the poor availability of bus services, particularly in the evenings and on Sundays. As a result, their visitors, including possibly regular visitors such as carers, have to rely upon on-street parking;
- the limited number of on-street resident and visitor parking spaces are not clearly marked on the ground; there is no distinction between the small number of resident spaces and the visitor parking spaces; there are some streets with no nearby visitor spaces; and there are a number of areas of wide pavement that are being used for parking;
- the streets are relatively narrow and not designed for on-street parking other than in the designated resident and visitor spaces.

In our view, the proposed Order is premature. We hope it will be withdrawn and that the Council will take the opportunity for fuller consultation with residents, councillors and the developers, in the hope that a consensus can be reached about the best solution.

If the Council pursues the current order, our specific objections are:

- the hours of operation of the Visitor spaces: we are concerned that the proposal to have no restrictions on the use of Visitor spaces from 6 pm to 8 am will result in the spaces being used overnight by residents and not be available for evening visitors, and suggest that more effective hours would be say 7:30 pm to 8 am;
- we would like to see evidence that the proposed order is consistent with the approved Reserved Matters plans for the development (11/0073/REM), the plans showing parking spaces that were provided to home owners at the time of the initial purchase of a property, and the covenants signed by home owners.
- Visitor parking permits: the proposed permits are too limited and inflexible; in the absence of other parking spaces, there should be a provision for residents with specific requirements (such as daily attendance by a carer) who require multiple permits for the whole year and there should also be an option of having permits which are for a short period such as 2 hours;
- Resident spaces: the small number of on-street Resident spaces need to be clearly marked;
- absence of overnight parking restrictions in areas which are not Visitor or Resident spaces: we are concerned that the effect of the proposed Order will be that residents and visitors will be able to park elsewhere on the streets between 6 pm and 8 am; the streets were not designed for this type of use and it will have a negative impact on the streetscape and potentially on safety; we propose that on-street parking should not be permitted at any time outside the designated spaces;
- there are errors with the street names marked on the map;
- the enforcement rules in the City and the District should be the same; if this is not achievable, there needs to be clarification of any difference in the enforcement rules that apply to streets that are in the City or the District, noting that there is no distinction on the ground;
- there needs to be action by the developer to clearly mark and distinguish between Visitor and Resident on-street spaces and to introduce physical barriers to prevent parking in other on-street areas.

Xxxxxx Xxxxxx

Trumpington Residents' Association

---

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident living on Charger Road in Trumpington Meadows.

We are household with two cars as both of us are working professionals and need to commute by drive to different places. We only have one parking space allocated to each house. The new rules on parking control in Trumpington Meadows don't consider case like us.

Regarding the distance of Trumpington Meadows from Cambridge centre, so far we have not found difficulty to find a spot on visitors bay. At the same time, I also suppose we may eventually need some kind of regulations to prevent non-residence parking for the future.

Taking account those points, I propose to issue resident parking permits for residents rather than only allowing visitor permits.

Also, I would like to have more detailed and clear explanations why the council has decided to take this action, particularly if any parking-related problems are already rising.

---

I LIVE IN BEAD ROAD. THE SITE PLANE DISPLAYED ON-LINE NAMES BEAD ROAD AS AVALON WAY. IS THIS TO BE CORRECTED? IF, AS PROPOSED, UNRESTRICTED PARKING IS ALLOWED THEN A DOUBLE YELLOW LINE SYSTEM NEEDS TO BE INTRODUCED TO PREVENT PARKING IN DANGEROUS LOCATIONS. THIS HAPPENED PRIOR TO THE CURRENT RESTRICTIONS BEING INTRODUCED, MANY ROADS ON THE SITE ARE NARROW LESS THAN 5 METRES WIDE WITHOUT PAVEMENTS. AGAIN IF UNRESTRICTED PARKING IS ALLOWED I FEAR THAT CARELESS PARKING WILL OBSTRUCT MOVEMENT OF VEHICLES IN AND OUT OF GARAGES INCLUDING MINE. I SUSPECT THAT THIS PROBLEM HAS NOT BEEN CONSIDERED.

---

I am a current resident in Trumpington meadows and I would like to object to your proposed parking restrictions, reference PR0393.

Firstly, the parking spaces are always filled by residents at present. The fact that there is no through road on the site means that no 'visitors' would be currently parking. Therefore the cars parked in the bays currently are all residents.

The bays would then be empty should the restrictions be brought in as there is no logical reason for a visitor to park on site, leaving residents stuck for somewhere to park with these empty bays across the estate.

The volume of restrictions you're proposing is unreasonable. The residents on the roads you have earmarked have been in their properties for a number of years, with no issue around parking. To expect them to change their habits/car routines because you want to bring in a money making scheme is completely wrong.

I also question the logic and level of review of the proposals, with you mislabelling the roads. You have identified Renard Way as falcon road, which makes me think this was pulled together in a hurry without proper review or scrutiny.

I look forward to hearing your responses to my above points.

To whom it may concern, I am writing regarding proposal PR0393 (parking restrictions on the Trumpington Meadows development).

I wish to protest the proposal for several reasons:

1) We live in the outskirts of town where visitors need cars to visit. I do not see the point whatsoever that the council needs to charge for visitors parking. It is completely unreasonable. To me, this is clear revenue grabbing from the council. Also, parking is free in the rest of Trumpington so why single out Trumpington Meadows for chargeable visitors permits? Especially when this is further out of town. Even if one believed that commuters parked on the estate rather than the park and ride, the simple solution would be to issue free visitors permits for residents.

2) The process was completely clandestine - there was one sign that was on the estate and the only reason I knew this proposal existed was because a neighbour told me. Furthermore, there was supposed to be a community consultation and the council representative didn't even show up! To me this clearly indicates that the council is trying to slip through a proposal through the net that they clearly knew would be unpopular. In fact, the Lib Dems have created a petition to get the council to delay its decision so residents can be appropriately informed and the proposal debated.

3) The proposed visitor permit structure of up to 20 permits, each enabling up to 5 visits each of 24 hour duration is completely unjust, and something I believe is a ridiculous over engineering or what is a simple basic human right: to have people visit them at their home.

4) The proposed structure is completely untenable - we have a cleaner and will be having a nanny next year for our baby son. Under the proposed structure, we would not be able to have them visit our premises in a fashion where they could do their job whatsoever - the 100 visit limit overall will be reached in something like 15 or 16 weeks into a 52 week year. This is ridiculous and completely unjust. And this is not including any actual visitors like friends and family! I could understand if we were in the city centre, but we are on the outskirts of town near the M11 - people need to have cars to come to the estate (public transport is woeful - the buses don't come past 8pm so if you don't have a car, you have to take a taxi).

I believe the current system works well so I do not see why it needs changing at all.



We have recently been informed by a neighbour of the county council's proposals to change parking arrangements on the Trumpington Meadows estate. It was disappointing in the first instance that we had to be informed of this by a neighbour, since we were not able to make a meeting of residents earlier that week, and the notices posted around the estate by the council were very poorly advertised and easy to miss.

We strongly object to the proposals, on the following grounds:

- When we bought our house, the current parking restrictions were a condition of sale, i.e. parking on the roadways was not permitted. Changing the parking restrictions is a significant change to this condition.
- Lifting the restriction would significantly impact both the privacy, light and semi-rural nature of the street where we live, which is home to nesting barn owls each year as well as several deer. (I also note that it will significantly affect the semi-rural aspect of the Hill development of converted barns opposite; have the owners been consulted?)
- It would also make it impossible for us to access our garage, as the streets would become very narrow if unrestricted parking were allowed, which is obviously counter-productive in the extreme.
- Much of the estate has no pavements. However, residents including young children and parents, as well as elderly people, are currently able to walk around and even play safely in the community areas - precisely because of the strict parking restrictions. Removing these would destroy the community feel of the estate, and be unsafe given the lack of pavements.

We therefore strongly request that this proposal is rejected.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing my objection as regards the parking control proposal set by the Cambridgeshire County Council.

As a resident, living at x Banner Road, the proposal, which I found stuck to my car window, has not considered the residents who are on low income.

I am a single mother, working part time at Addenbrookes Hospital, living in housing association house, which is supposed to be affordable housing!

I currently have been living here 4 years, each year the rent comes up, I currently pay over £700 in rent per month with the help of a small housing benefit.

Whilst I have been a resident I have already witnessed the parking private company who have set up on the estate. Giving tickets over £100. The company also have given tickets to people with blue bandages. You are now proposing a second parking control in which I personally would have to pay £15 per month for a permit as my mother helps with my child care for me to work.

£15 per month is a huge amount of money & limiting visits 2 100 annum ridiculously when my mother & father visit for child care.

My friend personally phoned the City Council & residents who live in permit areas only pay £50 per annum!

This is true as she phoned them direct, which your proposing is way over what you normally pay & terms which don't match the rest of Cambridge.

Also considering I already pay a high amount of council tax in total £1630.71 per annum.

I think if you are going to put parking control in place you should be allowing a permit per year at £50 like the rest of Cambridge.

Not at any moment did you consider the lower class residents & restricting visits your restricting family members visiting who help with childcare.

I can not afford £15 per month. I am a nurse on a wage that has not had a pay rise for 10 years. Nurses wages are not matching the cost of living.

You also proposed this without resident consultation meeting. Very poor notice, with a few leaflets stuck on cars & in the paper, which I never buy & I know a lot of other residents who wouldn't have seen this either!

I will write further complaints & objections to the local MP, as I believe these proposals have been acted in a fraudulent manner & I will be complaining directly to the head of highways.

I want the council to seriously consider their position on this and think of the lower class residents who

can not afford this proposal. Also the fact its very unfair having two parking controls in place where you live, this is our homes!

I truly believe the county council have acted under handed with the trumpington councillor!

I will be taking my views and my objection further on this matter.

BTW, you also have left out Falcon Road on the map for PR0393; and only mention it in the Public Notice.

Please label Falcon Road on the map, it is near Renard Way.

Graham Hughes/Gary Baldwin,

Please see attached more corrections that need to be made to your PR0393:

1. Your (revised) Public Notice refers to "Roads marked # contain visitor permit holder bays."

This is incorrect.

The "Roads marked # contain visitor bays". That is it. There is no permit holder system in place for these bays under Regent Parking.

Regent Parking operates a simple system (photos & pdf of wording attached). No permits involved in any way shape or form.

You won't find any permits on the cars' windscreens parked here in the bays today. I just checked Osprey Drive and One Tree Road, about 10 cars in bays this afternoon, none display any permit (of course not).

Your current wording is misleading, because it implies a permit system is already in place. It isn't.

2. You have failed to label Bead Road entirely, and Piper Road properly on the map. Yes, it is also wrong on Googlemaps.

If you or your team pop over for a visit (no doubt your team must have done so, to carry out an assessment of the parking situation, pointing to the 'problem' PR0393 purports to resolve), you will have known:

(a) all the correct street names, that

(b) nobody in bays displays any sort of permit, and

(c) that empty bays abound, no visitor has any problem finding a spot to park in.

Hope this helps.

Yours sincerely,

Graham Hughes/Gary Baldwin,

Please see attached more corrections that need to be made to your PR0393:

1. Your (revised) Public Notice refers to "Roads marked # contain visitor permit holder bays."  
This is incorrect.

The "Roads marked # contain visitor bays". That is it. There is no permit holder system in place for these bays under Regent Parking.

Regent Parking operates a simple system (photos & pdf of wording attached). No permits involved in any way shape or form.

You won't find any permits on the cars' windscreens parked here in the bays today. I just checked Osprey Drive and One Tree Road, about 10 cars in bays this afternoon, none display any permit (of course not).

Your current wording is misleading, because it implies a permit system is already in place. It isn't.

2. You have failed to label Bead Road entirely, and Piper Road properly on the map. Yes, it is also wrong on Googlemaps.

If you or your team pop over for a visit (no doubt your team must have done so, to carry out an assessment of the parking situation, pointing to the 'problem' PR0393 purports to resolve), you will have known:

(a) all the correct street names, that

(b) nobody in bays displays any sort of permit, and

(c) that empty bays abound, no visitor has any problem finding a spot to park in.

Hope this helps.

I am emailing to register my objection to the proposed parking restrictions for Trumpington Meadows.

There is already too little parking in Trumpington Meadows for residents, and to add in new restrictions will make even more difficult for families with more than one car, or residents living in house shares. Walking around the development, you see that the on road parking spaces are being used consistently by the same cars - residents with no-where else to keep their cars! It would be lovely if households could manage with just one car, but in reality it is just not possible for most families. A lot of the houses on the development are aimed at families and I really do think these restrictions will put off future potential buyers.

My other objection, aside from effectively removing much needed spaces for residents, is that given that there will be so few spaces available to visitors according to your proposal, it seems like residents who buy the visitor permits will be wasting their money - there will be no guarantee that a space will be available for a car with a visitor permit. Residents who live at the back end of the development (Otter Close, Charger Road etc) are at a distinct disadvantage to those living on, say, Spring Drive who have visitor spaces on their road - would residents who live on streets without visitor spaces get permits at a reduced rate?

I'm afraid it all feels a bit like a money making scheme - addressing a problem that doesn't really exist. There *is* a problem with parking in the Meadows, but not the one you are addressing in your proposal. You seem to think that life in Trumpington Meadows is akin to living in a city centre - it certainly is not. The bus services are not as good as you would like us to believe they are, we have lost the number 7 and number 26 from Trumpington already, and getting to town in the evening is particularly difficult without a car.

I ask that you please reconsider (read scrap!) your plans to bring in visitor permits, it penalises both residents and their visitors.

The proposed scheme will encourage those who currently hog visitors spaces or park illegally on-road, to invade privately owned spaces, of which there are many that already suffer from illegal parking. What do you suggest owners do to counter this without causing civil unrest?

Firstly, Proctor Drive (odds) is marked incorrectly on the map as Avalon Way.  
Secondly, what restrictions will be in place on the roads after 6 p.m. Our garage fronts onto Proctor Drive and we have had occasions where people park on the road blocking access to the garage.

Having received a copy of the public notice regarding proposed parking controls in the Trumpington Meadows development in Cambridge, I wish to object to these proposals.

Firstly I do not accept that the reason the council has given for the controls – safety – is substantiated by evidence. I live on Consort Avenue and in my opinion the visitor bays do not pose any safety risk at all, being safely situated in bays clear of the roadway. Regardless, I also do not accept that imposing a charge for the use of these bays would in any way affect the safety of the situation.

Secondly I believe that these proposals would have a significant negative impact on many residents; a number of the properties only have provision for one parking space, which means families who need more than one car rely on the visitor parking spaces. Similarly, family and friends visiting at weekends would also be subject to the same excessive charge.

I strongly favour keeping the status quo with which I have not seen any problems, or if absolutely necessary then a scheme where all residents were given a free and unlimited visitor parking permit. I am unclear why the council is focusing on this development in particular when there are far worse parking and traffic issues to be solved elsewhere in the city.

I hope that you will reconsider the need to implement such controls.

Hereby I am sending you my objection email to the proposal of on street parking.  
I hope for you support in stopping stripping us down from the right to have visitors over and taking even more money from all residents at TM.

Reference: PR0393

Dear Graham,

I am writing to object to the extremely poorly advertised proposal for waiting restrictions and street parking places at Trumpington Meadows leaving little doubt that this is an attempt to introduce a method of collecting parking charges and fines by stealth with little or no consultation with most residents.

As a resident I have concerns with the existing parking arrangements already being restrictive. The proposal seems particularly unfair considering other places more central in Cambridge have unrestricted parking while such stringent restrictions are being proposed for what is largely a residential area.

We frequently have visitors during the week and weekends often staying over for several days, the proposal would make this difficult to impossible. We sincerely hope that these proposals are not introduced as we have no doubt that they will make what is already a difficult parking situation worse.

I am writing regarding the parking restrictions in Trumpington Meadows. I strongly oppose the proposal and sincerely request that this does not go ahead.

This is a very large residential estate. There is a huge shortage of visitor parking spaces throughout the estate. In such a situation, enforcing this parking restrictions will be very unfair.

