

Sir/Madam

We are writing to object to the proposals. We were told in the consultation meeting that if we requested a PPA there would be minimal signage, no marked bays, no double yellow lines and just time-limited hours for anybody to come down as this is a no through road area. However, this is not at all what the announced plans now propose.

We object to the new plans as:

- 1) A simple PPA arrangement with permit parking in the key morning hours is all that we ask for and all that is required.
- 2) There is no indication of how many car spaces there will be, as on the consultation paper where numbers were marked in the key.
- 3) If there are double yellow lines, it will be a rat run for deliveries which could endanger children playing on the street (as well as pets).
- 4) Adding yellow lines creates an unnecessary responsibility on CCC to arrange bays and yellow lines for emergency service access. At the moment responsibility rests with residents and it works very well. As a community, traffic is self managed and lorries have to slow down as there are cars on both sides. No need for marked bays, no need for yellow lines, just signage at the entrance to the area.
- 5) If you read on line, this is not making our life better as is proposed, as we didn't have an issue in the first place. Less is more. These are family homes and we have multiple children going through different stages of life and some have cars for work reasons. PPA by all means, but with as little fuss as possible.

Dear Sir or Madam,

We are writing with regard to the proposed Benson North parking scheme, and in particular to the Sherlock Rd / Eachard Rd / Hoadley Rd / Woodlark Rd section.

We understand that there may be a need for a parking scheme for other parts of the Benson North area, for example Oxford Road, but the current proposals would be negative not positive for us as residents of Eachard Rd. If there has to be a scheme, and we see no need for one, a PPA plan with much less signage, no marked bays or double yellow lines would be more appropriate for the Square.

Our problems with the current proposals are as follows:

- 1) The current proposal does not indicate how many parking spaces will be available for residents with permits. We cannot tell if this will be an adequate number, or if there will be enough additional spaces for visitors.
- 2) Double yellow lines all round one side of the streets, will encourage drivers to go too fast on that side of the road. This already happens when there are no cars parked there. Parking needs to be in blocks on alternating sides of the road in order to create a stagger.
- 3) The double yellow lines will be in operation seven days a week 24 hours a day. So this is a limitation on us and our visitors all the time, not just when the scheme is in operation. If this scheme is about controlling commuter traffic, why have limitations all the time, which have a detrimental effect on residents?

We are also concerned about the costs of this planning and consultation process and the implementation of this scheme, which we think is unnecessary and therefore a waste of money.

Yours faithfully,

As a resident of \_\_, number \_\_, I feel very strongly that the resident Bays are not necessary. We are not affected by park and ride traffic. Not only that the double yellow lines will be an eyesore as well as being unnecessary and ridiculous that they will be in operation all week! It is already disappointing that our street is not planted with trees as are the surrounding Sherlock, Hoadley and Woodlark roads but now you are proposing to make our road even more unattractive to live on. I understand the need on Oxford Road for resident bays but it is not the same on our road and I do not feel we should be lumped together. I again feel strongly this is the wrong decision for our street and will only negatively affect those living here. We already pay a huge amount of council tax and should have more say, be heard more fairly on the planning for our road. I know a significant proportion of neighbours on \_\_ are in agreement and do NOT wish to see this proposal go ahead on our street.

yours sincerely  
(Letter separate - scanned)

We write as residents in \_\_ since \_\_\_\_, who have observed the ever-increasing demand here for parking spaces by drivers from outside the area.

While welcoming the long-overdue introduction of controlled parking in this area, we write to express our dismay that the times of restriction are different from the adjacent Benson Street scheme.

It will soon become apparent that Benson North spaces will fill up immediately after the 12 noon restriction ends. Present experience shows that in the afternoon any space vacated is filled as soon as it becomes available by drivers looking for free parking (Halifax Road in particular suffers from this phenomenon, since it is the last road with such free spaces for cars coming into Cambridge down the Huntingdon Road).

Rather than impose a temporary solution on us (implying considerable costs when it is found necessary to move to timings compatible with schemes which apply to most areas of Cambridge), we ask you to think of the long term, and extend now the hours of operation from 9.00 till 5.00. This will have the additional benefit of avoiding confusion to motorists driving from Benson North to Benson who do not pick up the difference in hours and thus find themselves liable to a fine. The additional cost to us of the change we suggest (from £52 pa to £62 pa) is unlikely to cause opposition to a doubling of the controlled hours.

(Letter separate - scanned)

Dear \_ and \_

As a resident of \_\_\_ \_\_ and a \_ at The Therapy Room, 25 Oxford Road, I would like to make you aware of my concerns about the parking restrictions being implemented in the Castle Ward area.

As a resident I can appreciate the Council's desire to do something about parking, but I'm concerned about the lack of consideration and the potential detrimental effects the proposals have on a key local business in the area - a business that not only serves the local community, but the county and its surrounding areas. The livelihoods of the 15 therapists are of importance here too.

My concerns are:

- The proposed 9am-12pm parking restrictions will limit commuters, but will have a negative impact on, not only on The Therapy Room, but local tradesmen in the area working at people's properties, visitors to St Augustine's church, and visitors to local residents.
- The restrictions will have a significant detrimental impact on patients using The Therapy Room because they remove all road parking options near the clinic. It's vital for the survival of the clinic that patients are able to park in the vicinity, particularly for those with mobility or pain issues.
- I am also concerned about the introduction of mixed bays, which could encourage a flow of traffic and parking in the area. In reality, I think these would predominantly be used by local residents, leaving few or no spaces for visitors, tradesmen, patients for The Therapy Room, or those visiting St Augustine's.

I would like the introduction of a parking window to be considered – "Max stay 2 hours, no return within 2 hours" thereby discouraging commuters from parking and walking to work, but limiting the impact on local residents and their visitors, St Augustine's Church and The Therapy Room.

Your sincerely,

To Whom It May Concern

RE PRO549

Why were Sherlock / Eachard / Woodlark and Hoadly roads included in Benson North (The Square) as we do not have any current parking problems. It would be interesting to know who actually put this forward and the reasons why.

There is the possibility that commuters displaced from Storeys Way and Oxford Road area may venture our way. But neither you, the Council, or I have sufficient proof that this will happen. You are just assuming this is going to happen.

Maybe you should look at better ways of encouraging/providing commuters with cheaper ways of leaving their cars outside the city, ie Park and Ride, instead of consistently punishing residents. Parking may be free but the charges on the buses are extortionate, £14 per week, £728 per year, which is why they won't use it. If you are on a low wage that is a lot of money.

If there is to be any issues with an influx of non residents parking in our streets it would mainly be on weekdays and gone by the evening. Also the builders are so numerous around here and arrive before 8 that others will have a hard time finding any spaces if residents always park if they are at home on the road.

We all know how to park so traffic can flow around including larger vehicles and do so.

For this reason why can't the plans for The Square be put on hold until a more clearer picture unfolds.

I did note that at the consultation meeting earlier in the year, it was said that it's now or never, was this just scare mongering to force the scheme in.

What guarantees are you giving residents that the permit fee will not rise as I note it varies across the City.

I do not have the benefit of parking outside my house as I live in one of the cul-de-sacs on \_\_\_\_. I have \_ cars which are usually parked off road but occasionally \_ or \_\_ may need to be parked roadside. So I will have to buy \_ permits. Why are the permits applicable to vehicles and not a household. Is this just to raise further revenue for the Council.

Why do you need to put double yellow lines both sides of the single track cul-de-sacs on \_\_\_\_. I believe traffic regulations state lines on one side are sufficient. In the case of the cul-de-sacs path side only. And just why do you need to put any lines at all in the cut-de-sacs. I have lived here for \_\_ years and no one has ever parked in the roadway.

Looking at the plans, available parking will be very limited, especially at weekends. Car ownership will increase as children in families grow up and start driving. Where will they park.

We are continually told it's not environmentally friendly to pave over front gardens. Have you taken this into consideration. I very much doubt it.

What is a pleasant residential area will be spoilt with road markings and signs for ever.

Putting double yellows down one side of the roads in The Square will allow vehicles to travel at speed unhindered. Delivery drivers in particular will be able to fly up and down the roads. At present with cars parked sensibly on both sides, vehicles have to travel slowly.

The whole scheme is flawed and for the reasons given above I object to the scheme in its entirety for The Square until sufficient evidence is shown that we need parking restrictions.

Regards

Dear Policy and Regulation team,

Thank you for keeping us informed regarding the next phase of the proposed residents' permit parking scheme for the Benson North Area.

It is encouraging that action is being taken to improve the traffic calming in Oxford and Windsor Roads: in combination with this proposed parking scheme, local residents will stand to benefit.

I am, however, disappointed and surprised that you allow residents of eligible addresses up to three permits. The area is well served by local transport, and is within easy cycling distance to the centre of town. Please reconsider this overgenerous concession as a positive contribution towards the mitigation of global climate change and local air pollution.

With kind regards,

I'd just like to say that I wholeheartedly support the proposals for residents' parking in the so-called Benson North Area.

Such measures are very long overdue and I think that the Mon-Fri 9am-12noon option would work well, deterring commuters, who are the bane of our lives in these roads, but allowing visitors, care workers, friends and the like to park here throughout most of the day.

Yours,

RE PR0549

I am pleased to learn that the long overdue residents parking scheme for Oxford Road is going ahead. I do strongly feel that the parking restrictions for non residents should be extended beyond 12 noon to be in keeping with the adjacent scheme covering Canterbury street.

Good morning

Thank you for the recent information received about the proposed Residents' Permit Parking Scheme being investigated for Benson North area.

First of all - I am opposed to the scheme (and also to the separate expensive traffic measures being planned for this area).

Second - I have a specific objection to the fact that parking in my particular area of \_\_ is going to be especially restricted: not only are we losing parking spaces as a result of the new double-yellow line near \_\_ Oxford Road but we will also lose all the parking spaces on Wentworth Road where metering is being installed. In practice, it will become impossible to park our cars in the area near our house. The current system works very well and has nothing has changed in the \_\_\_ years while I've been living here.

I'd like to object formally to the Permit Parking Scheme, to the broader traffic changes being made on Oxford Road, and - specifically - to the severe restrictions to parking being applied in the immediate vicinity of my own house. We will no longer be able to park near our house. I'd also like to register the fact that this would seem to be an inappropriate time for such a large amount of public money to be spent on these schemes in the current social and economic climate.

Thank you for taking this into consideration.

Kind regards.

Ref PRO549

Dear Mr. \_

Further to the consultation please note I wish to vote NO to the introduction of a scheme. I have never had difficulty parking close to my property and feel it is unnecessary and will make life more difficult for deliveries, visitors etc.

If you are not the right person to write to concerning this please advise.

Thanking you.

Yours

(Letter separate - scanned)

Hello

Looking at the drawing shown at <https://ccc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/PR0549%20Drawing%201%20%28Oxford%20Road%20area%29.pdf?inline=true>, it appears (though there is no key on that drawing) that the proposal would include parking bays installed over a dropped curb and garage entrance to what would be nos. \_\_\_-\_\_\_ \_\_.

Can you please assure me that this is not the case?