Imposing restrictions 7 days a week is very unfair. There are plenty of roads in Cambridge which are far more central in location and near the city centre (e.g. Holbrook Road) which have ample off-street parking spaces. It is very unfair that you propose to impose such restrictions at a large residential estate which is located on the edge of Cambridge and where there is already a huge shortage for visitor parking spaces.

Furthermore, the proposed fare for the visitor parking spaces is extremely expensive. Allocating only limited number of passes to the residents is going to make everyone's life difficult.

We have regular guests over the weekends. Whilst there is ample free parking (for the entire day) available in the central Cambridge over the weekends, we feel extremely hard-done-by to have a proposal where no free parking is available on the weekend.

In summary, I strongly oppose this proposal and sincerely request that this is not imposed at all.

This is regarding the Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places Order at Trumpington Meadows. We as residents of x Proctor Drive, Trumpington Meadows, Cambridge, object to the proposal on the grounds that at time of purchase of the aforementioned property the developer stated that all property owners would have use of the parking bays for visitors. Free of charge for all visitors, which is the opposite of what is being proposed. The proposal therefore would be in breach of the original verbal agreement between vendor and purchaser.

**Recommendation**

All parking bays that have been outlined in the development, which have not been specifically allocated to properties, be marked as available for visitors free of charge, with a maximum stay duration of say 6 hours and no return within 2 hours.

Secondly, no on-Street parking 8am-6pm Monday to Friday applicable on all roads, except the visitors spaces.

We wish to object to the proposal: Waiting restrictions and street parking places Order 2017(amendment No 1) order 20\$\$

1. The map provided by you has errors in some of the street names
2. The number of visitor car parking spaces provided is totally

inadequate for the number of dwellings on the site.

3. There are no visitor car parking spaces to the west of Osprey Drive and One Tree Road (according to your map). Is this a mistake?

4. At the moment visitor car parking spaces are not clearly identified as such, and are currently used by residents because the provision of parking for residents is inadequate.

5. Since the re-routing of the Citi 7 bus service, there is no public transport between central Trumpington and the city centre after 19:30h which means cars need to be used.

6. Getting to the railway station or visiting the hospital on a Sunday is difficult as there is no bus connection between central Trumpington, the station and the hospital site. This will not be improved by the proposed new circular bus service which will also not operate on a Sunday or after 7pm.

7. There will be no parking controls in operation between 6pm and 8am. Does this mean that visitors/residents can park anywhere between these hours? Is this your intention?

8. Trades people must be allowed to un load and park at the premises. Unless safe car parking is provided, Cambridge tradesmen are reluctant to carry out work on the site.

9. The fees for the parking permits are too high. If a resident needs regular medical/care visits (maybe twice a day) it would seem this is not provided for in possible free permits. Also visitors bays might be a considerable distance from the premises and bulky equipment might have to be carried some distance.

10. No waiting is unworkable. What about unloading wheel chairs, children, shopping, frail elderly persons, waiting taxis?

11. There would be opportunities on the site to create more on-street car parking spaces. By not providing adequate car parking this is already an un welcoming site.

12. If there were excellent public transport services the need for a car/second car could be reduced.

I have recently received a notice regarding the proposed changes to off-street parking around my home in Trumpington Meadows. I am very disappointed that the proposed visitor parking system seems to show little regard for the parking issues around the area as well as the local residents.

The following are points of concern I would like to raise, explained in further detail below:

- Money making scheme.
- Not targeting the problems I see.
- High costs for visitor parking, equivalent to £3 per day.
- Visitor parking calculated on a daily basis, rather than a 24 hours period from arrival.



- Disregard of local, Cambridge City council tax paying residents.
- Lack of consideration of issues causing this, i.e. traffic issues in central Cambridge, limited central parking, high costs of Park + Ride system and limited travel alternatives.
- Quick turnaround time, seemingly trying to force through changes.

In my opinion, the order looks to be targeting commuters parking in the Trumpington Meadows area to avoid paying high costs of parking in other City areas. This, from what I have seen, is not a large issue in this area.

As it stands, I believe this system's design incorporates money generation as the primary implication factor (whether through penalty notices or the purchase of visitor passes), while masquerading itself as a way to keep streets free of parked cars.

Similar systems exist in busy streets in central Cambridge, however this is a surrounding village where parking demands are not the same. The main issue I see is actually that of residents, whether through owning multiple vehicles or sheer laziness, using the visitor bays as their additional parking zones. Additionally, this Cambridge based on-street parking is usually allowed for permit holding local residents.

Considering the vicinity of Trumpington Park + Ride to Central Cambridge and Addenbrooke's Hospital, returning the Park + Ride back to free parking might well reduce these other pressures, rather than targeting the local residents who actually call Trumpington Meadows their home. This is easily highlighted by the lack of an offer of a limited number of free visitor parking (for example, the equivalent to a weekend a month).

Whilst I believe the costs of the Park + Ride are ridiculously high (£10 for 18-24hrs, £20 for 24-48hrs and £30 for 48-72hrs!), I still believe that for £1 for up to 18hrs parking, local residents may well choose to park in the Park + Ride during the 8am-6pm active times, limiting the space for people who actually want to catch a bus from this location instead of driving into Cambridge, where parking is even more expensive and limited.

Other cities run a visitor parking scheme over a 24 hour period (for example Oxford) allowing people who visit and stay in an area overnight not to be penalised.

Finally, I believe the limited time to oppose this motion clearly shows that the parking order is trying to be shoehorned in, preventing residents objecting the changes.

I hope to hear back regarding these concerns, however if the same level of disregard shown by this order to the local residents is replicated, I won't hold my breath.

We wish to object to the proposed parking controls for Trumpington Meadows ("TM") as follows:-

- 1) The advertisement of the proposals has been sporadic, patchy in circulation and very limited and therefore consultation of members of the public who are most likely to be affected (ie. Residents of TM) has been insufficient. Moreover, the deadline within which members of the public have been expected to reply is far too short and inadequate notice has been given in particular to local TM residents.
- 2) The reasons given by the Council for the proposed parking controls are generic and lacking in detail. In no way has the Council taken the time to fully explain why it believes parking controls are justified for TM specifically and how such parking controls will benefit local residents in particular. The current reasons given are wholly inadequate.
- 3) In addition, the fact that the roads concerned will in due course be 'adopted' is insufficient in itself

to justify the imposition of parking controls. There are many roads much closer to the centre of Cambridge which are adopted and do not have any parking controls. Therefore there is an obligation on the Council to properly outline **in detail** – and in a tailored fashion, bespoke to TM – its justification for imposing the proposed parking controls in the TM area.

- 4) The attached map upon which the Council is relying is incomplete and flawed, with erroneous road markings. Therefore the Council's decision will be based on wholly unreliable evidence. Consequently, any decision to impose the current proposed parking controls will be illegal and in breach of public law principles.
- 5) The current public notice fails to clearly set out the extent and details of the proposals.
- 6) The map and information provided by the Council thus far also fails to indicate which are visitor bays versus other non-visitor bays (such as resident bays) since the map fails to identify and label all parking bays on the development and therefore the future status of all parking bays on the development remains unclear.
- 7) If the Council's reason for imposing the parking controls is to ensure sufficient visitor bays are available to TM residents, then that in itself does NOT justify the imposition of paid visitor parking permits. The Council could achieve this aim by allowing residents a certain number of annual visitor parking permits (ie. the 100 currently proposed) for free. In particular, for those families of low means living in flats or 2-3 bed houses with limited residents' parking, and for those residents who are elderly and living on limited pensions, the proposed cost of the visitor permits is prohibitive and unfair.
- 8) Any parking controls should extend from 9am to 5pm Mon to Fri ('office hours') at the most. These hours and days would be sufficient to discourage members of the public from parking in TM in an effort to avoid the parking costs at Trumpington Park & Ride when trying to reach their workplace in the centre of Cambridge.
- 9) It will be detrimental to the family life of residents on TM if any parking controls are in place on Saturday, Sundays and holidays. Visitors of residents are more likely to visit at these times and residents may also need to park their own car on the development (if they do not have sufficient residents' parking available to them) on Saturday, Sundays and holidays. The Council should not treat TM as though it were another road in the centre of town, close to the tourist trail. TM is a residential area, several miles outside of the centre of Cambridge, and thus residents and their visitors should be free to park near to their own home without sanction, cost and limitation.
- 10) However, even these more limited 'office' hours of 9am to 5pm Mon to Fri will adversely affect those TM residents who may have bought or rented a house/flat on the development that comes with only 1 parking space BUT who actually require 2 cars as a family in order to get to their respective jobs – including especially shift work (nurses, paramedics, security staff, police, fire personnel, cleaners, taxi drivers etc) - outside of the immediate centre of Cambridge and/or at times that buses do not run and who therefore cannot rely on the bus infrastructure or cycling to get to their workplace. Consequently those local TM residents who undertake shift work will be unable to park their own car in the development during usual office hours when they may actually need to leave their car near their home in order to sleep during the day before the next night shift. In this circumstance the parking controls would be an unfair sanction and a burdensome imposition upon residents of low means.

It is clear that residents of TM do not wish to suffer from a displacement effect, whereby members of the public take up valuable TM visitor parking bays as a way to avoid the Park & Ride charges. Therefore, restrictions on parking on TM to ensure residents and visitors have priority is a reasonable aim.

However, at the current time, the Council's proposed parking controls as they stand are punitive, unfair and verging on Wednesbury unreasonable. They are certainly in breach of the requirements of proportionality since the Council has clearly failed to balance the general interests of the TM community with its legitimate aims as a public body and is currently seeking to impose controls which place an unfair and costly burden upon local residents, many of whom may suffer great hardship and a detrimental impact upon their family life as a result.

The proposed parking controls – as currently drafted – have not been thought out and are not a suitable measure suitable for achieving the Council's stated aims. There are less intrusive and burdensome means of achieving the same aims. Consequently, the ends do NOT justify the (currently proposed) means.

The Council would be better placed employing a free visitor/resident parking scheme, whereby residents can apply for free visitor/resident parking permits, thereby preventing members of the public from parking on the development rather than in the Park & Ride.

Similarly, if the Council is concerned about visitor bays on TM being taken by people from off the development (such as those who would otherwise be Park & Ride users), the cost of the Park & Ride

should be reconsidered and reduced or cancelled entirely, to encourage people to use it as opposed to trying to avoid it.

Moreover, where the Park & Ride is starting to fill up to the point of full capacity, the Council has a duty to provide more free out of town parking, rather than starting to limit resident/visitor parking on a residential development and then impose unfair costs upon those residents.

In conclusion, the Council has a duty to extend the consultation period, more widely advertise and set out in detail its proposals to residents of TM and, importantly, reconsider entirely the scheme as currently proposed. The Council has wholeheartedly failed to outline its reasons or the details of the scheme, provide inaccurate evidence upon which it is basing its decision and the current proposals are unfair and burdensome to those TM residents which the Council has suggested it is seeking to protect by its stated aim of wishing to "ensure that parking spaces are available for visitors" of TM.

Therefore, the Council needs to cancel its current proposals and start afresh, with better input from residents, to ensure that residents and their visits are protected and given priority rather than punished unfairly.

Graham Hughes/Gary Baldwin,

Please find attached my objections together with grounds (and additional comments) in line with the Public Notice (as amended).

In summary:

PR0393 appears to address a problem that is not defined, and arguably doesn't exist.

Parking problems (due to shoppers and commuters) do exist in Cambridge City centre, where we have 14 residents parking zones.

No such parking issues are apparent anywhere in Trumpington, old or new.

PR0393 simultaneously contravenes Highway and Community Infrastructure Committee 14 March 2017: Section 10.6 on New developments, the Highway Code 243, and the Design Code for Trumpington Meadows re car parking.

If anything in it is unclear, or the attachment will not open, please drop me a note.

I should be grateful for any comments, or if I have made any errors here.

I am a resident of Trumpington Meadows. I have been notified of the proposed Order for parking controls by the Lib Dems, though I cannot ascertain their opinions on the matter from their web site. However, it has afforded me the chance to consider the draft order.

I am pleased that rules will be introduced. However, I am concerned that the controls do not go far enough. I believe the roads should be retained as freeways with no parking at any time.

On a practical note, I have a flat and one parking space and I pay for visitors to park in the Park and Ride car park, which is invariably outside of normal working hours and so there is plenty of room. That works conveniently, especially using their online parking facility, and only costs £1.

It was made clear from the outset that the apartments and houses were only designed for one car. That should work perfectly fine. The last thing we want are the roads cluttered with cars - the councils planning guide lines have (to my knowledge) had this as a principle for a long time. As a result, the likes of Spring Drive where I live, are not designed for on street parking - that is evident by its width. It is vital that easy access is afforded for emergency vehicles, bin lorries and deliveries.

This road also often has children of all ages playing in it. When I drive in currently, I can see them and they can see me; I've not felt any danger of an accident. If they are playing and hidden by parked cars, there is an inevitably greater danger of an accident.

Whatever rules you decide upon, and I do hope freeways prevail, please do make sure they are applied.

I am a resident in Trumpington Meadows in Cambridge since 2014 and I am writing to you to appeal against proposal of restrictions in parking in our area ( reference number PR0393). After reading a public notice on the lamp post I was very much disturbed that residents parking was not mentioned at all.

I am one of these unfortunate residents who has got only one allocated parking space and our household has got two cars. Both me and my husband are using cars for work and there is no possibility of us coping without it. We do have equipment and heavy tools in cars, impossible to carry. We do pay council tax and want to be able to park close to our house but looks like the proposal is excluding this possibility.

We are not the only family in this situation, just next to our house are at least 5 households like this. And in whole estate probably hundreds .

What is the solution to this situation? It is very important to us.

Concerning the visitor parking permits I also feel that it's unnecessary as during the day time there is plenty of parking space and it is only going to be another problem to have to pay to have people visiting us.

Trumpington Meadows is a closed estate and people who don't have reason to visit do not park here except few who want to avoid Park and Ride payments .

Real problem is that developer didn't supply enough parking for residents and with restrictions from Cambridge County Council it is only going to be worse for us living here.

Me and my husband want to appeal against proposed restrictions as we do not see any benefits for residents and are really worrying about our personal situation with parking.

I would be very grateful if you could answer my question and let me know what is the solution to this situation.

Ref Trumpington Meadows Parking suggestions.

I would like to protest in the strongest terms that I see no reason whatsoever for any change to the parking in Trumpington Meadows. I have lived in One Tree Road for 3 years and there are no issues that need addressing. Certainly none of the issues that you have highlighted in your directive. The available parking is just fine and should be left to the people who live in Trumpington Meadows. This is a situation where the county council need not concern itself. There is no problem to solve. Just leave it alone.

If you want to raise more income from constituents just be honest and increase the council tax. Just do not do it in such an underhand way which leaves people losing trust in the council and the service it aims to provide. We can then judge you at the ballot box. Just leave it alone. The council does not need to be involved.

I feel strongly about this.

I am writing to object in the strongest possible manner to the proposed parking controls in Trumpington

meadows.

The reasons you state on the website are: " The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to **facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users**. The waiting restrictions are intended to **manage non-resident parking in the area and ensure that parking spaces are available for visitors.**"

Having lived in Trumpington Meadows for three years I can only assume you have never been here. We are nowhere near the centre of town, and are in an area where nobody except residents and their visitors would ever want to park, there is a perfectly good Park and Ride and Waitrose car park nearby. There is absolutely no issue with cars from outside the estate parking here, and there is absolutely no issue with the movement of traffic in the area.

**In my opinion the reason you should be quoting is the unashamed desire to raise money through parking. There can be no other reason for wishing to introduce these measures.** There is a saying "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." The current parking system is working fine. Today I went past the visitor parking in one tree road and all the spaces were empty!

Introducing the plans you have listed "no waiting between 8am and 6pm" will have the adverse effect to the one intended. It will encourage people to park on the road at night thereby causing potential issues of accessing garages etc and genuinely affecting the movement of traffic and safety of road users..

Please please leave things as they are, they are not broken. We all pay council taxes and should not be viewed as constant sources of extra cash. If we lived in a busy terraced street near shops, schools and offices with limited or no parking spaces, this would make complete sense, but charging £15 for up to 5 visitor ie £3 per visitor (who might only be here for half an hour) in an area like this is totally obscene, unnecessary and downright offensive.