Thank you

\_\_ (\_ of the property)

Hello

Looking at the drawing shown at <https://ccc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/PR0549%20Drawing%201%20%28Oxford%20Road%20area%29.pdf?inline=true>, it appears (though there is no key on that drawing) that the proposal would include parking bays installed over a dropped curb and garage entrance to what would be nos. \_\_\_-\_\_\_ \_\_.

Can you please assure me that this is not the case?

Thank you

\_\_ (\_ of the property)

Dear \_\_.

Thank you for replying so promptly.

It is true that we have not been in the habit of using our garage, on the plot of land which would be numbered \_\_\_ (not \_\_)-\_\_\_, \_\_. However, in view of the proposed parking restrictions, we will obviously need to use it more, and we will have to 're-open' it, as you say.

I am curious as to what 'responses to our earlier consultation' you are referring to: we were certainly not consulted, and I would have thought that the owners of the property would be the first and most important people to be consulted in the matter

I wonder what action we should take which would establish that we had 're-opened' our access: I am a bit concerned that you say only that you would 'consider' a break in the parking bay so that we would be able to use our garage.

I will hope to hear from you.

Thank you

Dear \_\_

When I go to the site [cambridgeshire/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/ParkingFAQ](http://cambridgeshire/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/ParkingFAQ), (referred there by a letter I received from my county councillor) I read:

Q How will the scheme affect the use of my private driveway?

A You do not need a permit to park on your driveway or any other private areas of land. If you have a constructed access with dropped kerbs, we will not mark a bay across it.

In view of this advice, and of the admitted fact of 'a constructed access with dropped kerbs', I must ask you to correct the error in the plan you have submitted.

Thank you

Dear \_ \_

I am forwarding an email I had sent some time ago to your colleague, \_ \_ , who referred me to you, to which he has replied both by email and on the 'phone that he does not have the authority to give me the assurance that I require.

I will try to telephone you to speak of this matter

Thank you

Dear \_ \_

Thank you very much for attending to this so quickly.

I told my \_ the glad news, and he asked that you would be asked to confirm this in writing.

My address is \_ , \_ \_ . \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ .

Can you include in the confirmation the actual nominal address of that part of our property, \_ - \_ \_ \_ , so that it is clear in your letter which address 'your garage' refers to. Sorry to be so pernickety...

Thank you again

As long term members of the local community we have enjoyed living in the area and having the excellent community facilities we all share. While at times parking can be a little difficult we as \_ car owners leaving and arriving at different times of the day have seldom had to look elsewhere to find a space. We have always believed that having a thriving community hall and a lovely location more than makes up for a little disruption.

The idea of having residents parking is totally at odds with our views and presents no additional advantage to us or to the many people who utilise our local facilities. In fact the idea of paying another road tax on top of our car license to park on the road to us is unwarranted and unnecessary.

It also feels quite unfair that neighbours with drop down curbs should be included in the consultation given they are already taking up road parking space and will not have to pay a residents charge if introduced. Also a charge for friends coming to stay with is totally against our values.

Furthermore, I note that dual use parking has also identified our terrace as one of the two designated to have the dual parking restrictions imposed presumably with ticket machines. As long term opponents to residents parking it would be doubly insulting to have meters located outside our garden and trust if enforced, any machines will be located outside the community hall for users to access.

Finally, as given the closeness of the opposing views for residents parking and the low number of responses to previous consultations on residents parking I would expect any decision to change the status quo will be based on a proper majority of those in favour of it i.e. 60/40.

Should this scheme go ahead I would recommend the time slots 9-10 am and 2 -3 pm to minimize inconvenience to residents as observed in the South Wimbledon area.

Thank you for enabling our voices to be taken into consideration.

We have both read the proposal in detail, attended the exhibition at Mayfield School and responded to the consultation. Although there are several aspects of the proposal that we personally would not have wanted, and we still feel it was odd to bundle together streets which have little in common, I suppose it does represent a 'fair' compromise, in that almost nobody I have spoken to is going to get what they really wanted but most get at least some aspect of it.

We note that it has the positive support of 19.25% of the residents in the area, which I guess is rather better than the current government, but is a pretty sad reflection of people's involvement!

Anyway, be that as it may, our thoughts and concerns on the design etc were included in our response to the consultation, and conversations at the exhibition, so there is little point in repeating them here. There is however one request we would urge you to consider.

We understand that it is possible to introduce such a scheme on a trial basis and this we would like to do. The law of unforeseen consequences (and many years professional work) have shown that things rarely turn out quite how we expect when it comes to predicting human behavior. So, if the scheme could be initially introduced on a trial basis, it could then be 'tweaked' when we have all earned for experience of the actual effect.

Regards

Dear Sir

I live in \_\_\_ Cambridge and hold a Disabled Drivers badge. I wonder if you would consider one or possibly two Disabled parking bays in the area outside \_\_\_ of the \_\_\_ flats. It would be very helpful to residents with badges and visitors.

yours sincerely

\_\_\_ is not on the section of map shown, it contains flats \_\_\_ to \_\_\_ and is side on to the road up the path by the row of cars parked side on to the road. It is the first building after \_\_\_.

I hope that helps

Sir

Thank you for your latest letter. I do not ask for a private parking bay, but ask that at least one disabled bay is provided in this area as there are many elderly residents in the \_\_\_ flats that make up \_\_\_. One bay outside \_\_\_ seems inadequate.

I leave the matter in your hands, I know there is a great deal to be considered.

Sir,

I am strongly opposed to the proposed parking scheme in the area where I live.

\_\_\_ is a quiet cul de sac and we have never experienced unusual parking during the week or week ends. Parking for residents has always been easy and there is no need of restrictions.

I see no logical reasons on why this scheme should be imposed on our small community

I hope you will give proper consideration to this letter

Kind regard



Dear \_\_ \_\_,

Thanks for you prompt response

FYI, attached is the delivery error message that I kept receiving for the last 7 days, when trying to send my e-mail

Kind regards

Dear \_\_ \_\_,

I no longer have the letter with me but of course I trust what you say

So, apologies for my earlier complaint and thanks for your kindness and patience

I wish you a good day

Dear Sir/Madam

I am in support of the installation of residents parking in \_\_ \_\_.

I would like to make two comments:

1 Please remove the single parking bay outside \_\_ \_\_ \_\_ (in the cup-de-sac).

I live at \_\_\_\_, in the cul-de-sac, and frequently witness problems of vehicles turning in the cul-de-sac. This causes problems for pedestrians, cyclists and cars. By removing this one parking bay, the south side of the cul-de-sac will be clear of parked vehicles, giving a safer route for cyclists and making turning at that corner easier. Now that the \_\_ opens into \_\_ \_\_ cul-de-sac, there is a constant increase in cyclists using this route, and this increase is set to continue as Eddington is populated, hence safety for cyclists in the cul-de-sac is of major importance. Removing this one parking bay would make installation of residents parking cheaper (no need for a sign) and is an easy way to ensure cycle safety is a priority.

2 I think we only need a one hour parking restriction, to prevent commuter parking. Whilst I appreciate traffic wardens need time to make their rounds, surely this could be managed within one hour? At most, the 3 hour restriction currently proposed should be permitted.

Yours sincerely

Hello,

I moved recently to \_\_\_\_, on \_\_\_\_\_. I have found that a public vote has been carried out a month before I moved in and also found that now it is in the statutory consultation stage until 27th August. For what I have read, residents are still able to have a say and send comments before the deadline (27th August). Although I could not find where to send my comments. Is it to this email the correct place? Please, find my comment bellow. Also, When I should start applying for the resident permit? I believe this is after the final decision in October 2019?

Comment:

"As I moved into \_\_ just a few weeks after the public vote I did not have the chance to vote for something that directly affects me and might be implemented after me being a formal resident in the area. Therefore, I would like to express my opinion during the "Statutory Consultation step that finishes on 27th August 2019.

As a formal resident in Benson North area since \_\_\_\_\_ 2019, I would like to say NO to the Proposed Residents Parking Scheme in Benson North area, Cambridge.

My details:

\_\_ and \_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_, \_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_."

Thank you very much for your attention.

Best,

We welcome the decision of the Council to take this parking scheme forward and express our wish for it to be implemented at the earliest possible date.

We live in \_\_ which is constantly overrun by dayparkers, often blocking pavements and compromising the movement of service and delivery vehicles.

There is an urgent need for a managed parking arrangement.

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the statutory consultation for the Benson North Parking Scheme.

We live in \_\_ \_\_ \_\_, \_\_ \_\_ \_\_ \_\_, and we are strongly in favour of the introduction of the Scheme.

We provided a number of comments during the public consultation stage, and we are grateful for your responses at that time.

At this stage we would simply like to express our strong support for the Scheme and to repeat one of the comments we made at the earlier consultation stage, that relating to the hours of operation..

The Scheme as proposed will only operate between 9am and 12 noon. \_\_ \_\_ is situated directly opposite Churchill College, and close to Fitzwilliam and Murray Edwards Colleges. As such we experience two distinct types of parking congestion - commuter parking and day/conference visitors to the Colleges, even though there are College car parks.

The proposed hours of operation will tackle the commuter parking issue, but will not significantly affect the parking relating to College staff/visitors into the evening.

We would request that the hours of operation be re-considered, and be extended to between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday.

As we are unfamiliar with the details of consultations such as this, please do let us know if you need us to provide any more information.

Many thanks

Yours faithfully

Residents Parking in \_\_ \_\_ - charges

Dear Sir or Madam

I am a \_\_-year-long resident of \_\_ \_\_ and I have no desire to start paying for the right to park outside my house. It is something that I currently do for free.

I have never had any difficulty parking in my street and I don't expect to have any difficulty in the future.

Please add my name to those who are AGAINST this proposal to start charging residents for parking space.

Yours sincerely

Dear \_\_ \_\_,

As a resident of \_\_ \_\_ and an \_\_ at The Therapy Room at 25 Oxford Road I can see the stances on both sides of the argument for and against the restrictions to be implemented. However I do not think you have considered the detrimental effects on a key local business in the area that not only serves the local community and county but provides work for more than 15 people.

I would be most grateful if you could read my concerns and suggestions for the residents parking zone outlined below:

1. It is to be too stringent on local parking for patients by removing all road parking options nearby to the clinic. Due to the clinics' success and outreach many patients come by car because of poor public transport access and because of need due to being in pain. It is vital we have road parking for them. If the parking measures are excessive (too long hours and not enough/close enough parking for the clinic) then relaxing them at a later date once the harm to the community has been noticed will have already damaged the clinic in ways that would take a long time to recover from. It is better to start lighter and then increase limitations as necessary, especially as the majority community has not recognised a major issue with parking but sided with preference for residential parking in the area.

2. The proposed 9am-12pm hours will certainly limit commuters but has negative impacts too - it will hamper tradesmen in the street, attendants of St Augustine's, visitors to local residents (especially small gatherings in the day which my elderly neighbour enjoys with her friends) and will certainly challenge the clinic. What I would like to propose is two hour long windows on either side of the street 9.30am-10.30am on one side and 1.30pm-2.30pm on the other side thus preventing people from using the road to park on and walk to work, which from attending residents meetings is the largest concern. It would meet all parking issues head on whilst allowing the concerns for the clinic and local residents about the challenges surrounding the scheme to be put to bed.