We would like the following points to be taken into account in response to Council's consultation on proposed parking controls at Trumpington Meadows (ref; PRO393)

We are in favour of the introduction of visitor permits if this will restore the visitor bays to the use for which they were intended and discourage residents from parking in them rather than in the allocated resident spaces.

We would urge the Council to give serious consideration to the extension of the parking prohibition to 24 hours a day in Consort Avenue, which is a busy main spine road. Prior to the introduction of the current controlled parking arrangements there was a real safety issue caused by a few residents parking regularly in Consort Avenue, particularly on the bend approaching the traffic lights at the junction with Hauxton Road. This obscured drivers' views of pedestrians crossing the road and created a bottleneck for people coming to and from the junction.

The 2014 Google Streetview image below shows that bend in Consort Avenue, between Spring Drive and Forty Acre Road.

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.1702373,0.1097402,3a,28.5y,135.78h,81.49t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1s6rQNntKSbX2hCN87HRwbrA!2e0!7i13312!8i6656>

It seems to be irregular for parking restrictions administered by the County Council to be applied to land still owned by the developers. The area of Trumpington Meadows in which we live has plenty of space for cars and most visitors during working hours can find spaces vacated by the working population. We welcome the absence of restrictions between the hours of 18.00 and 8.00 and this implies that some of the many areas that are safe for cars to park can be used if there are several visitors during those hours. Is this time to be policed by the existing parking company - who have ticketed us at 4.30 am in the past? We think that such parking changes should wait until the Council adopts this area and can apply yellow lines where parking would be dangerous and this could be policed by Council employed wardens.

Thank you for your reassurance that the road outside of 20 Avalon Way will not be subject to the restrictions detailed.

Please find attached a plan that details the land that I own and the road area that the residents own in the corner of Trumpington Meadows. You will see that the blue checked road area on Avalon Way and Bead Way is owned by the residents whilst the orange marked road is owned by the Trumpington Meadows Corporation.

This is all within the land registry and confirmed in my house purchase contracts.

Please confirm that you will not be applying your regulations to a part of the road that I own.

Please find attached the warning about future parking restrictions you are proposing to the roads in the vicinity of my house on the Trumpington Meadows development.

I note that you include Avalon Way in your proposal. For clarity, parts of Avalon Way and the adjoining road are privately owned. The stretch that I live on (20 Avalon Way) is owned by the residents and the area outside number 20 by myself. This is detailed on all the deeds.

As a result, you have no rights to impose this enforcement restriction on this particular area of the development.

If you could clarify your understanding at the earliest opportunity, it would be appreciated.



I'm writing to complain about how i found out about Parking Permits in Trumpington, Cambridge, First off you didn't post enough letters as i didn't get one and i live down Spring Drive which says it's on the list for the parking permits, Why? i have lived here for 5 years and if something like this was happening i want to know, I don't read the news paper or ever online, i found you posted there when i made a call to my local Councillor, It wasn't good enough, And why is the cost so MUCH!!!! i spoke with the council and was told when they do these there £50 for the year so why is our £15 a month, I cannot afford that as my husband is the only one working right now, You really need to re think this and talk to more people like those on benefits to see what we (they) can afford. Then there's the part about how many visits you can have, I have my mum come baby sit 2 times a week from what i can see she would go over the limit set. Please don't do this or at least think about how to make it better for those on a low income.

I'm writing to voice my objection to and concerns over the proposed parking controls for Trumpington Meadows (PR0393).

I have two main concerns over the proposal. Firstly, the statement of reasons is very poorly justified. As a resident of over three and a half years, I have seen little or no evidence of a heavy burden on parking spaces from non-residents that requires this kind of regulation. The Park and Ride and Waitrose car parks are sufficiently large, and sufficiently far away to make parking in the Trumpington Meadows bays a considerable inconvenience for non-residents. Furthermore, I haven't once been aware of a problem with traffic on the estate, as it is no higher than expected, and flows freely at all times.

Secondly, the proposal essentially penalises residents financially for i) having friends and relatives come and visit, and ii) the supposed anti-social actions of non-residents. It is entirely unclear to me why such charges should be levied on innocent residents.

The proposals are unjust and unnecessary, and the patchy and illogical manner in which they have been disseminated (under random car windscreen wipers on a rainy day!?) is shameful and suspicious.

This is regarding the proposals to introduce parking permits and controls in the Trumpington Meadows area (PR0393).

While I appreciate the intention of keeping parking spaces clear for visitors, I am concerned about the steep price that you propose for visitor parking permits, as well as the way to obtain them.

The proposed price of 15 GBP for a visitor permit for up to 5 days seems very high, especially when compared with other areas outside the Cambridge city center. For example, Cambridge West areas seem to offer visitor permits for only 8 GBP, almost half the price!

I often receive short-notice visitors, so would appreciate a way for me to apply for, pay and print (!) a visitor permit at home at short notice and with little delay. I understand that it will be possible to apply for a visitor permit online but shipping of the permit takes 5 working days?

Furthermore, I would like to ask for clarifications on how you propose to prevent unauthorized parking in residential ways and parking lots, which are often not labeled as residents-only parking at the moment. For example, visitors often park in our shared residential parking area off Huntsman Road. By introducing parking controls on public roads, the risk of visitors abusing these areas increases further.

I object to the proposed parking scheme **Proposed TRO (Reference Number PR0393)** for Trumpington meadows. Banner road is spelt incorrectly as 'Barner' on the plans, and a existing residents parking bays are missing, along with various other mistakes. We have received no information about the proposed plan and have only seen an A4 paper with incorrect information on a lamppost on another road (not our own) in a very unobvious place.

The proposed controls don't achieve the statement of reasons given for the scheme 'to stop non – resident parking'. Instead it stops residents and their visitors parking (unless they are willing to pay for visitor permits which are limited in number and are a high cost to buy)

- Residents and their visitors will be forced to move their cars from the roads/bays at 8am (adding to existing busy traffic at peak time on Hauxton road and finding alternative local roads to park in causing congestion, or parking in the park and ride which is already full most days, causing people who want to use the park and ride to drive into the city instead. In turn leaving perfectly good parking bays in Trumpington meadows empty and unable to be used because of restrictions. Unnecessary queuing to leave the estate, car journeys adding to local traffic and pollution, and endangering school children at a time they may be walking or cycling to school.

- The recent announcement of ending £1 parking charge at p&r sites means non residents have no reason to use Trumpington meadows for parking, so such controls are unnecessary.

- Trumpington meadows residents who chose to cycle or walk or use a bus to get to work are stopped from leaving their cars at home. (by leaving our two cars on our driveway, my retired pensioner mother will not be able to receive any visitors during the day (when bays are readily available for them to use considerably) unless she pays for a permit for them (and then can only have visitors 100 days a year at a great financial cost)

- How are Trumpington meadows residents meant to receive genuine weekend visits from family/friends when they can't leave their car in a visitor bay over the weekend, or during the day for a weekday visit?

- The only apparent reason for this kind of scheme is the council making money from visitor permits and penalty charges for people not abiding by the rules, not local residents whose lives will be made very difficult by following these rules.

- Comparable new housing areas such as Orchard park have no such controls, and residents use the streets and bays to park considerably. Allowing visitors to visit at any time of day. Trumpington Meadows, like Orchard park, is not near the city centre or any built up area or amenity that would attract non resident parking.

Residents are in the habit of using the visitor bays considerably, keeping the roads clear and safe for their own benefit. Allowing sensible on road parking (in line with traffic law) and unlimited use of the bays for residents, either by having no restrictions at all, or by issuing permits for free to Trumpington meadows residents for use 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This would be a more appropriate action to achieve the goals set out in the the statement of reasons of the scheme.

The main core road (Consort Avenue) should have no stopping at any time restrictions applied on the entrance from Hauxton road around its first bend as it is a major route and allowing any on road parking here would make seeing oncoming traffic difficult. However, all side roads and cul – de sacs do not require such strict controls, the proposed 8am – 6pm limit would not benefit anybody who lives at Trumpington Meadows.

I hope the consultation period for this scheme is extended, mistakes in the plans are corrected and information is sent to all residents to gather their views before coming up with a new proposal in line with what local residents want.

I have read the proposed parking restriction plans for Trumpington Meadows (PR0393) and am unclear as to what the difference is between the green and red zones.

The green zones are labelled restricted parking zone with no waiting 8am-6pm except in permit holder bays. There does exist some parking bays in the green zones - so how is this different from the red marked bays on the map? Does this mean one can temporarily park without a permit in a bay in the green zone?

I am confused by your sentence which states 'Unfortunately there is no scope to vary what has been agreed'. It calls into question the whole present process in which you have asked residents for their feed back.

At present there are notices which prohibit parking on all streets and this applies to the stretch of Old Mills Road to which I refer. If those notices are removed and your plans, as they stand, are introduced, it is going to be a free for all, and I can see the street becoming an extension of the Waitrose car park and children's lives being put at risk.

I imagine people whose houses front onto the country park will have all the dog walkers parking outside their homes at the weekends, instead of using the Byron Pool car park, which is further to drive.

I would invite you to come to Trumpington Meadows and accompany me on a walk around the streets, rather than just working from a map and you will see the problems that your proposed plans are going to cause.

The part of Old Mills Road for which I am suggesting double yellow lines actually goes off this map excerpt, where Old Mills Road goes East to West towards Proctor Drive. It is the short stretch of road from the end of Banner Road/Waitrose back pathway, away from Waitrose and along to the bollards adjoining Anstey Leap children's play park.

I hope that this clarifies the request.

Ref PR0393

I am writing with regard to the regulations which are being planned for introduction in the near future at Trumpington Meadows, your reference quoted above.

I would like to suggest that Old Mills Road between the Waitrose entrance footpath, opposite to the end of Banner Road, and the bollards adjacent to Anstey Leap should be designated a No Waiting On Road at all times. It is an extremely busy thoroughfare, especially at the weekends, for people on foot and bicycles, coming from the main part of the estate through to the back entrance of Waitrose in order to shop. Many of the pedestrians are pushing buggies and are accompanied by small children on scooters or running on ahead. Given that there are no pavements, parked vehicles would make the road narrower than it already is and quite hazardous. There are very few cars which need to come down this short stretch of road other than the residents who need to access their garages and there is a visitor's parking bay at the junction of Banner Road and Old Mills Road, should extra parking be needed.

Dear Gary,

Please find attached a plan that details the land that I own and the road area that the residents own in the corner of Trumpington Meadows. You will see that the blue checked road area on Avalon Way and Bead Way is owned by the residents whilst the orange marked road is owned by the Trumpington Meadows Corporation.

This is all within the land registry and confirmed in my house purchase contracts.

Please confirm that you will not be applying your regulations to a part of the road that I own.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached the warning about future parking restrictions you are proposing to the roads in the vicinity of my house on the Trumpington Meadows development.

I note that you include Avalon Way in your proposal. For clarity, parts of Avalon Way and the adjoining road are privately owned. The stretch that I live on (xx Avalon Way) is owned by the residents and the area outside number xx by myself. This is detailed on all the deeds.

As a result, you have no rights to impose this enforcement restriction on this particular area of the development.

If you could clarify your understanding at the earliest opportunity, it would be appreciated.

Dear Gary,

I understand that the roads in general on the Trumpington Meadows are owned by the estate and by definition remain private. The Trumpington Meadows owner therefore has the rights to pass on this jurisdiction on those roads, but they do not own the road outside my house.

For this reason, this part of Avalon Way (outside number xx) cannot be passed to anyone without my consent. I am not sure how you can assume right to a road that you do not own.

Please confirm you will not be applying these restrictions to a part of the road that I own and by

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached the warning about future parking restrictions you are proposing to the roads in the vicinity of my house on the Trumpington Meadows development.

I note that you include Avalon Way in your proposal. For clarity, parts of Avalon Way and the adjoining road are privately owned. The stretch that I live on (xx Avalon Way) is owned by the residents and the area outside number xx by myself. This is detailed on all the deeds.

As a result, you have no rights to impose this enforcement restriction on this particular area of the development.

If you could clarify your understanding at the earliest opportunity, it would be appreciated.

Hi Gary,

The part of Old Mills Road for which I am suggesting double yellow lines actually goes off this map excerpt, where Old Mills Road goes East to West towards Proctor Drive. It is the short stretch of road from the end of Banner Road/Waitrose back pathway, away from Waitrose and along to the bollards adjoining Anstey Leap children's play park.  
I hope that this clarifies the request.

Dear Sir

Ref PR0393

I am writing with regard to the regulations which are being planned for introduction in the near future at Trumpington Meadows, your reference quoted above.

I would like to suggest that Old Mills Road between the Waitrose entrance footpath, opposite to the end of Banner Road, and the bollards adjacent to Anstey Leap should be designated a No Waiting On Road at all times. It is an extremely busy thoroughfare, especially at the weekends, for people on foot and bicycles, coming from the main part of the estate through to the back entrance of Waitrose in order to shop. Many of the pedestrians are pushing buggies and are accompanied by small children on scooters or running on ahead. Given that there are no pavements, parked vehicles would make the road narrower than it already is and quite hazardous. There are very few cars which need to come down this short stretch of road other than the residents who need to access their garages and there is a visitor's parking bay at the junction of Banner Road and Old Mills Road, should extra parking be needed.

I'm a resident living on Charger Road CB2 9EA in Trumpington Meadows.

I refer to the PR0393 public notice regarding to the introduction of parking restrictions on a number of roads in Trumpington Meadows.

We are a household with two cars, simply because two working professionals need to commute to different sites around Cambridge and car sharing will not possibly work. Given that there is only one allocated parking space for the house, one of us is parking in one of the visitor's bays. For this new rules to be applied, will there be a resident parking permit issued given our situation? If not can you explain what will be the solution for households like us? I don't think applying visitor's permit will be either suitable or fair to us.

We require some assistance, as the leader of the Trumpington residence committee, has emailed me to express concerns over the consultation role out relating to the changes to the parking policy for Trumpington Meadows.

At their recent residents meeting which was attend by 39 households, there seems to be grave inconsistency into which households have been consulted with relating to this change of policy. The senior resident xxxxx is indicating that the officer from the council responsible for the change was not present at the meeting.

Somehow Barratt homes seem to be getting barraged with negative communication from existing residents on their grave concerns not being listened to that there will be no parking control between the hours of 6pm-8am. Somebody returning from work at 7pm of an evening could have access issues due to antisocial parking.

Could we please have a full update on what consultation steps have been taken to date, so that we can forward this onto xxxxx to ensure that these residents meeting that were hugely supported by the local authority for the first 4 years continue to provide an open forum for residents to have access to enter into dialogue with the local authority.





I am writing with regard to the regulations which are being planned for introduction in the near future at Trumpington Meadows, your reference quoted above.

I would like to suggest that Old Mills Road between the Waitrose entrance footpath, opposite to the end of Banner Road, and the bollards adjacent to Anstey Leap should be designated a No Waiting On Road at all times. It is an extremely busy thoroughfare, especially at the weekends, for people on foot and bicycles, coming from the main part of the estate through to the back entrance of Waitrose in order to shop. Many of the pedestrians are pushing buggies and are accompanied by small children on scooters or running on ahead. Given that there are no pavements, parked vehicles would make the road narrower than it already is and quite hazardous. There are very few cars which need to come down this short stretch of road other than the residents who need to access their garages and there is a visitor's parking bay at the junction of Banner Road and Old Mills Road, should extra parking be needed.

Dear Gary,

Thank you for your reply and the copy of the parking charge plan. Obviously there was a misunderstanding or a mistake about the plan at the Trumpington Community meeting. I am relieved and glad that the area where the building of my flat (xxx Osprey Drive) belongs is not affected by the plan; although I do believe thorough open consultation with the public is the best way forward, if we want to make any policy to proceed successfully.

Thank you again for your time and effort to explain to me about the plan.

I am a resident of Trumpington Meadows and I am writing to ask the Council to postpone a new plan for on street parking charge at Trumpington Meadows until all residents are well informed.