This style of residents parking is done in Colchester to prevent people parking and walking to the train station in Mile End Road, it works extremely effectively.

3. Paid for mixed bays - I understand that mixed bays have been proposed for Wentworth Road and Richmond Road to improve ease of access for the church which comes across as a rather cruel cost to implement on a place that benefits the community in many ways. Furthermore if residents choose to park in these bays all day there will be no incentive to move and there will be no flow of parking spaces which may make it difficult for those to attend the church and activities there. Potentially some bays need a limit of how long they can park there for, possibly a "2 hour limit." Similarly the same would go for the clinic but those spaces would be too far for patients who are in pain. What I proposed in point 2 would allow parking to flow and allow people to still enjoy the local services.

4. Traffic calming measures - although these are a good idea they will put further pressure on parking in the area due to further reduction in numbers of spaces. One width restriction on Windsor Road is surely enough, there have been issues with Emergency services getting down the roads as it is, please don't oversee the bigger picture, peoples lives ought not to be negatively impacted by the measures and currently from what is being proposed it will have many detrimental effects on the community.

Having lived in \_\_ \_\_ most of my life and worked on Oxford Road for \_\_ years I very much understand the balance required - parking in the area has always been busy but never impractical. The solutions outlined by the council seem short sighted, relatively excessive in light of what is required and damaging towards the clinic which helps many people in many ways. Please consider the two short windows time slots for two sides of the road, residents wouldn't need to move through the day due to permits but this strategy would keep a steady flow for visitors, tradesman, church goers and patients to the clinic without a negative effect on parking for the residents and would certainly reduce the strain on parking on the road. If there are still complaints then hours may be adjusted to find tighter constraints to appease this but I do not believe there to be a major parking issue at present nor in the last 32 years so the radical measures that have been offered are likely to be far too drastic for what only needs mildly adjusting.

Your sincerely,

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please take my notes and opinions on board, \_\_ merely replied with a blanket email template that came across as lazy and unprofessional - the parking scheme as outlined is likely to harm the Therapy Room, a local health clinic to a level that it would cease to exist. A shorter set of windows on either side of the road at different times of the day as I outline in point two would be extremely effective and minimally intrusive.

As a resident of \_\_ and an \_\_ at The Therapy Room at 25 Oxford Road I am writing to you to voice my opinion regarding the residents permit parking scheme in Benson North. I can fully understand the need to reduce congestion on roads in Cambridge and in residential areas however I do not think you have considered the detrimental effects on a key local business in the area that not only serves the local community and county but provides work for more than 15 people.

I would be most grateful if you could read my concerns and suggestions for the residents parking zone outlined below:

1. It is to be too stringent on local parking for patients by removing all road parking options nearby to the clinic. Due to the clinics' success and outreach many patients come by car because of poor public transport access and because of need due to being in pain. It is vital we have road parking for them. If the parking measures are excessive (too long hours and not enough/close enough parking for the clinic) then relaxing them at a later date once the harm to the community has been noticed will have already damaged the clinic in ways that would take a long time to recover from. It is better to start lighter and then increase limitations as necessary, especially as the majority community has not recognised a major issue with parking but sided with preference for residential parking in the area.

2. The proposed 9am-12pm hours will certainly limit commuters but has negative impacts too - it will hamper tradesmen in the street, attendants of St Augustine's, visitors to local residents (especially small gatherings in the day which my elderly neighbour enjoys with her friends) and will certainly challenge the clinic. What I would like to propose is two hour long windows on either side of the street 9.30am-10.30am on one side and 1.30pm-2.30pm on the other side thus preventing people from using the road to park on and walk to work, which from attending residents meetings is the largest concern. It would meet all parking issues head on whilst allowing the concerns for the clinic and local residents about the challenges surrounding the scheme to be put to bed.

This style of residents parking is done in Colchester to prevent people parking and walking to the train station in Mile End Road, it works extremely effectively.

3. Paid for mixed bays - I understand that mixed bays have been proposed for Wentworth Road and Richmond Road to improve ease of access for the church which comes across as a rather cruel cost to implement on a place that benefits the community in many ways. Furthermore if residents choose to park in these bays all day there will be no incentive to move and there will be no flow of parking spaces which may make it difficult for those to attend the church and activities there. Potentially some bays need a limit of how long they can park there for, possibly a "2 hour limit." Similarly the same would go for the clinic but those spaces would be too far for patients who are in pain. What I proposed in point 2 would allow parking to flow and allow people to still enjoy the local services.

4. Traffic calming measures - although these are a good idea they will put further pressure on parking in the area due to further reduction in numbers of spaces. One width restriction on Windsor Road is surely enough, there have been issues with Emergency services getting down the roads as it is, please don't oversee the bigger picture, peoples lives ought not to be negatively impacted by the measures and currently from what is being proposed it will have many detrimental effects on the community.

Having lived in \_\_ most of my life and worked on Oxford Road for 9 years I very much understand the balance required - parking in the area has always been busy but never impractical. The solutions outlined by the council seem short sighted, relatively excessive in light of what is required and damaging towards the clinic which helps many people in many ways. Please consider the two short windows time slots for two sides of the road, residents wouldn't need to move through the day due to permits but this strategy would keep a steady flow for visitors, tradesman, church goers and patients to the clinic without a negative effect on parking for the residents and would certainly reduce the strain on parking on the road. If there are still complaints then hours may be adjusted to find tighter constraints to appease this but I do not believe there to be a major parking issue at present nor in the last 32 years so the radical measures that have been offered are likely to be far too drastic for what only needs mildly adjusting.