I bought my home at Trumpington Meadows in August and moved in in September. When the contracts were exchanged, it was stated that two visitors' parking space in front of our building (plot 554-558) are shared by the residents who live in this building. However, during my first time to attend the Trumpington Meadows Community meeting on 27th November, I realised, also for the first time, that the Council has made a proposal for on street parking charge, where our two visitors' parking space were marked on the map of the Council's proposal. This is shocking and outrageous as (1) the area where our building is does not belong to Cambridge City Council and (2) we residents were not formally informed whatsoever at all; if I hadn't had been to the community meeting, I wouldn't have known it and (3) the roads and the green areas in Trumpington Meadows are privately owned and I pay annually for the management and maintenance for them all and thus I have the legal right to request what the on-street parking charge will be used in the future? Any income from such a charge - if it does go on to take place - should put in use within the Trumpington Meadows community.

I urge you to do door-to-door delivery of the public notice for the parking proposal and to do thorough consultation within the community, before starting any parking charge. I very much look forward to hearing from you.

I note that the Council proposes to enforce parking controls and I have a few questions:

1. When is this likely to occur?
  2. When is the Council likely to adopt the roads concerned?
  3. During the period between the two dates above, would I be correct in assuming that the road would be private property and therefore car owners could remove their number plates to avoid fines?
  4. Can you explain the rationale behind the exemptions suggested for blue badge holders? My reason for asking is that there is no reason why a disabled person would live near to a parking bay and all homes have allocated parking spaces near to their homes, so why would their disability mean they need extra spaces away from their homes?
- 4a. This exemption would also mean that any disabled person can use the bays regardless of

where they live or whether or not they are visiting a resident of the estate. Indeed they could leave a car parked in a bay, (paid for by the home owners) indefinitely. Is that reasonable?

4b. Is it not patronising to the disabled and unfair to the non-disabled that someone should get free parking because of a disability? I fail to see why disabled people should be given charity when they are capable of working and often receive benefits to cover the cost of their disability. The rationale behind this decision would be welcome.

I have just been made aware of the changes in parking regulations, via a Facebook group, on the Trumpington Meadows estate. I live on the Great Kneighton estate and I can only assume that this policy will spread to where I live. I believe these new enforced parking regulations are absolutely unfair and should be rethought.

There are many housing association residents in both estates, including myself, who will not be able to afford to pay £15 for visitors permits. This is absolutely ostracising the poorer residents and to me makes no sense as there is already adequate parking enforcement in the area. I regularly rely on friends and family coming over to look after my 9 month old while I complete my university course and this new enforcement will certainly impact my studies and finances.

A thread in the aforementioned Facebook group also pointed out that there are many "shared households" with members owning a car each, with up to 3 cars in each household, so they will surely be hit with fines regularly. The restriction of Addenbrookes road residents being unable to use the access road was limiting enough and I still believe that matter should also be rethought. The route over the guided busway is closed for cars meaning that addenbrookes road is the only exit and entrance of the estate, the closure of this and the restrictions of the access road have created further congestion, brought from the creating of the access road, for those who now must now exit Addenbrookes road towards the M11 as the only way of leaving the estate.

I implore you to reconsider these restrictions, and not to bring forward the Trumpington Meadows parking enforcement rules onto Great Kneighton. We, as residents, were generally content with the parking enforcements that were already put in place.

I am objecting to the parking regulations being brought in at Trumpington meadows .

I believe that not being able to park in the Lay by with out buying a ticket which is going to cost a visitor £15 is absolutely ridiculous. It's a huge amount of money for may be some one only staying a hour ! What about care staff . Visiting the elderly , health visitors , doctors, police will they all have to by a ticket ? Delivery drivers, tradesman.

Whom will be exempt ?

I have lived on his site for 5 years now and at present have never had a problem with parking , people park in the lay bys or in there garage or parking spot , people don't seem to park on the roads.

Could you explain to me where the revenue from the parking permits go? will they go back in to the community of Trumpington meadows if this is not deemed to be seen as a money making proposal .

There is a park and ride site which I'm sure people use will you be dropping the £1 charge for this soon ?

Why can residents not have one visitors permit free of charge for each house ?

Can blue badge holders park on any of the roads as obviously mobility is difficult and walking is a issue so will they be able to park any where not just in lay bys , as the Kerbs are high and they can be a issue for a wheelchair user?

Will you introduce all this scheme to the whole of Trumpington village if not why not because surely if Trumpington meadows is deemed as a car issue then the whole of Trumpington is !

Why have you not put leaflets through doors to make every one aware it seems underhand .

When I moved here 5 years ago I got told no on street parking . However nothing was mentioned about the lay bys for visitors only , it works well at the moment and parking isn't a issue !

Please could you answer my questions and make sure my objections are registered

I am objecting to the parking regulations being brought in at Trumpington meadows .

I believe that not being able to park in the Lay by with out buying a ticket which is going to cost a visitor £15 is absolutely ridiculous. It's a huge amount of money for may be some one only staying a hour ! What about care staff . Visiting the elderly , health visitors , doctors, police will they all have to by a ticket ? Delivery drivers, tradesman.

Whom will be exempt ?

I have lived on his site for 5 years now and at present have never had a problem with parking , people park in the lay bys or in there garage or parking spot , people don't seem to park on the roads.

Could you explain to me where the revenue from the parking permits go? will they go back in to the community of Trumpington meadows if this is not deemed to be seen as a money making proposal .

There is a park and ride site which I'm sure people use will you be dropping the £1 charge for this soon ?

Why can residents not have one visitors permit free of charge for each house ?

Can blue badge holders park on any of the roads as obviously mobility is difficult and walking is a issue so will they be able to park any where not just in lay bys , as the Kerbs are high and they can be a issue for a wheelchair user?

Will you introduce all this scheme to the whole of Trumpington village if not why not because surely if Trumpington maedows is deemed as a car issue then the whole of Trumpington is !

Why have you not put leaflets through doors to make every one aware it seems underhand .

When I moved here 5 years ago I got told no on street parking . However nothing was mentioned about the lay bys for visitors only , it works well at the moment and parking isn't a issue !

Please could you answer my questions and make sure my objections are registered

I write to you regarding the changes to the parking at Trumpington Meadows.

As a resident I do have some concerns at how this will effect the residents.

The small limit on how many permits a household can purchase is a concern. I really do not like the thought of being told how many visitors I am aloud to have per year. I can imagine if you had a few family get together you would soon run out of permits!

The high cost is also an issue and could leave some residents feeling isolated as they're not able to cover the cost and there for unable to have visitors. What happens when you need your boiler serviced, BT need to visit etc?

Another concern is how are you going to stop vehicles coming into residents car parks and parking in their bays? I'm worried that these permits will push more cars into our car parks and into other people's allocated bays. If someone parks in my only allocated bay I will then risk a fine parking on the street. This is not something I'm able to spend money on. We already pay a charge to maintain the car park.

Please give this some more thought and address the residents concerns before bring this into force.

The proposed changes to the parking regulation in the Trumpington Meadows development would cause no significant improvements to movement of traffic or non-resident parking issues, whilst also causing exceptional harm to a great number of residents living within the development.

Please take some time to review my reasoning for this statement and on behalf of every individual Trumpington Meadows resident I have yet to come across, please reconsider PR0393.

First lets review the very brief and unjustified Statement of Reasons for PR0393:

> The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users.

The movement of traffic is already unhindered in such a way that few areas in Cambridge equal. Throughout the day, hours can pass without a single vehicle entering or leaving the development via Consort Avenue. Requiring residents to pay to park outside their own homes will not enhance road safety - in fact, will likely even decrease safety due to a net increase in anger among drivers.

> The waiting restrictions are intended to manage non-resident parking in the area and ensure that parking spaces are available for visitors.

The small distance from residents doors that visitors may have to leave their vehicle due to lack of spaces may be a very slight inconvenience for some residents but this is simply not caused by non-resident parking; the number of vehicles parked throughout the daytime on weekdays is very low, anyone seeking to park during these hours is guaranteed as much space as they could require. During the evening and overnight, the same vehicles are seen every day because they are in fact residents themselves.

There are many large plots designed for large families throughout the Trumpington Meadows development, almost all of which one would expect to require multiple permanent parking spaces - often more than their garages can provide, hence the many shared parking bays. It can surprise no one that residents make use of the bays outside their own properties, the vast majority of vehicles consuming the available spaces at night are residents who have no other choice but to do so.

Now lets consider the effects that PR0393 would actually have on residents:

For the considerable number of families with more vehicles than their garage space can provide, the restriction of on-street parking to only paid permit holders inherently forces these residents to purchase said permits in order to continue living in their family home. Believing that residents will simply and suddenly reduce the number of vehicles in their household is absurd; people rely on their vehicles as I'm sure you do too.

The appalling "likely" cost of £15 per 5-day visitor permit means that larger families (who are by no means more wealthy than their neighbours) or HMO's with two more vehicles than their garages can support will be plainly forced to pay £600 just to park outside their own home for 3 months. It is not clear what the proposed solution is after these 100 "visit" days are used, it appears these residents will be forced to pay even further to rent garage spaces further into Cambridge centre at an extraordinary cost. Additionally, to avoid paying £3 daily to park after returning from work, the time restrictions force residents to leave their property at 8am and not return until 6pm; leaving just half an hour after or returning half an hour earlier than these limits means that a person would be forced to pay for an entire day to "visit" his or her own home.

The proposed changes of PR0393 are unjust; benefitting very few in a very insignificant way whilst causing considerable pain to many, especially larger families and the less affluent residents of HMO's.

In all sincerity, the moral imbalance of the whole proposal is disgraceful; suddenly imposing a beyond-significant fine on a huge number of residents to park outside their own homes is shocking - all in order to please the few who feel that their infrequent guests are inconvenienced.

I urge you to reconsider PR0393 and its negative effects on the residents of Trumpington Meadows. This proposed TRO simply should not progress.

Please consider the distress PR0393 could inflict on many Trumpington Meadows residents. Thank you for your time and understanding, I would be thankful if you could respond briefly confirming my plea has been understood.



To whom it may concern,

I am writing to outline my objections to the parking proposals planned for Trumpington Meadows (TM).

As a resident of TM for the last four years, I appreciate the need for a permit system to be introduced.

We have an allocated space in our garden, which we use, but many other residents do not use their allocated bays, meaning that there is often no space in the laybys for visitors.

However, charging £15 for a permit that allows only 5 visits, and restricting these to just 20 per year seems incredibly restrictive. To the point that this will prevent families like mine from being able to have visitors as often as we would like or need. We currently receive one visitor a week on a regular basis, add to this any service visits; extra visits due to my ill health (I have multiple sclerosis and as a result often have to call upon my parents to drive in from South Cambridgeshire to assist with childcare), friends visiting, a birthday party in the summer for our son, not to mention the extra visitors we will need when our second child is born in June 2018.

As you can see, these visits could easily average out at more than 2 visitors a week.

I see that there is the possibility of free permits for people with a medical need, my concern is as much for the frequency as it is for the cost. I need more than 2 visitors a week for emotional and practical support, but this is unquantifiable with such a varying medical condition, and it is not official medical visits that I can prove in any formal way are for medical reasons. Instead it is family visiting to take care of my child to allow me to rest, or attend medical appointments, or to take my children out to be active in a way I cannot offer them on many days. As I am sure anyone with children will appreciate, when you have a newborn, as we will next summer, you generally receive a lot more than 2 visitors a week!

Article 8 of the Human Rights Act deals with the rights of private life and family.

What is meant by family life?

You have the right to enjoy family relationships without interference from government. This includes the right to live with your family and, where this is not possible, the right to regular contact.

As my email has already demonstrated, these parking restrictions will severely impact mine and my children's rights to regular contact with our family.

As well as the concern with the very restrictive number of the allowed visitor permits, I am also concerned about the cost. As a disabled person, my partner works but often has to take time off if my health means he needs to take care of our son. We are not a well off family. An extra £15 - £30 a month is simply unaffordable to us, meaning that having family and friends visit becomes a luxury only afforded to those with money. Again surely this contravenes the right to a family life as previously mentioned? The human rights act applies to ALL people, not just to people with money.

As I said at the start of this email, I do recognise the need for permits. Firstly, I believe these permits should be cheaper, at £5 for 5 permits. There should also be the option to have more than 2 visitors a week, either by allowing more permits to be purchased, or by lifting the restrictions at weekends.

Secondly, I believe we should have free residents permits to display in cars parked in allocated residents bays, in order to prevent those who have allocated bays in residents car parks getting their bays used by those attempting to evade the visitor charges.

I would appreciate a response to this email, especially to clarify what the rules will be to getting extra permits for medical reasons. This issue is deeply concerning for me, as it has the potential to have a hugely negative impact on my daily life.

Here's my feedback.

1. The roads are currently privately owned and the developer's consultant provided the attached drawing showing the parking layout. There are several issues, such as this, that will need to be discussed with them at the end of the public notice period. In general, there would be no waiting 8am-6pm, with parking for visitor permit holders only during those times.

**All parking bays should be for visitor parking permit only, not just the ones marked on map the in red, including the parking bay outside our house on Bead Road and Avalon Way. The times should be increased between 8am and 10pm to prevent residents deeming it acceptable to own more cars than they have parking for, and using the parking bays for their own personal use, thus defeating the whole point of the visitor bays. Most residents tend to work during the day and are likely to want the visitors to see them in**

*the evening, so stopping the visitor bays at 6pm is ludicrous and encourages misuse of the bays.*

2. If the restrictions go ahead there would be no formal parking controls in operation from 6pm to 8am, so drivers could park on the roads and/or in the visitor spaces during those times.

*That's a ridiculous idea. For many of the roads particularly Avalon Way, Bead Road, Hereward Road etc **do not have pavements nor is there enough space to park cars outside houses** and have the road functioning as a road. **I've been unable to drive down Hereward Road for that very reason on a few occasions.** God help us if a fire truck needs to get through and cars are parked on the side of the road. One other consideration is that **there is no proper curb to the road** – cars can't even park in the allocated parking spaces properly (seriously, I had to get parking bollards installed in my garden to stop drivers parking all of over my garden!). It doesn't promote the green image or pedestrian friendly nature of the development if you let cars park all over the roads that weren't built to cater for on road parking. At the end of the day **all residents who purchased properties were informed about the parking restrictions.***

3. It is intended that the roads will be adopted by the Council as highway maintainable at public expense, which means that we need to introduce parking restrictions to the appropriate enforceable standard for public roads. This is what we are currently doing and, if implemented, the restrictions would be enforced by the Council's civil enforcement officers.

*The private parking company has been terrible at enforcing the parking restrictions since we've moved in and handing out tickets. Hopefully the council will be better – you could earn a fortune if you enforced it properly.*

Hello,

Please can you clarify the following points with regard to the proposed parking changes in Trumpington Meadows?

1. The parking bay outside our house (Bead Road parking space next to the Avalon Way junction) is not highlighted as a visitor bay. What parking restriction will cover this bay? Do you need a separate parking permit for this bay? (are there permits other than the visitor ones or will this space be unusable between the hours of 8am - 6pm). It is not clear.

2. Will cars now be able to park on the streets (but not in the visitor bays) outside of the proposed hours?

3. How will the parking controls be enforced?

Dear Mr Hughes,

I have received the Public Notice about the proposed parking restrictions on Trumpington meadows development, and have looked at the related documents online (detailed plan, etc.)

I have some concerns:

1) a generic concern: I am generally in favor of limiting and regulating car use, but interventions should be aimed at areas where cars are too many, or get in the way and prevent others from enjoying public spaces.

This tends to be the case in crowded areas with popular destinations, e.g. the city center in a city like Cambridge. It is less of a concern on a site like Trumpington Meadows where there is not a single shop or restaurant, and where the only inbound traffic is towards houses. The school, the Waitrose and the Meadows themselves are also destinations for the public, but have their own car parks. So this proposed restriction seems unnecessary to me. As a resident for over 2 years, I have not noticed the need to regulate parking on these streets.

2) The streets on the map, I understand, are not currently adopted by the council. Furthermore, a few of the streets highlighted in the plan (I am aware of the North/West corner of Avalon Way) are not even meant to become council roads (that corner is lacking a pavement and illumination). I would resent a parking restriction being applied to a private road.

Good morning,

We are tenants at xx Osprey Drive, Trumpington and we moved in a few months ago.

Today I have received the surprising news the parking spots in front of our house are under proposal to be a parking control area. We have not received any previous notice and the closing date for comments is the 15th December.

Please find below the reasons for our objection:

- We had no previous notice regarding to this issue, especially during the process when choosing this house. Having free parking spots available was definitely a positive point and convenience when we chose this property;
- We did not receive any communication about the Proposed Order from the Cambridgeshire County Council although our Council Tax has been paid on time.
- Our Council Tax is very expensive, it should cover the usage of these parking spaces for free. We do not agree to add to our expenses purchases for visitors parking, it should be free for residents.
- Our private parking spot is not properly signed, therefore this order will motivate people parking on resident's spots. This already happened last weekend. We arrived home and our parking spot was taken by someone else.
- The streets are named incorrectly, and they are also incorrect on Google maps which creates a lot of confusion for deliveries, guests, suppliers, etc
- This development is not yet finished, it is still under construction. There are many things still to be organised before setting up paying parking spots. Waitrose's traffic lights is Trumpington's worst traffic "bottle neck offender" and we don't see any signs of a solution for that.
- Trumpington Park and Ride is already a huge paying parking lot and it is just around the corner. There is no need to extend its payment area.

Thank you very much.

I am a resident of Trumpington Meadows and I am writing to ask the Council to postpone a new plan for on street parking charge at Trumpington Meadows until all residents are well informed.

I bought my home at Trumpington Meadows in August and moved in in September. When the contracts were exchanged, it was stated that two visitors' parking space in front of our building (plot 554-558) are shared by the residents who live in this building. However, during my first time to attend the Trumpington Meadows Community meeting on 27th November, I realised, also for the first time, that the Council has made a proposal for on street parking charge, where our two visitors' parking space were marked on the map of the Council's proposal. This is shocking and outrageous as (1) the area where our building is does not belong to Cambridge City Council and (2) we residents were not formally informed whatsoever at all; if I hadn't had been to the community meeting, I wouldn't have known it and (3) the roads and the green areas in Trumpington Meadows are privately owned and I pay annually for the management and maintenance for them all and thus I have the legal right to request what the on-street parking charge will be used in the future? Any income from such a charge - if it does go on to take place - should put in use within the Trumpington Meadows community.

I urge you to do door-to-door delivery of the public notice for the parking proposal and to do thorough consultation within the community, before starting any parking charge. I very much look forward to hearing from you.

Hi

**Reference PRO393 Trumpington Meadows**

I attended the meeting on Monday 23/11 at Trumpington School to hear your representative give more details of the proposed scheme, how it would work, how the parking regulations would be enforced, and most importantly allow residents to raise concerns that the proposal would create. This was to be the consultation between the residents and the Cambridge Partnership.

However your representative decided not to attend, Decided not to answer any questions , Decided not to give residents any information about the proposal, Decided not to enter into any consultation.

As no consultation has taken place - can you confirm when the consultation will take place - when this will take place - and where the venue for the consultation will take place.

As it stands now no consultation has taken place - and any attempt to force through the proposal will be met by legal challenge that the correct protocol has not taken place - and could delay the introduction of the proposal by many months.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email - and confirm when the consultation will be taking place.

**Reference PRO393 Trumpington Meadows**

I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-

Parking on the estate roads between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM is completely unregulated

The current proposal is that parking is completely unregulated between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM and traffic can park on both sides of Consort Avenue (the main spine road into and out of the estate) during this time - or anywhere else for that matter.

If the proposal is adopted the estate will become completely gridlocked and residents, emergency services and refuse collection may be unable to enter or leave the estate if residents park in an inconsiderate manner. Under the proposal blocking of the estate roads would be completely acceptable between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM and no enforcement action to prevent this would take place. I have first-hand experience of living on an estate where there was no parking enforcement took place on the estate roads. I sometimes have to leave for work at 7.00 AM and I was prevented from leaving the estate for over an hour as the main access road had been blocked by residents parking on both sides of the road leaving no space for a vehicle to pass. This is precisely what this proposal would lead to.

This proposal would lead to the estate becoming unsafe as Ambulances Fire or Police service vehicles would be impeded from accessing homes in the event of an emergency – this proposal could literally cost someone their life.

This aspect of the proposal is very short sighted and its potential consequences have not been thought through.

I remind you of the Grenfell tower block tragedy in which Council officials ignored residents legitimate safety concerns and subsequent loss of life occurred - you may well be held accountable if some dies as a result of this proposal. You have been warned - and I suggest that you take this concern seriously.

It is recommended that NO parking at any time is allowed on the main spine road (Consort Avenue) at any time. In addition NO parking at any time is allowed on any narrow roads where parking a car would block residents from accessing their homes or allocated parking.

Visitors Parking Bays use between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM is completely unregulated

When I purchased my house the deeds to my property included specific legal covenants pertaining to the visitor parking bays, which were included in the deeds of all properties sold on the estate. Barratt Homes Ltd inserted a covenant (or legal agreement) that the visitor parking bays were to be used exclusively by VISITORS only and they were not to be used by residents. The properties were sold on the basis that residents were allocated two parking spaces each

and any addition parking that residents require should be off the estate and not in VISITOR parking bays.

The current proposal would mean that residents can block the VISITOR parking bays between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM. This is completely unacceptable as all residents have been allocated their own parking

The effect of this proposal would be that VISITORS would not be able to park bays between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM, even if visitor permits were purchased.

It is recommended that the Visitor parking bays are reserved for VISITORS only not residents as originally intended.

It is recommended that no parking at any time is allowed on the main spine road (Consort Avenue) at any time. In addition no parking at any time is allowed on any narrow roads where parking a car would block residents from accessing their homes or allocated parking.

It is recommended that the Visitor parking bays are reserved for VISITORS only not residents as originally intended.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email

Hello,

I'm writing to you regarding the proposal to implement visitor parking permits in Trumpington Meadows.

I have a house with two allocated parking spaces in the private parking areas. I currently have problems with people parking in my allocated spaces. When this happens, I am forced to park in the bay on the street until I am able to track down the car owner and ask them to move their car. This can take time, and sometimes people refuse to move. I have been unable to park in my own spaces for up to a week at times.

I'm concerned that if people require visitor permits to park in the bays on the street, people will choose to park in my spaces instead, leaving me with nowhere to park. In addition, if the bays require a visitor's permit, I feel that people will be more reluctant to vacate my allocated spaces.

How do you plan to stop visitors and residents from parking in other people's allocated spaces?

RE PRO393

SINCE SENDING THE SECOND MAIL I HAVE ALSO NOTED ON-LINE YOUR STATEMENT OF REASONS  
HOW CAN THIS POLICY OF UNRESTRICTED PARKING FACILITATE THE MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC AND  
ENHANCE THE SAFETY OF PEDESTRIANS IN NARROW ROADS WITHOUT PAVEMENTS HOW CAN THIS  
POSSIBLY MAKE PEDESTRIANS SAFER?  
RT

SINCE SENDING THIS MAIL I HAVE VIEWED THE PLAN OF PROPOSED STREETS ON-LINE AND NOTE  
THAT YOUR INCOMPETENT STAFF HAVE WRONGLY IDENTIFIED BEAD ROAD AS OTTER CLOSE THIS  
WILL NNED TO BE CORRECTED TO AVOID CONFUSION

Hello,

Please can you clarify the following points with regard to the proposed parking changes in Trumpington Meadows?

1. The parking bay outside our house (Bead Road parking space next to the Avalon Way junction) is not highlighted as a visitor bay. What parking restriction will cover this bay? Do you need a separate parking permit for this bay? (are there permits other than the visitor ones or will this space be unusable between the hours of 8am - 6pm). It is not clear.
2. Will cars now be able to park on the streets (but not in the visitor bays) outside of the proposed hours?
3. How will the parking controls be enforced?

Your email confirms my worst fear that if the restrictions go ahead there will be no formal parking controls in operation from 1800 to 0800, as a result drivers could park on the roads during those times. The problem when there are no sanctions and a free for all, however incomplete, is that general



exhortations to drivers, however obvious they are, do not mean that they will exercise a general responsibility not to obstruct the public highway when they can do so with impunity. When we were sold the house, we were told that there was every likelihood that there would be double yellow lines. Of course, I don't hold you responsible for their sales talk, but that suggestion would be a deterrent to those who might otherwise park. Whatever the shortcomings of the parking supervision in place at the moment, it has at least had the effect of almost completely reducing on street parking, including overnight parking, at least in our part of the estate, in large part because of the (supposed) 24 hour surveillance and the sanctions which are in place.

One problem that may be peculiar to our location (the last house before the Anstey LEAP) is that we are vulnerable to overnight parking of cars associated with the houses around the LEAP where there is, of course, no road.

I am a resident on the Trumpington Meadows estate and live at xx Old Mills Road CB2 9AJ.

While in general I welcome this initiative, I was puzzled by the reference at the end of Paragraph 2 stating that 'there will be no parking controls in operation outside of those times' (0800-2000). If this means that there is a free for all, and cars may be parked in streets overnight, this would be a backward step. There have been many shortcomings with the recent arrangements for parking on Trumpington Meadows, but it has largely ensured that there has been an absolute minimum of on street parking, which may change if the proposed order comes into effect. Old Mills Road, like other roads on the estate, is an important, though relatively narrow, thoroughfare, which pedestrians, cyclists and cars all share, and the likelihood of roads being full of parked cars is a something which I would want to avoid at all costs.

Hence my comment why Cambridgeshire County is planing to regulate parking in Trumpington Meadows and not in other closer similar areas. Why and Who decided which area need regulation and which one doesn't. Where the Cambridge City Council stands in all this?

I believe the majority of the community is against this proposal at least the ones to know about it. Maybe it would be beneficial and more transparent to send letter to the neighbors to get people informed and ask for their feedback

Dear Graham Hughes,

My name is xxxxxxxxx, I am a home owner in Trumpington Meadows (xx Spring Drive, CB2 (AD)

I am writing you to express my disconformity with the TRO (PR0393) proposed for Trumpington Meadows streets. I consider it quite excessive, as it will affect a lot of the residents of this neighbourhood. The majority of the houses only have one allocated parking and a lot of houses have 2 cars. Limiting the parking it such way will definitely have a negative impact on the community.

I understand the need of the council to regulate it but I think something more adequate would be from 5pm to 9 am, Monday to Friday only as it is other areas outside of Cambridge city centre (for examples in the roads around Addenbrooke's Hospital, at Sedley Taylor Road)

I would like to ask the City Council to reconsider this proposal and put the necessities and requirements of the neighbours and resident of the area first.

I am a resident on the Trumpington Meadows estate and live at xx Old Mills Road CB2 9AJ.

While in general I welcome this initiative, I was puzzled by the reference at the end of Paragraph 2 stating that 'there will be no parking controls in operation outside of those times' (0800-2000). If this means that there is a free for all, and cars may be parked in streets overnight, this would be a backward step. There have been many shortcomings with the recent arrangements for parking on Trumpington Meadows, but it has largely ensured that there has been an absolute minimum of on street parking, which may change if the proposed order comes into effect. Old Mills Road, like other roads on the estate, is an important, though relatively narrow, thoroughfare, which pedestrians, cyclists and cars all share, and the likelihood of roads being full of parked cars is a something which I would want to avoid at all costs.

Dear Mr Graham Hughes

I am at x Renard Way, Trumpington

I refer to your Public notice regarding the introduction of on street parking control in Trumpington Meadows and introducing the visitor permit only. I like to raise my objections based on the following grounds.

1/ My house is a 4 bedroom terrace with 1 garage.

2/ I have 2 cars and it is not a lot for a 4 bedroom house

3/ I now have 2 extra permits from the developer - Barratt for parking at the roadside outside my house at any time at no cost

4/ Barratt confirmed when I purchased my house that there will be ample visitor parking spaces outside once the apartments opposite completed and Barratt did not mention about the cost

5/ All parking bays at Trumpington Meadow now is free of charge and my 2 permits are free. So I was not smart enough to think it would actually cost money for the visitor parking spaces. Most importantly, Barratt decided not to mention.

6/ For 3, 4 and 5, it is probably not your problem, we are just being misled by Barratt. I have to say I might buy somewhere else with 2 parking spaces or fight for a price reduction if I knew the 2<sup>nd</sup> parking space needs money

7/ Anyway, there should be at least one resident parking permit for resident at Trumpington Meadows at no cost or a lower and reasonable cost for such permit

8/ A lot of other areas within Cambridge has resident parking permit, why there is a different at Trumpington Meadows

9/ For me, I cycle to work into the city and my car is needed for regular site visits. I decided to cycle to avoid creating more congestion to the Cambridge city. So you are forcing me to drive but weekends will still be a problem. We need resident parking permit

as a follow up - as you were unable to join the Trumpington Meadows residents meeting on Monday evening, at the Trumpington Meadows Primary school. Those who attended firstly queried what problem CCC is trying to solve by proposing the complicated and expensive visitor permit system and restricted hours. It was not obvious.

Those who park on site are primarily residents, followed by visitors of residents and tradesmen who are attending to residential issues, or deliveries. Tradesmen who work for Barratts are not allowed to park on site with the one exception where they are attending to residential issues. On occasion, for example on Charger road where I live, visitors to the Country Park who are not residents, who want to walk their dogs, park on Charger road because it is right next to the park. Those are really only the types of parkers that you need to take care of. Residents, visitors of residents, already live peacefully on site and coexist, with the exception of a few repeat offenders who choose not to park in their garages/allocated spots, but on footpaths and on the road. Enforcement of highway code will take care of that as it is against the Code to obstruct footpaths, and to park on yellow lines within restricted hours.

Now - back to the meeting on Monday evening - it was very clear amongst those who attended that there was consensus that the current, albeit private-contractor-led, parking scheme works pretty well and better than the CCC proposal in many ways. The one clear deficit with the current system is that enforcement is sporadic and inconsistent resulting in repeat offenders who frustrate residents. These offenders are in the minority of the development.

The current system is 24 non parking on all roads. visitor bays are free to access, and with a provided free visitor permit. two per household. simple.

Now imagine this Gary - once adopted, the roads could be single yellowed. The visitor bays are displayed as for valid permits only. Hours of parking restriction on yellow lines = 7am to 8pm, 7 days a week. parking restrictions for visitor bays and with valid permits - 24/7 7/7. **AND it is enforced with regularity and predictability.** simple, effective.

The Trumpington Meadows site does not suffer from commuter traffic issues. There isn't a large scale visitor problem that needs solving. And won't if the above simple model is implemented.

Gary - I would be more than happy to have a short conversation with you about this to explain further if you wish.

Available at your service....

thank you for the response. Apologies I got my maths wrong.

the principles behind my complaint still apply. It is very under-handed to post one sign in an half unoccupied road, when the proposal applies to the entire development.

Then £300 for a basic human right and civil liberty and the system is overly and unnecessarily complex. 5x24 hour, x 20.

Why not a simple straight forward system of up to 2 (or whatever number that is appropriate) visitor permits per household per year, for a nominal fee, e.g. £50 each to cover administration costs. The vast majority of Trumpington has free parking don't forget. It is unfair to target this development, when already there is limited parking available.

AND - once administered, is CCC going to be patrolling to ticket non-permitted vehicles? What about vehicles that park on footpaths and not in the visitor parking areas to bypass this proposal etc?

if the ambition is about restricting parking and enabling residential access, then the nominal fee and straight forward system I proposed is more than sufficient. If the ambition is to raise revenue and create administrative jobs to issue the permits, then the CCC proposal applies.

I'm writing in protest from a practical point of view. I welcome restrictions. But fairness and common sense should prevail. See my example of home help (e.g. cleaner or child care minder), and grand parents visiting - easily the 100 day limit is reached quickly.

Thank you for your e-mail.

Your comments are noted and we will reply in more detail at the end of the public notice period.