Your sincerely,

I would like to provide feedback on the Benson North statutory consultation.

I strongly oppose the design of parking bays on Windsor Road. Alternating double yellow lines and parking bays increases very substantially the risk that the road becomes inaccessible to emergency services (especially fire engines), council services (bin and recycling lorries), and private delivery vehicles. Earlier this year my car would not start and needed to be towed to a local garage. The tow vehicle had to reverse along Windsor Road and was then able to turn into Oxford Road. This was only possible because Windsor Road residents who live between Oxford Road and the cut-through currently park on the north side of the road leaving the south side clear to traffic. Any deliveries from other large vehicles (eg builders merchants etc) could potentially be impeded by the proposed parking layout. While it would be possible for parking bays to be suspended for known access requirements, this is not possible in the case of emergencies.

While I understand that the aim of alternating bays is to reduce traffic speeds, my view is that accessibility should take priority. I note that the location of the bays on Sherlock Road, Eachard Road, Woodlark Road and Hoadley Road is on one side of the street only. I see no reason why Windsor Road should not be treated the same.

I also oppose the timing restriction of 09:00-12:00 and would support a two hour restriction, preferably 10:00-12:00.

Hello.

I wish to register my support for the proposed resident's parking scheme referenced above (Benson North Area).

As new developments arrive in the area, I believe schemes such as this are important to control overspill parking into residential areas. I live on \_\_ and although this may not currently be a 'first choice' location for overspill or commuter parking, it soon will be as parking is limited on the surrounding roads. As the residents of Benson North have indicated that a resident's parking scheme should be implemented, I believe it is critical that Windsor Road is included in the scheme.

Furthermore, the proposed addition double yellow lines along Windsor Road will be of great benefit to those residents like myself who make use of our private driveways. Windsor Road is narrow as is the dropped kerb access to driveways. Inconsiderate parking leads to access on or off private driveways being difficult or, on occasions, impossible. Your proposal to limit parking to one side of the road with overlapped areas of no parking will address this issue. I also believe this step is important to ensure access for emergency, service and delivery vehicles to the entire length of Windsor Road.

Kind regards.

Dear Sir/Madam.

As a resident of \_\_, in general I'm in favour of the proposed residents parking scheme and gave my feedback in the earlier consultation.

I would comment that allowing households to apply for as many as 3 permits seems excessive. On Windsor Road, all have drives that accommodate 1 or often 2 cars off-road. (They can certainly be enlarged to take 2 cars.)

Then, we are going to have double-yellow lines that (effectively) mean two households end up sharing a single "frontage". On this road, that would mean available parking of maybe 2 average or 3 small cars per two households while in theory those households might have applied for 6 permits.

So I'd be in favour of putting the number of permits at 2 per household for Windsor Road and any other road where similar arguments can be made.

Kind regards,

I would like to respond to the Proposed Residents' Permit Parking Scheme - Benson North Area. My area of interest is in the proposed parking scheme for \_\_.

I am supportive of the proposed layout of the parking bays and double-yellow lines on \_\_.

In particular I am supportive of the following features of the parking bays and double-yellow lines layout:

1. The parking bays alternate between both sides of Windsor Road several times on the northern (cul-de-sac) end of the road. This has the benefit of narrowing the "visual width" of the road which discourages drivers from driving at high speed.
2. There are some parking bays on both sides of Windsor Road on the south end of the road (from the Oxford Road junction to the Histon Road junction). This again has the benefit of narrowing the "visual width" of the road and helps to traffic-calm the section of Windsor Road subject to rat-run traffic flows.

Thanks and Best Regards,

I am writing in response to the proposals for residents permit parking scheme in Benson North area. Reference PR0549.

I understand why this has been suggested and accept the majority decision supporting the scheme.

I do however feel it very unfair to charge for residents to park outside their own houses when we pay a significant council tax already. We are being penalised for people coming into the city who choose not to pay for parking, as it is so expensive, or do not wish to use the park and ride scheme. I feel it would be fair for residents to have the first permit free of charge and then to pay for any subsequent ones.

Hi,

I am a resident of \_\_ and I have the following comments on the proposed implementation of the Residents' Permit Parking scheme for Sherlock Road, Woodlark Road, Hoadley Road and Eachard Road ("the square") in the Benson North Area.

1. Please do not put double yellow lines on these streets.

At the moment, residents stagger parking on both sides, which creates a natural traffic-calming chicane. Double yellow lines will force all parking to be on the same side of the road. This will create a straight length of carriageway that will encourage cars and delivery vans to drive considerably faster than is currently possible. There are many children living on these streets, most of who cycle around the area and to/from the local schools. Please do not put their safety at risk!

Also, road markings and signage are generally unattractive, please minimise as much as possible to preserve the street view. As this will be a Permit Parking Area (PPA), the only signage required should be a notice at entry to the PPA on Sherlock Road.

2. Please consider changing the hours of operation to 9am-10am, Monday to Friday.

The hours of operation are currently planned as 9am-12noon, Monday to Friday. Please consider reducing this to 9am-10am, Monday to Friday. This will be enough to stop the vast majority of commuters from parking, but will make it much easier for residents to arrange tradespeople, deliveries etc.

Kind regards,

We hereby object to the proposed installation of a residents parking scheme relating to PRO549 on the following grounds:

1) the whole process has been flawed and information hard or near impossible to assess on line using the links and information given by the powers that be.....even accessing the information through Shire Hall reception was difficult and the scheme was not ready to look at. I had to wait a long time whilst the helpful man at the desk first searched where it should have been ,then made several phone calls to locate and finally print out. This was following spending precious time over several days looking on line.