Just to clarify visitor permit costs; for £15 (under review) you get 5 separate visits, so £3 per day. The maximum of 20 permits (100 visits) per annum is per applicant, not household. If someone wanted the maximum of 20 permits that would cost £300.

Regards

Gary Baldwin



Sirs. I write with respect proposal PR0393 - parking restrictions on the Trumpington Meadows development.

I have a THREE key comments.

**1. Process:**

by chance, i came across the public notice. It is attached to a lamp pole on the corner of Renard and Argent Roads at Trumpington Meadows. I find this to be most distasteful and underhanded of CCC considering the proposal applies to many streets on the development. The notice should be in the minimum, be on every single street impacted.

**2. Proposed system for visitors parking.**

Secondly, whilst i welcome the concept of restricted parking so as to enable and prioritise the limited available parking to residents and visitors, i find the proposed visitor permit structure of up to 20 permits, each enabling up to 5 visits each of 24 hour duration to be an gross over engineering or a simple basic human right: to have people visit them at their home.

**3. Fee structure:**

Lastly, the proposed £15 for a permit of 5 x 24hour visits, up to 20 permits per year is over the top in terms of potential costs to residents. £3000 in costs for 100 visit-days? Say a cleaner comes once a week - that's already 52 visits. Say grandparents visit on weekends staying Friday and Saturday nights. That's easily already reaching 150 visit-days, well over the 100 limit. Having to pay £3000 for a simple civil liberty and human right, to have people visit, is preposterous and outrageous. Especially considering that 40% of residents on the Trumpington meadows site is in shared ownership or council housing.

So in summary, what is wrong with allocating each resident with 2 visitors permits per annum for a single nominal fee?

Creating a system in which there is a maximum of 20 permits each with a limit of 5 x 24hour stays, up to 100 per year at a total cost of £3000 per resident is an over engineered system that creates nothing but bureaucracy and administration, and unfairly places residents out of pocket for what should be a basic human right: visitation.

**Dear Sir or Madam**

**I would like to object to the proposals set out for Trumpington meadows**

Proposed TRO (Reference Number PR0393) to introduce visitor parking permits or more importantly to have no restrictions in place between 6pm and 8am.

It is not possible to obtain a parking permit in advance when you have visitors who decided to visit at short notice. Furthermore, Carmine road is a very narrow road which hasn't been built according to road standards and there are currently no visitor bays. Carmine road has garages on both sides of the road, if people start parking on the road this will make it impossible to get ones car out of the garage as was the case before signs were put up to enforce strict no parking rules by Barratt's.

I'm writing in order to strongly object to the above mentioned notice displayed at various streets of the Trumpington Meadows development.

While I agree that parking needs to be regulated, in the main because not enough on road parking spaces are provided, I strongly disagree to the proposed charges and restriction of numbers of parking permit for each household. Considering that many residents are in social or subsidised housing it would provide further burden and potential exclusion of poorer households who already struggle to live in Cambridge. I find it puzzling that the charges are much higher than residents have to pay for visitor parking permits much closer to the city centre - where parking space is also in very short supply. I am thinking of the Petersfield and Romsey areas for example. Unless Trumpington is provided with an appropriate public transport system (affordable, available and reliable) there is no alternative for visitors that are either working (e.g. builders, cleaners) or frail (e.g. elderly relatives) or who live far away than to use a car and park in close proximity to the house they are visiting. Parking at the Park & Ride may be proposed as an alternative, however, this also costs money. It may also mean a 10 minute walk to some local addresses, which at night is not considered safe due to both very quiet and dark streets.

I would be happy to explain my points in greater detail, but I hope you will seriously consider mine and others objections to this proposal.

My name is xxxxxxx and I am a home owner in Trumpington Meadows.

I've just learned last week about the TRO PR0393 that will affect the streets in our community. I have a few complains that I would like to express.

- The first one is the sneaky way used to make this changes. If it wasn't for a Facebook page that we have in the Trumpington area I would have never found out.

- The second one is that yesterday (28/11/17) I attended a Trumpington Meadows association meeting where somebody was to come and explain to the neighbours what the change was about. That person was supposed to answer questions too. Nobody appeared so it was just a group of frustrated neighbours with no voice. That was extremely inappropriate.
- The third is the TRO itself. I believe the time restrictions are abusive for an area which is nowhere close to the city centre. Other areas such as Addenbrooke's hospital surroundings, which are at the same distance from city centre than us, have a less restrictive neighbour parking. I would advocate for a restriction from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday.
- I feel it is unfair to have parking restrictions in a neighbourhood that doesn't have pedestrian crossings, priority signals on the streets or any other traffic signalling.

So to summarize, I think that this is an unacceptable change that will negatively affect our Trumpington Meadows community. So I would like for this TRO to be reconsidered and modified to accommodate the needs of the people.

My name is xxxxxx, I am a home owner in Trumpington Meadows (xx Spring Drive, CB2 (AD)

I am writing you to express my disconformity with the TRO (PR0393) proposed for Trumpington Meadows streets. I consider it quite excessive, as it will affect a lot of the residents of this neighbourhood. The majority of the houses only have one allocated parking and a lot of houses have 2 cars. Limiting the parking it such way will definitely have a negative impact on the community.

I understand the need of the council to regulate it but I think something more adequate would be from 5pm to 9 am, Monday to Friday only as it is other areas outside of Cambridge city centre (for examples in the roads around Addenbrooke's Hospital, at Sedley Taylor Road)

I would like to ask the City Council to reconsider this proposal and put the necessities and requirements of the neighbours and resident of the area first.



I am writing to object to the proposal for parking restrictions at Trumpington Meadows reference PR0393.

I welcome restrictions to enable priority parking to residents and visitors. However the reasons to object to this proposal are numerous.

A restriction of 100 visits per year is way too low. My father visits me twice a week and is unable to use public transport but does not qualify for a blue badge. My cleaner comes once a week by car. Various friends with small children visit me regularly and would not be able to if they had to use public transport. What about people with nannies who come every day by car? What about people who use a befriending service where people come and visit once a week by car? Elderly grandparents visiting?

Why not implement a system similar to areas of London where there is one hour of the day with restrictions e.g. 10a mot 11am, which would stop people parking here and commuting into work in central Cambridge? Then at least genuine visitors could time their visits to be outside the parking restrictions.

Regarding the above Parking Restriction propose for Trumpington Meadows, I would like to make the following comments:

1. I am in favour of stricter (or at least better enforced) parking restrictions than there are currently in place.
2. I am happy to pay for visitors' passes; however, your suggested tariffs are too high, particularly considering that 40% of the houses are social or shared ownership. I would suggest a tiered payment scheme e.g. £5 per permit for the first 5, £10 for the next 10 and £15 for a final 5.
3. My biggest concern is the lack of parking restrictions overnight; does this mean that anyone (residents and non-residents) can park on any of the roads, even outside of visitor bays, 6pm to 8am? If this is the case then I can see the parking getting worse at night, with cars causing obstruction and potentially hindering emergency access etc; this would seem a contradiction to your stated reason for the restrictions: '*The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users*' ([here](#)). I would urge no street parking outside of visitors or resident assigned bays 24/7; remembering that all residents have assigned parking areas / garages.

I would like to comment in order to express my objection to the proposal you have set out in PR0393 – parking restrictions in various streets on Trumpington Meadows.

Whilst I would welcome properly considered proposals to ensure the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users, I believe the implementation of the 8am-6pm parking restriction fails to do this and is unnecessary. In fact, I fail to see how it positively affects movement of traffic or directly affects the safety of road users on the development.

Specifically:

- It is wholly inappropriate to consider only part of the development, namely the City element, and not the whole area which includes areas within South Cambs.
- The proposals cover only part of a non-central area of Cambridge and thus will only serve to displace vehicles to areas on the boundaries of the development – the South Cam area of the development, Waitrose, the P&R site, Byrons Pool car park and other residential streets in the area. This is hardly a valuable proposal!
- I understand that the P&R charges cease in April – further compounding the above displacement options for parking
- The proposal only applies to daytimes when those parking on the development will most likely be due to either a) those trying to avoid the current P&R charges, or b) part of Barratt's workforce. The former is a consequence of your erroneous decision to implement charges, the latter your inability to enforce the conditions of the planning permission for the site restricting workforce parking.

In order to achieve your objective of movement of traffic and safety of all road users, I would suggest your time is better spent on attempting to alleviate the congestion at the Trumpington Road / Shelford Road junction outside Waitrose which is much more pressing!

Separately, I would like to enquire as to the progress you are making to implement a more appropriate set of boundaries such that the whole of the development is contained within Cambridge City – this would allow the consideration of issues like the above to be made in a much more integrated way, and not in such a misaligned way as your current proposals!

I look forward to hearing from you.

#### Objection to the proposed parking restriction PR0393 on the Trumpington Meadows development

I would like to log my objection to the proposed parking restrictions on the Trumpington Meadows development. My reasons are as follows:-

Firstly, this proposal has not been notified to residents on the development via post, but I happen to have logged into a Facebook group and discovered it. It feels like an underhand way of enforcing parking restrictions/revenue generation for the council.

Secondly, the reason for the order is inexplicable given the remote / out of town location of the development, and the fact that visitors parking bays are currently only used by residents and their visitors.

Thirdly, the proposed cost and the restrictions of the visitors parking permits is expensive and very limited. Having moved from central London, SW1, the visitors parking is less expensive and less restrictive, but there is also a superb public transport system and therefore less reliance on vehicular

access. Weekends have FREE parking.

It seems nonsensical that there would be greater restrictions to a remote country-side location, which is heavily dependent on vehicular access / not served well by public transport. Most people who have labourers, cleaners, grandparents visit would soon run out of visitors parking permits and this would therefore cause the other streets in Trumpington to become very busy / blocked with parked cars. Or would prevent people from a basic human right – to have visitors!

Fourthly, when I bought my home on the development, it was never discussed with me that these parking restrictions would later come into effect. It is not unreasonable to expect that the same parking restrictions that apply to residential areas in the rest of Trumpington / remote areas of Cambridge town would also apply to Trumpington Meadows i.e. none. This type of parking enforcement does not exist in other residential areas of Cambridge. I therefore have a concern about the future marketability of my house if I wish to sell it.

I propose that the visitors parking bays that currently exist on the development are retained as-is, without the need to display a visitor / resident permit. They currently provide parking for existing residents and visitors in a development which already has limited parking per household.

I further propose that the council provide a resident and visitor parking permit scheme to allow residents and their visitors to park on the roads outside of the existing parking bays, much like the systems that are currently in place in London. One example is that residents can purchase up to two visitors parking permits per year for a nominal fee.

I'm writing to lodge an objection to your proposed visitor parking scheme on Trumpington Meadows. You'll find I use the word ridiculous a lot in the text below.

My first objection is on the basis of cost – effective cost of having a visitor park for a day of £3 is ridiculous (especially for an estate where everyone's already paid a pretty premium to live there). Is this a scam you've come up with in conjunction with stagecoach to try & up their park & ride parking revenues?

My second objection is around administration of the scheme – The idea we need to keep a stock of vouchers in our houses (so that you keep the money up-front in your account) & keep track of how many we'll need to have to hand is ridiculous. As is the idea that the council sets how many times I people have visitors. Congratulations on coming up with such a complicated scheme.

My third objection is on the statement regarding **all** the roads as “no waiting 8-6pm” with **no parking controls outside those hours**. The estate is currently making use of a private parking contractor to ensure no roadsides are used for parking. This works really well. There are very few official pavements on the estate, and roads are narrow. Cars can easily block access for emergency vehicles, and the lack of pavements mean pedestrians have to walk on roads. If you put up “park where you like after 6pm” signage it's going to be confusing (if the private clamping company stay) and reckless on the councils part if the private clamping company are cancelled, allowing a free for all in the evenings.

Sir,

The Plan that accompanies this Order has a mistake:

Where you have labelled Falcon Road, this is actually Renard Way. Charger Road turns left and becomes Renard Way, not Falcon Road.

I know because I live in x Renard Way.

Falcon Road is further on south-west, not coloured on your map.

Please correct this.

Also, Does this Order only cover Cambridge City Council?

Does it not cover South Cambridge District Council?

Because 1 Renard Way is under City Council, but 3-11 Renard Way is under South Cambridge.

I particularly have a problem with this. I find very upsetting that District Nurses are not gifted the same parking privileges as Police, Fire and Ambulance. These people are extremely valuable and play a huge part in keeping people alive or seeing them through a painless and comfortable end. Dealing with a wide range of health issues. They play an important role in helping to reduce bed blocking, yet they are find for parking. I find this an insult to the profession and thus should be stopped. District nurses have to carry very heavy equipment, which means they can't park any distance from the patients house.

I would like to know if GP's are also find for attending home visits.

Due to the fact that District nurses are a medical service they should receive automatic exemption from parking restrictions.

### **Reference PRO393 Trumpington Meadows**

I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-

Parking on the estate roads between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM is completely unregulated

The current proposal is that parking is completely unregulated between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM and traffic can park on both sides of Consort Avenue (the main spine road into and out of the estate) during this time - or anywhere else for that matter.

If the proposal is adopted the estate will become completely gridlocked and residents, emergency services and refuse collection may be unable to enter or leave the estate if residents park in an inconsiderate manner. Under the proposal blocking of the estate roads would be completely acceptable between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM and no enforcement action to prevent this would take place. I have first-hand experience of living on an estate where there was no parking enforcement took place on the estate roads. I sometimes have to leave for work at 7.00 AM and I was prevented from leaving the estate for over an hour as the main access road had been blocked by residents parking on both sides of the road leaving no space for a vehicle to pass. This is precisely what this proposal would lead to.

This proposal would lead to the estate becoming unsafe as Ambulances Fire or Police service vehicles would be impeded from accessing homes in the event of an emergency – this proposal could literally cost someone their life.

This aspect of the proposal is very short sighted and its potential consequences have not been thought through.

I remind you of the Grenfell tower block tragedy in which Council officials ignored residents legitimate safety concerns and subsequent loss of life occurred - you may well be held accountable if some dies as a result of this proposal. You have been warned - and I suggest that you take this concern seriously.

It is recommended that NO parking at any time is allowed on the main spine road (Consort Avenue) at any time. In addition NO parking at any time is allowed on any narrow roads where parking a car would block residents from accessing their homes or allocated parking.

Visitors Parking Bays use between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM is completely unregulated

When I purchased my house the deeds to my property included specific legal covenants pertaining to the visitor parking bays, which were included in the deeds of all properties sold on the estate. Barratt Homes Ltd inserted a covenant (or legal agreement) that the visitor parking bays were to be used exclusively by VISITORS only and they were not to be used by residents. The properties were sold on the basis that residents were allocated two parking spaces each and any addition parking that residents require should be off the estate and not in VISITOR parking bays.

The current proposal would mean that residents can block the VISITOR parking bays between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM. This is completely unacceptable as all residents have been allocated their own parking

The effect of this proposal would be that VISITORS would not be able to park bays between 18.00 PM - 8.00 AM, even if visitor permits were purchased.

It is recommended that the Visitor parking bays are reserved for VISITORS only not residents as originally intended.

It is recommended that no parking at any time is allowed on the main spine road (Consort Avenue) at any time. In addition no parking at any time is allowed on any narrow roads where parking a car would block residents from accessing their homes or allocated parking.

It is recommended that the Visitor parking bays are reserved for VISITORS only not residents as originally intended.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email

Please can you provide me with some information?

I am a Health Visitor working in South City. I am in possession of a parking dispensation disc for residents parking and pay & display within the city which has been provided by the council due to working in the community and visiting people in their homes. A large proportion of our work is on the new estates in Trumpington, would our current dispensation cover us for the proposed visitors parking bays? If not can you please advise me if there will be a similar scheme, if so who would we need to liaise with to arrange it when it comes into force?

Any information would be appreciated.

To whom it may concern,

I would like to object to the proposal for visitor only parking. Reference **Number PR0393**

**I object as I currently live in a two bedroom house hold containing three adults with two cars. Upon moving here four years ago we were told by the housing association that visitors are to park in the park and ride car park. Removing all the lay-bys would result in me unable to park**

**My car and unable to got to work, I work full time on child care and unable to pay expenses to park near my own house. There is barely enough parking for all the people currently living here, removing the lay-bys and moving more people in is going to cause more havoc.**

**I hope you reconsider this proposal.**

Thanks very much for the helpful clarification. I do hope that the daily fee is reduced but other than that I welcome the intervention of the council in all respects.