2) My husband and I attended the initial consultation at Mayfield school and spoke to two councillors and also transport officials to try to understand the proposals as per the original plans sent to us, which had tiny writing and small print . ( Even my neighbour had missed the fact that double yellow lines would be all around the outside of the square and by the flats too, as. a result of which she changed her vote to no after I had informed her . Information and implications were not made clear ) .

3) We were told at the original consultation that if we asked for a PPA ( the transport officer admitted he was not familiar with our area ) and the area was not a through road that a PPA could be considered, I was clearly told by a number of officials and councillors that a PPA would just mean a ,sign at Huntingdon Road end of our square with small repeater signs , NO MARKED BAYS AND NO DOUBLE YELLOW LINES . Therefore this at the time appeared to be a good way forward but based on erroneous information., and further discussions to be had regarding times at which PPA would be operational . I even offered to take the transport Official around the area as it was a stone throw away he declined .

An important issue that came up time and time again before we talked about PPA s was that if the council don't put in the bays and the double yellow lines ,then the council looks bad /gets into trouble / financial implications with the Fire department ..... maybe you can cast more light on this?

4) A major complaint is that we have been 'lumped in ' with the surrounding roads that have commuter parking and apart from Storeys Way and Windsor Rd have few if any driveways. My understanding now is that we were not originally included? Why did that change?

The view propagated by Smart Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the County Council is that residents parking is required to enhance and improve the access to local residents properties..... this proposal that is now going to statutory level does the exact opposite for Sherlock Rd , Woodlark Rd. Eachard Rd and Hoadly Rd. We have NEVER had an issue in the Square and we all park with consideration . If DOUBLE YELLOW LINES are imposed it is unlikely there will be enough spaces for local residents ( especially when having family gatherings at a weekend . Moreover as some established families here are at the stage of their teenagers and up to mid twenties adults either living at home or learning to drive, the number of vehicles per household could increase for a considerable time. There will be no parking for them . ( I accept that in an ideal world their would be car sharing, or cycling all the time ) .

In addition, even without visitors we do not believe there will not be enough on the road capacity for local people if DOUBLE YELLOWS are imposed. so much , for the improving things for local residents it is definitely the opposite.

5) a further objection is since the original rather inadequate survey ( similar to Newnham Area, which I understand took two and a half years of consultation to refine and resolve after the original consultation ....I hope we will be given the same courtesy and resolve on your part ) is that there are building works going on at the top end of Woodlark Road on the flats that are set back from the road and this will create more pressure on parking if the owner builds on the front area near the bungalow . There might not be sufficient parking on or off site ( what market are these flats aimed at ....if students ARU permit cars whilst Cambridge University does not ..... if privately rented then who knows ). Could this be clarified maybe as we move forward with further consultation in our Square .

6) We have spoken to several residents at Sherlock road flats who are worried they will not have parking space on the road. Many of them are elderly have no internet and could arguably have been disenfranchised from the whole process. Indeed my elderly next door neighbour is currently in hospital with an injured right arm and in any event has no internet and for personal reasons was not able to access fliers etc from you with information about this latest phase in the process and therefore has been unable to vote against the scheme , despite voting against via a letter at consultation stage , Also many people are away over the summer.

7) DOUBLE YELLOW lines will also make our area a rat run for the numerous ,frequent delivery lorries and cars that will have no reason to slow down but need to meet their TARGETS of 3 minutes a delivery .... at least with



residents parked on both sides it slows them down . Suggesting double yellows interspersed on both sides would not work as it would in all likelihood leave even less parking . We do have local children playing cricket on our roads very sensibly and fast delivery personnel would be dangerous.

8) I understand when the Stratton ave/Harvey Goodwin consultation was undertaken a while ago that they voted against residents parking preferring to share with commuters during the day and being able to park outside their houses at night ..... if this is the only way of not getting DOUBLE YELLOW LINES then maybe we should opt for nothing and take a chance of sharing our area.....it may never happen .

9) I understand the the Double yellows are required because of the width of our road should we become a PPA , but I also understand that the Fire service purchased three smaller fire engines for this purpose ? Is this correct then there is a solution ?

10) We also object on the grounds that the cost of parking permits will no doubt increase ( something beyond our control ) and indeed could be pitched at the higher rate charged at Brooklands Ave and Accordia area levels which I am lead to understand is nearer 90 pounds per vehicle.

11) Also if you live in an extended household with young adults ( by necessity ) the number of visitors permits allowed per year is NOT sufficient , they should be unlimited , both my \_ and \_ come from \_ \_ and indeed we have \_ \_ \_ who visit regularly ..... we would soon run out of permitted visits per year.

So, we have objected on 11 grounds ..... we may have more when it comes to further consultation with us depending on your views . I would also add that there was a fair bit of 'scare-mongering ' going on in the background that we would be inundated with commuters..... however I note the Newnham area people in one bit that had been left out were told they could come back to your authority if things did not seem to be working . If that is the case and PRO549 was removed from the scheme then presumably when you do the consultation for the Mayfield Area at some future date we could be joined with them should it be necessary ? A potential solution .

Could you please confirm , initially , that this objection satisfies the ambiguous terminology and instruction in the PUBLIC NOTICE ' to reach us by not later than 27th August 2019.

Thank you .

Hi there

I would like to lodge a complaint against this parking scheme in my area. We live on \_ \_ and I don't ever recall in the \_ \_ years I've lived here having a problem finding parking. I don't believe that resident parking restrictions further into town will make a difference to this moving forward.