Does this mean that once the scheme is in place Regent Parking will no longer dispense tickets.

Does it also mean that after 6pm (until 8am) evening guests can park anywhere including on roads without permit bays eg on Renard Way?

We have huge problems with dinner guests having nowhere to park, and did last night. I see the need for daytime control, but in the evening it serves no clear benefit other than collection of parking fine revenue.

I have noted the contents of proposed TRO (REF PR0303)

The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users. The waiting restrictions are intended to manage non-resident parking in the area and ensure that parking spaces are available for visitors.

We are South Cambs residents, and there are few parking spaces in South Cambs. As far as I can see South Cambs residents cannot purchase tickets, and the very few South Cambs spaces will be continue open for anyone. This will mean that City residents can park in the few South Cambs spaces without paying, or pay and park in the City spaces, whereas South Cambs have no option whatsoever should their few spaces be full, as they assuredly will be.



The announcement of times when the spaces are to be patrolled and policed is welcome and overdue, though the length of restrictions might reasonably be reduced further and the proposed charges seem extremely high.

However an unintended consequence of the proposed scheme is that it will be almost impossible for South Cambs residents to accommodate visitors following the introduction of your changes. This does not therefore meet the objective of managing non-resident parking in the area and ensuring that parking spaces are available for visitors. This is a yet another complication of the absurd City boundary which continues to blight South Cambs Trumpington Meadows residents.

**Please do not implement any new parking system in Trumpington Meadows without co-ordinating properly and seamlessly with South Cambs.**

Reference Number PR0393

I was wondering if the lay-by bays are going to be allocated to visitor parking requiring a badge will residents be able to park in them? I live in a house with two cars but only one designated parking bay, therefore I rely on parking on a lay-by for my car. However if I am unable to park my car in the lay-by where else is there to park? Will you be providing more residential parking bays?  
Thank you for your time

**Trumpington Meadows Parking  
Comments on proposed Traffic Regulation Order PR0393  
Cllr Zoë O'Connell - 3rd January 2018**

This TRO is likely to set the model for parking restrictions elsewhere on Southern Fringe developments, so it is important that we get the right TRO here that meets the needs of residents and the wider community. As well as being the first southern fringe site to be adopted, the proximity of the Park & Ride site and the presence of the City/South Cambs boundary across the site raise a number of issues not likely to arise elsewhere.

At the moment, there are few problems with parking in the area. Residents tell me this is mostly limited to inconsiderate parking blocking access to drives and people using clearly labelled private parking spaces instead of the Park & Ride.

Neither of these issues will be addressed by the proposed TRO - the former, because restrictions are not 24x7 and the latter because parking on private land is not controlled by the council. As a result, there is little enthusiasm from residents for the proposals.

**Current Drawings**

The currently published drawings, dated 29th November 2017, miss out some parking bays, showing them instead as restricted parking. (For example, on Bead Road and Hereward Road) It is not clear if this is an error or intentional but if intentional, it is certainly undesirable as it leaves parts of Trumpington Meadows with limited nearby visitor parking.

Some roads are also misidentified on the plan, including Avalon Way and Bead Road being identified as Otter Close and a section of Proctor Drive being shown as Avalon Way. We have already seen a case, with Addenbrooke's Road, where errors in road names have made a TRO unenforceable.

**City/District split**

The presence of the Cambridge City/South Cambridgeshire border creates an unusual problem with enforcement. In at least one case, the border occurs in the middle of a parking bay.

Cambridge City parking is decriminalised and parking offences can only be handled by civil enforcement officers - as far as I am aware, no similar arrangement exists within South Cambridgeshire and the police would need to take action instead. This difference in enforcement potentially leads to a two-tier situation where car drivers will be encouraged to park in whichever side is perceived to have the weaker enforcement regime, which is likely to cause problems for residents in that area.

How this split is handled should be well understood and made public before the TRO is approved.

**Problems with an phased approach**

The plans as drawn do not extend into areas not yet fully built. This suggests that a

## Problems with an phased approach

The plans as drawn do not extend into areas not yet fully built. This suggests that a phased approach to enforcement is intended as roads are adopted. This is undesirable as it will simply push parking out to undated roads, creating more problems for people whose drives are blocked while they are in an unadopted area.

Thus, a "big bang" approach - applying the TRO in one go from when the estate is fully adopted - would be a more effective proposal.

## Hours of operation

The general feeling has been that 8am-6pm is not a helpful enforcement period.

On the one hand, it would not be fully effective at discouraging multiple car ownership or preventing residents parking on the road rather than in their drive, as they will likely be using their cars to commute. It would also not solve the problem of accesses being blocked outside of 8am-6pm.

On the other hand, there are some residents who currently do not leave for work until after 8am who are unhappy at having to change their work patterns simply to fit around parking times.

There does not appear to be a consensus on which approach (Longer or shorter hours) fits best, and a one-size-fits-all approach across the estate is probably not the ideal situation. Residents closer to the P&R site, and on narrow roads such as Spring Drive are most affected by rogue parking and access being blocked, and 24 hour restrictions on parking would be more appropriate here - although the station may change once P&R parking charges are abolished, as long as the Park and Ride site is not regularly full.

Conversely, residents at the other end of the site with less restricted access were more likely to feel that shorter or no restrictions were more appropriate.

## Restrictions on numbers of permits

The cost and restrictions on the number of residents permits allowed was felt to be excessive and likely to be unaffordable for those on lower incomes, although the cost of permits advertised was based on a proposal that I believe has now been turned down by councillors.

Although residents closer to the P&R have the benefit of visitors being able to park there, (Albeit not overnight) residents further away do not have this advantage. This will disproportionately affect those who need regular short visits, such as those requiring childminder pickups and so on. The current language around "medical visits" in the public notice is vague, and needs clarifying for residents.

However, given the lack of current problems with parking in the area, either unrestricted parking in bays or restricted only by a non-time-limited residents permit seems a more attractive solution.

We would like to oppose the proposed changes to parking restrictions PR0393. As has already been identified in southern fringe meetings etc., these spaces are often used by residents which restricts visitors being able to park and this is not what we are disputing. However, the proposal does not put forward alternative arrangements for residents who currently need to use these spaces.

It may be argued that properties in the area are sold on the condition of a single allocated parking space; but, how does this fit in with the modern aims of multiple members of a single household participating in work? In our house, one person works in Stow-cum-Quy, whilst the other works at various district general hospitals. The public transport network is not adequate to provide transport for numerous reasons, as follows:

- 1) The park and ride is expensive at 3 pound, before even considering subsequent journeys needed to be undertaken to reach either Stow-cum-Quy or district generals.
- 2) The park and ride is prohibitive for shift workers (both of us) who operate outside of the operating times of the park and ride.
- 3) Public transport to places of work significantly increases commuting times in comparison to car, despite traffic.
- 4) The busway is not adequately lit, or monitored to ensure night-time safety of individuals cycling along it.

We put this to the council. We completely support the thinking of reducing the number of cars both in Trumpington Meadows and the Cambridge area as a whole. However, to implement these severe restrictions would make it impossible to keep the required second car, and doing this whilst the public transport network is not fit for purpose will force us to move away from the area. Indeed, as a young people in our early 20s, why is Cambridge attractive anymore? House prices are soaring. The public transport network is outdated, overstretched and overpriced. The removal of the ability to park my own car outside my house feels like the last straw. I strongly urge the council to reconsider its proposal, which once again skews the advantages to those who can afford higher standards of living.

Indeed the price proposed for visitor permits is just extortionate (how is anyone justifying £3.00 per a visit, this is more than some centre of town parking!!!). My boyfriend regularly visits via car, and these proposals are effectively a tax on him doing so.

It is difficult enough as it is to find spaces in which to park, mainly due to the terrible design of 'designated parking spaces'. There is significant ground space which could be utilised in better ways for this purpose. Therefore, it is clear that the only reason the council are proposing these changes are because they want to force households into possessing one vehicle, regardless of whether the residents work in separate locations and therefore need access to two vehicles. This is a very weak argument indeed. If the transport network was sufficient, we would use it voluntarily. As it stands, all this proposal will do is push young talent out of Trumpington Meadows, and considering the lack of affordable housing within Cambridge itself, outside of the local area. Until public transport links and prices are improved, it is premature to push these parking restrictions through.

I am writing to object to the proposed order whereby on-street parking controls will be in place at Trumpington Meadows.

The main objection is that there are few spaces for residents' cars in the first place. I have one space in my small back garden which is very difficult to get into such is Barrett's drive to cram in as many houses as possible. I have regular visits from my partner (age 60+) who drives a distance (70 miles) and wants to unload his car when he arrives. This also applies to one of my sons who finds it difficult to get into my garden space as it is so narrow (even though at vast expense and considerable effort I got the gates widened by 1ft). Thus he is very much reliant on parking spaces on the estate and, with the nature of his job, cannot always give me much notice. This means I often have to park elsewhere if I get a visitor as my garden is simply not big enough to take another car. To compound matters, there are relatively few visitor spaces, given the size of the estate. Interestingly, none of the supposed visitor spaces are marked out as such.

As things stand, as a single freeholder, I pay Barrett's an annual management charge for the upkeep of the grass verges and other landscape features on the estate. I would not mind this but for the fact that I will be expected to pay up to an additional £300 a year (if the proposed charges are implemented) for visitors/myself to park here.

What is going to happen at 6pm when the visitors spaces become free of charge? There will surely be a mad dash from everyone who needs an extra space as couples/families often have 2 cars (or more).

I am more than happy to use public transport, though that too is pitiful in Trumpington now that the Citi 7 no longer stops here and the Park and Ride from Cambridge to Trumpington stops at 8:30pm during the week and is non-existent on Sundays. I am unable to ride a bicycle.

I feel that I will be trapped in my home without any possibility of visitors and fearful of moving my car out of my garden. In addition, as the buses do not run after 8:30pm from town, my car is the only possible means of certain transport for me as I cannot afford to pay for regular taxis.

I chose to live here because I am unable to ride a bicycle and because there were no parking restrictions on this estate for visitors as long as they parked in the appropriate bays which, as already stated, are not marked out as such. I am considering getting a valuation of my house now and for when the order is finalised as I do feel this will adversely affect its value.

At the moment, parking on the estate is not a problem. Why implement something that is going to make things worse for everyone here? Indeed, why change something that works?

I look forward to your reply.

**I am writing to you to express my strong objections to the proposals on-street parking control for Trumpington Meadows, including visitor permit holder parking in signed parking bays every day from 8am to 6pm.**

1. Firstly it will affect my childcare service that I am offering to local parents. Parents need to be able to stop and go out of the car and pick up the child and receive a brief feedback about their child's day. They cannot park streets behind the house and have a permit first !!!! It will make me to lose my clients and also reduce the parent's chances to find the childcare service. There are only 2

childminders on nearest estates. Nurseries are fully booked.

2. Why to change what it is now and working? People are respecting the signs don't park on road only in bays. There is always enough spaces for visitors to park. Near by is Park and Ride to park which is cheaper to park than your proposal. It is outrageous.
3. We pay high rent including services, why we have to pay more???
4. Why you want to implement more strict restriction towards parking on a quite residential area? It seems to be more strict than parking at Regent Street in Cambridge????
5. You are limiting our Human Rights by impeding the right for private live and family life that you want to limit and control people who want to visit me.
6. I think any changes are not necessary. People will moan that there is not enough parking spaces but I don't think this is the solution they will be satisfied with.
7. And again you privilege people on higher financial status and disadvantage those who just live on tight budget or may have difficulties with applying for permissions.

I am totally disappointed with the proposal and find it unfair and entirely inequitable.

It will affected my own business as I need to client to be able to transfer they children in safe way to the car not walking miles in order to obtain permit first the go par and the collect child it is just nonsense.

# Objections to Proposal PR0393

This document:

- examines the existing parking at Trumpington Meadows.
- looks at evidence of a visitor parking problem, to support changes proposed in PR0393.
- makes a counter-proposal that is cheaper, simpler and meets the needs of the community.
- suggests improvements to the manner in which PR0393 is carried out.
- warns of the unintended consequences of PR0393,

and having considered all relevant issues, makes a recommendation as to a better way forward.

## A. EXISTING PARKING 2012-2017

Let's start with the existing parking rules enforced by Regent Parking.

We currently have no permit policy across Trumpington Meadows. There is 24hr no waiting on-streets. Parking is bays only. These bays are not restricted in any way.

## B. ARE THERE ANY CURRENT PARKING ISSUES?

As a resident since July 2016, I have yet to witness any significant visitor parking problem:

- Trumpington Meadows does not suffer from commuter parking.
- Trumpington Meadows does not suffer from shopper parking.

PR0393 Statement of Reasons states: '*ensure... spaces are available for visitors*', implying insufficient availability. How did you quantify and prove this? I don't see it. I expected the Statement of Reasons to articulate the problem: reasons backed up with factual evidence. I see none. I wonder if PR0393 is a 'solution' to a problem that does not actually exist.

## C. NO EVIDENCE FOR NEED TO CHANGE

The Design Code provides 1 visitor space for every 4 dwellings. Residents and visitors happily coexist alongside one another, within this capacity, under Regent Parking since Aug 2012. Since there is no evidence a problem exists, by definition there will be none to support a need for material change.

Let's pretend for a moment there is. *Is a visitor's permit scheme the right solution?* Other options exist:

## D. ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

1. Keep existing rules (i.e. 24hr no waiting on-street, parking in bays only. Bays not restricted in any way).
2. Make all streets double yellow, particularly important to protect junctions (Highway Code 243 – *do not stop or park... within 10m of a junction*).



3. Use white access marks for driveways.
4. No need implement any complex permit scheme at all.
5. The Highway Code applies, which covers any/all violations.

This solution is:

- a very simple way (see Fig 1) to meet needs of the community.
- fully in line with Design Code\* (that cars do not dominate streetscape).
- what residents are used to already. Same as throughout Trumpington\*\*.
- best for visitors: no need to plan visits, obtain permits, nothing to pay.
- most cost effective:
  - Zero incremental set up costs (technical survey, scheme design, public engagement, consultation, prepare TRO, signs and lines are all sunk costs and/or minimised).
  - Zero incremental ongoing costs (no scheme admin, no enforcement). Only maintenance (line painting), which is sunk cost anyway.



Fig 1. *Big Bang Theory* – Genius vs IKEA. Let's not overthink it: instead keep it simple.

## E. METHOD

Regulation 22\*\* stipulates an Experimental TRO which last for 7 months, and allows resident to test drive any proposal. Only if the proposal receives >50% votes, will it become permanent TRO.

In the online nextdoor.co.uk poll I conducted, 100% of neighbours supported the experimental TRO route.

Council also benefits from avoiding risking a financial commitment to expensive solution to address a hitherto barely-existent problem.

Council can ensure majority resident support (you need >50%). In another online poll I conducted on nextdoor.co.uk, 85% were against PR0393, 15% were for it.

~~Even if you decide not to apply Regulation 22, I would suggest that your deadline of 15 Dec for Permanent TRO is way too tight, several of our neighbours have been caught unaware. The deadline should be extended to enable full, transparent consultation.~~

## F. LACK IMPACT ASSESSMENT

I see no impact assessment of PR0393. I see disadvantages in both cost and outcome:

- Unrestricted on-street parking after 6pm is plain dangerous, counter to Highway/Design code.
- Timed patrols to enforce daily 8am-6pm is very expensive.

Cost of permits need to be set very high, yet even then, Council still cannot guarantee to balance permit revenue vs running costs. If the scheme does not pay for itself, you will be stuck in a downwards spiral: falling revenues/declining patrols.

If PR0393 is seriously unpopular, you will eventually trigger an expensive variation or rescinding scheme request TRO.

## Conclusion

PR0393 is simply not worth the risk. PR0393 would be appropriate for city centre (shopper parking) and train station (commuter parking), but not Trumpington Meadows. The Alternative Proposal listed section D above is better than PR0393, and we can prove it via Experimental TRO if you wish. The existing Regent Parking rules work fine. It makes no sense wasting money to fix what's not broken.

When we moved here we was not made aware of any parking restrictions and there was no signs in the streets, I work as a 24/7 on call Mobile Roadside Technician fixing Lorries & Buses and I have to bring a van home, which I have done for 34 years, I have had so many parking tickets as there is nowhere to park the van as it will not fit in my garage as I have explained above what my job is.

We need to get into the real world of where people go to work and have work vehicles and some families have more than one car, to not be able to park outside your own house is a absolute joke, why can we not park in the roads, people use their common sense in the manor that they park their car or vehicle, At the top of the estate outside Barratts it states only parking with use of a parking permit which has been there since we moved here almost two years ago, Also it is pretty wrong to organise meetings and the people representing the parking decline to come that is very poor, I do feel the parking charges should be quashed as it makes it pretty is pointless going to work as your wages is just paying parking charges,

The introduction of parking permits will cause more problems with parking as there is no enough parking here already it is also expensive, please let us have Trumpington Residents Parking permits.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC NOTICE REF PR0393

12/12/2017

I am a member of Trumpington Meadows Community(TMC) and currently run their meetings . We had a very lively debate about this public notice at our last meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> Nov 2017 . Residents were encouraged to respond to this public notice individually . This is my response .

### 1.Inadequate notice to residents

The public notice about parking on Trumpington Meadows should have been delivered to every household affected .The few notices on lamp posts were easily missed . Only a few residents were present at the Southern Fringe Forum on 30<sup>th</sup> Oct ..The notice in the Cambridge News on 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov. was not seen by many .Gary Baldwin was invited to our meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> Nov . , when this issue was discussed . There was a lot of anger in the room because nobody from the parking policy team came to the meeting . 39 residents came to the meeting but there must be many others who are still unaware of this issue and it is an issue which affects everyone who lives at TM .

### 2.Confusion over eligible roads

The map provided with this public notice is incorrect with wrongly labelled roads eg Otter close instead of Bead rd and Falcon rd instead of Renard Way . Consequently people who live in these roads are totally confused as to whether they are eligible for parking permits or not. The city boundary zigzags between roads so some roads are half in the parish and half in the City . The boundary goes between semidetached houses and divides terrace houses . This is very divisive when different parking rules apply either side of the boundary so it is open to abuse . S.Cambs should have agreed with the City to move the boundary to the M11 when they had the opportunity in 2011 . But it was s.cambs who pulled out of negotiations with Cambridge City at the last minute . This traffic order is a classic example of the problems caused by the current ridiculous City boundary .

### 3.parking permits

Anyone who needs regular visits from carers/nannies etc will not be able to have enough parking permits per year . I understand the cost of permits is under review but £300 per year is expensive and may not cover all visits to one household per year .

### 4.Unofficial parking spaces

Currently at least 2 areas have regular parking day and night but are not marked in red on the map provided . 7 cars park on a wide pavement at the western edge of one tree green . 5 cars park on another wide pavement in Banner road alongside 2 Old Mills Rd . . Both areas are not official parking areas . The current private parking company cannot be fining theses car owners because they are there every day . This begs several questions – a) Will these areas become official parking areas? b) Will people need parking permits for these areas? c) Will they be fined for continuing to use them during the day?

### 5. Resident/visitor parking

There are very few official parking areas for visitors to use when considering the number of residents. Currently , most of these spaces are permanently used by residents who are not using their official spaces or they have too many cars in their household . The new permit scheme would free up these visitor spaces but only during the day from 8am to 6pm .

### 6.6pm to 8am the next day

There will be a free for all during the evening and night time . People will not park responsibly . Before the private parking scheme was introduced , people did park irresponsibly especially on the spine road . Some people have already admitted that visitors who come in the evening will be parking on the road outside their houses . Sanctions are the only way for making people park responsibly .

In conclusion , more thought should be given to this parking scheme . Yes , we need a decent number of visitor spaces controlled by sanctions but not a free for all during evenings and overnight . Some households need regular visitors for childcare or elderly care and this will be an extra financial burden on top of the caring cost . The position of the city boundary will create confusion with different parking rules on either side of the boundary .

## **Proposals for Parking Controls – Trumpington Meadows**

These proposals are obscure, unreasonable, and possibly illegal. Firstly, there has not been proper consultation with the residents of Trumpington Meadows. A notice should have been put through the door of every house and flat. A notice in a local paper, a few flyers on lamp posts and on cars that may or not belong to residents is not sufficient. Also it should be noted that a very large proportion of residents do not have English as their first language and must find this notice confusing.

Secondly, it is doubtful whether it is legal for you to charge for visitor permits on private roads that you have not adopted. It goes against natural justice for the residents to pay Trinity Estates for maintaining the roads and also to have to pay the County Council as well. If we pay for visitors' parking then we expect the roads to be maintained by the County and speed limits and give-way signs to be put in place.

Thirdly, to pay £3 per resident parking ticket is unreasonable. Some of the residents, especially the more elderly, have cleaning services most weeks. Also, apart from deliveries, maintenance personnel are often needed to mend appliances in these houses and flats. The off road parking bays should not be treated the same way as street parking.

In conclusion, I cannot imagine these proposals being upheld if challenged in a court of law.



I am writing to object in the strongest possible manner to the proposed parking controls in Trumpington meadows.

The reasons you state on the website are: "The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to **facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users**. The waiting restrictions are intended to **manage non-resident parking in the area and ensure that parking spaces are available for visitors**."

Having lived in Trumpington Meadows for three years, I can only assume you have never been here. We are nowhere near the centre of town, and are in an area where nobody except residents and their visitors would ever want to park, there is a perfectly good Park and Ride and Waitrose car park nearby. There is absolutely no issue with cars from outside the estate parking here, and there is absolutely no issue with the movement of traffic in the area.

**In my opinion the reason you should be quoting is the unashamed desire to raise money through parking. There can be no other reason for wishing to introduce these measures.** There is a saying "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." The current parking system is working fine. Today I went past the visitor parking in one tree road and all the spaces were empty!

Introducing the plans you have listed "no waiting between 8am and 6pm" will have the adverse effect to the one intended. It will encourage people to park on the road at night thereby causing potential issues of accessing garages, and have a genuine effect on the movement of traffic and safety of road users.

Please please leave things as they are, they are not broken. We all pay council taxes, and should not be viewed as constant sources of extra cash.

If we lived in a busy terraced street near shops, schools, the station and offices with limited or no parking spaces, this would make complete sense, and I guess would be welcomed by most residents. But charging £15 for up to 5 visitors, i.e. £3 per visitor (who might only be here for half an hour) in an area like this is totally obscene, unnecessary and downright offensive.

You will see on the attached sheet that there are no such measures on streets near us, why does Trumpington Meadows need to be singled out for such punitive measures? I repeat, we are not in the centre of town, parking is not an issue here, and neighbouring streets actually have free and ample on street parking. As you can see parking locally is NOT a big issue. All we are asking is to leave things as they are.

I am writing to object to the above proposed TRO which seeks to implement a No Waiting policy between 8am and 6pm all days of the week in the designated on-street parking bays.

The statement of reasons for the proposed TRO reads as:

*"The reason for intending to make the above named Order is to facilitate the movement of traffic and to enhance safety for all road users. The waiting restrictions are intended to manage non-resident parking in the area and ensure that parking spaces are available for visitors"*

I object on the basis that:

1. There is little proof that non-resident parking is an issue in the Trumpington Meadows estate
2. There is no proof that implementation of this policy in Trumpington Meadows will achieve the aims of "facilitated movement of traffic" and "enhanced safety"
3. The current proposal serves to inconvenience residents

Guidance used by other councils ([Bathnes.gov.uk](http://Bathnes.gov.uk), page 8) is that residents parking schemes should only be considered if "Not less than 85% of the available kerb side space is occupied for more than six hours between 8am and 6pm on five or more days a week from Monday to Saturday inclusive, and a bona fide need of residents is established" and "Not more than 50% of the car owning residents have, or could have parking available within the curtilage of their own property, or within 200 metres walking distance by way of garages or other private off-street space such as a driveway". My inclination is that both of these criteria are not met at the Trumpington Meadows estate and as such there is no basis for introducing the proposed TRO. Would you be able to provide evidence that this measure is required?

The current bays in the estate already limit the parking of cars such that the roads remain clear. There are therefore no traffic issues due to on-street parking. Additionally these bays already prevent dangerous parking by only allowing parking in approved safe areas. The of this measure will have no impact on safety or traffic flow.

The scheme proposed greatly inconveniences residents attempting to host visitors. Parking permits must be collected by residents in advance of a visitor arriving and must also be given to the visitor upon arrival. The charges proposed are significant (£15 per 5 visits) and incongruous with the other schemes in Cambridge city which all charge £8 per 5 visits. On the basis of this inconvenience (which even affects those residents who do not personally use the on-street parking bays) I believe that there should be more clear reasons and justification for this proposed TRO.

I would appreciate any response you may have to these principal concerns,

### **Reference PR0393**

There are a number of problems with this proposal

There are insufficient visitor's spaces on the Trumpington Meadows Estate, and the plan showing the proposed allowed visitor's spaces excludes some areas which are currently used without problems. Notably there is an area on One Tree Road at the western end of the green space (outlined in blue on the plan below) which is generally used by up to 8 or 9 cars, but is not coloured red on the plan. This area is particularly valuable as there is a dearth of spaces at this northern end of the estate. There seems no good reason for not allocating this area as a visitor's area, though it could be improved with a little engineering, such as moving the posts back a little into the grass and adding a kerb on the edge which the cars could drive up to, so that the posts do not get knocked over.

£3 per day seems very expensive, and the restriction to 100 visits per year seems unnecessarily mean (and maybe would encourage a black market!). Is there a good reason for restricting the numbers?

We attended a meeting at the Trumpington Meadows junior school Monday last together with about 60 other residents of the Trumpington Meadows estate. One of the matters discussed was the county councils proposals to change the parking arrangement here on the estate.

It was disappointing that you or any other council representative or a county or city councillor was present to answer questions and explain the reasons behind the council's strategy particularly when the matter is so seriously regarded by the residents.

When we purchased our house it was made clear that the current parking restrictions were a condition of sale so we were all fully aware of the situation and most houses have been provided with at least one parking space. We understood that parking on the roadways would not be permitted. A fixed penalty system is in place to enforce this and it seems to work well as there is very little on street parking. It was also explained that in due course visitor parking fees would be introduced for the parking bays.

The Councils proposals come as a surprise particularly considering that planning approval must have been granted with the the parking arrangements as a prime consideration. This is apparent as most of the site roads have no pavements. With no vehicles parked this is not too much of a problem for pedestrians or children who frequently play in the roads as they are clearly visible.

If the council's proposals are adopted then we fear that during the hours of unrestricted parking then once again vehicles will cause serious obstruction. There are many young parents living here who regularly walk out with prams and pushchairs, parked vehicles would be an immense hazard. If these proposals to allow unrestricted parking between the hours of 6pm and 8pm were a long term intention then surely pavements should have been incorporated into the development. Again we reiterate that walking down a road containing parked vehicles is extremely dangerous particularly considering the number of elderly persons residing on the estate.

Bead Road like many others on the estate is quite narrow (5 meters wide) if unrestricted parking is permitted then what is to stop vehicles being parked close to garages thus restricting access or even on both sides thus restricting traffic. It would render it very difficult if not impossible for us and possibly others to gain access to our narrow garage entrance.

Lastly most houses have low windows facing the roads and are within a meter of so from the road. A vehicle parked in front would not only restrict light but also privacy.

Since the meeting I have discussed this matter with several of my neighbours and it seems the majority of residents are not aware of your proposals. This is probably due to the sparse number of notices pinned up and the lack of a plan identifying the areas in question. Surely this information should have been more widely circulated and advertised. An explanation leaflet should have been delivered to every house/apartment with any additional information displayed in the Barratt sales office for all to view.

We strongly request that this proposal is rejected on the grounds that it will prove to cause danger and will be practically unworkable.

The statement of reasons says this policy is to facilitate movement of traffic and enhance safety for all road users. How can this be correct If unrestricted parking is permitted in our narrow roads? Vehicles will surely obstruct movement not enhance it and what about pedestrians walking along narrow roads without pavements how will this policy enhance their safety?

Re: PR0393

I am writing in protest to the proposed parking changes on Trumpington Meadows estate. I moved onto the estate in June 2015 with the express assurance from Barratt Homes that no parking was going to be allowed on my road and that parking wardens would monitor the situation. This has been done and the situation seems to be well controlled. I have a single garage and a single parking space outside it. When I have visitors, they know they have to park in one of the bays or leave their cars at the Park and Ride car park.

My road is very quiet and people walk down it to get to the country park. I am worried that if cars are parked on my road which has no footpath then children who are quite often on bikes or running ahead of their parents will have their view obstructed by the parked cars and may not see an oncoming car. Bead Road is only 5 meters in width and I have concerns that if cars are permitted to park on the road (and they will park on the grass verge too) then emergency vehicles will not be able to get through. This must be taken into consideration.

There is a wide strip of grass at the bottom of Piper Road that could be made into more visitor car parking rather than cars parking on the road.

I truly hope that this new parking scheme does not go ahead and alternative solutions can be found.



6 Mitre Buildings  
Kitson Way  
Harlow  
Essex  
CM20 1DR

DX : 40502 Harlow  
Telephone : 01279 439439  
Facsimile : 01279 775497  
Website : www.whiskers.co.uk  
Email : enquiries@whiskers.co.uk

Our ref : JJR/SJ/1ROB324-2

Your ref :

Date : 28 November, 2017

Mr. Graham Hughes  
Executive Director Economy, Transport &  
Environment Services  
c/o Policy and Regulation  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Vantage House  
Washingley Road  
Huntingdon  
PE29 6SR

Dear Sir,

**Re : Public Notice**  
**The City of Cambridge (Civil Enforcement Area)**  
**(Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places) Order 2017**  
**(Amendment No. 1) Order 20SS**

We act on behalf of [REDACTED] the proposed purchaser of [REDACTED] Osprey Drive, Cambourne, Cambridgeshire CB2 9FY (Trumpington Meadows). The property is a two double bedroomed flat.

The effect of your proposed Order is to limit ownership of cars to one per flat, we understand on the basis that this will discourage multiple car ownership. With due respect, it is not the function of the Planning process to seek to control private behaviour.

The effect of the Order, if implemented, would be to limit ownership of cars to one per Unit, save only for those Units just sufficiently large to have been allocated two car parking spaces, to say from the outset that this is therefore discriminatory, is self evident.

More importantly, if the Order is implemented, it will limit prospective purchasers to those who can manage with a single car and that will therefore rule out for example, couples, both of whom have separate places of work, couples with a child and so on. The market for these properties will be significantly reduced, with an inevitable adverse impact on the market value of the properties, perhaps by as much as 15% - 20%. It cannot be right that the residents of Trumpington Meadows should suffer financial loss, simply to assuage a "green" policy, however laudable that policy might be.

Further, and this we would have thought self evident, a decision of this nature should surely be for the residents themselves, not for councillors. While it is understood that a consultation is taking place, what attempt has been made to solicit the individual views of each and every resident at Trumpington Meadows? It surely must be for the residents to decide whether they are willing to accept restrictions of this nature.

If it is thought that there is a risk that visitors to Cambridge might seek to park within Trumpington Meadows rather than the adjoining Park & Ride in order to save the modest fee, this could be addressed simply by making all parking in Trumpington Meadows resident only, a simple solution which would not adversely impact on the residents themselves.

Finally, we note the proposals in respect of visitors permits, it being visitors only that are in fact permitted to park in the parking bays. These proposals which require residents to fund visits from loved ones or friends, and then to restrict those visits to no more than two per week, are outrageous, and beyond parody. It is not as if your Council can excuse itself on the basis that this is high density development in a City centre, this development is countryside, indeed part of the development is in South Cambridgeshire, not even Cambridge.

We would submit that if any restrictions are to be imposed, it should be a simple restriction of resident only parking throughout Trumpington Meadows.