Additionally, I have looked at the suggested plans and am not in favour of having the parking bays solely on one side of the road. The current, more random, nature of parking along the street naturally slows the cars down as they have to navigate cars parked on both sides of the road. I understand that this might help emergency vehicles move along the road but I'm sure the parking bays can be arranged safely so that this is still the case whilst still allowing safe emergency access. We have a 20mph speed limit but many of the delivery drivers / builder workers who drive down the road don't take this into account if they have a straight run.

I look forward to hearing how you will address these concerns.

Best regards

Dear Sir or Madam,

With respect to the proposed scheme above, whilst I do agree that measures to reduce commuter parking on these roads is appropriate - and indeed, when the wider area scheme is implemented, will become essential - I am concerned that the measures as proposed are unduly inconvenient for residents. Notably, the measure of double-yellow lines and parking bays seem exaggerated in the extreme, and will look very ugly.

Why can we not have single yellow lines - with perhaps double yellow in selected areas - and parking restricted to residents only 0900-1200 or 0900-1600 Monday to Friday? This seems to work well in other areas.

Whilst my own house has enough driveway parking for our vehicles - and most others could convert their gardens to accommodate more - my main concern is that there are always a few houses down each road in the Woodlark/Sherlock/Eachard/Hoadly square having work done - extensions, renovations, new kitchens etc. - often requiring multiple builders' vans during the day. Where will these go? And where will visitors park, given that the restricted number of proposed parking spaces mean that there is unlikely to be room for them?

I personally have local tradespeople who come by car to wash the windows, mow the lawn and clean the house, usually while I am at work. Normally I put one of our cars on the road so they can park or, if both our cars happen to be on the drive, they can park on the road. If there is even a possibility of them coming, under the new scheme I will have to leave one of our cars in the road, further exacerbating the pressure on parking spaces.

I have also been told that the building work mid-way along Woodlark Road is to create new flats with increased occupancy, which will have the same effect.

I suppose it depends on whether the purpose is to solely to block commuter parking for the benefit of residents, or to also reduce overall car use by residents. If the latter, then the plans probably make more sense. If the former, is some further thought possible?

Many thanks for considering these points.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your round robin letter dated 8.7.2019. I wish to comment.

1. A relatively modest response rate was probably to be expected in a road where many of the occupiers are renting their properties and probably are less committed to the wellbeing of owner occupiers and a good proportion are elderly without cars.
2. Today has been a classic example of what happens early. Please see attached photo which shows six vans parked from 7am. They are used by workers operating on the building site near Murray Edwards College. [The nearest of two providing a couple of workers each helping install reinforced concrete] Your proposed regulations will deter them. I doubt if they will ease our plight in the afternoons when shoppers park. I would have preferred to see the regulations cover the working day which is increasingly 8am to 6pm.

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your round robin letter dated 8.7.2019. I wish to comment.

1. A relatively modest response rate was probably to be expected in a road where many of the occupiers are renting their properties and probably are less committed to the wellbeing of owner occupiers and a good proportion are elderly without cars.
2. Today has been a classic example of what happens early. Please see attached photo which shows six vans parked from 7am. They are used by workers operating on the building site near Murray Edwards College. [The nearest of two providing a couple of workers each helping install reinforced concrete] Your proposed regulations will deter them. I doubt if they will ease our plight in the afternoons when shoppers park. I would have preferred to see the regulations cover the working day which is increasingly 8am to 6pm.

Dear Policy and Regulation Team,

Thank you for writing today to inform us about the resident parking being approved for \_\_ area.

This proved to be extremely good timing as I came home today to rubbish strewn over the street including a plastic bottle of what looks to be urine - thanks to commuter parking. I also have had a car parked outside my house for the last 3 weeks, so the sooner the better as far as I am concerned.

Appreciate you giving residents the opportunity to vote on the matter and hope for a speedy conclusion.

Yours sincerely,

I am disappointed that the scheme is going ahead without any of the concerns raised being considered.

As a resident of \_\_, our concerns are very different to many others of those in the same scheme as they have off road parking.

Below I outline again my request and would appreciate a response as to why the scheme cannot accommodate this.

1/ Canterbury street currently have parking bays that sit empty because the residents there have off road parking. As we will be losing parking spaces, we would like the corner of Canterbury street to be included with our scheme to compensate for this.

2/ Canterbury street also has a permit to include Saturday and for longer hours-(8-5?).

Saturday parking is still problematic with shoppers and if we are having to pay for a permit I would rather it included Saturdays to ensure we could park then too.

I look forward to hearing back from you with regards to the above.

Kind regards,

Following on from my email, I attach a video taken at midday today, Saturday 13th July, clearly illustrating the problem detailed in my email below- Saturday shoppers parked; Canterbury street bays empty. This was the same when I was out at 2.00 pm and 4.30 pm too.

Consequently, we had to park 3 streets away, which currently is fine as it is the same for everyone, but not acceptable if we are going to have to start paying for parking and still be unable to park on a Saturday (as it is not included in the permit hours although Canterbury is).

kind regards,

Hello,

I would like to register my strong objection to the residents' parking scheme in the so-called 'Benson North' area. I do not believe that 55% majority is sufficient to justify the outlay of funds and subsequent cost and inconvenience to residents. Please could you provide the following information:

- What caused the consultation to take place - was it called for by residents, or a scheme dreamt up by the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership?
- How much the scheme will cost to implement - signage, monitoring, administration
- A breakdown of household responses by road - whether my road ( \_ \_ ) actually was in favour
- An explanation of why households need to pay for a parking permit to park where they currently do for free, given that the our road is only ever full weekends which this will not affect, and even then there is still no problem parking
- Where all the commuters apparently parking on these roads will be able to leave their cars if this scheme is enforced

I would also like to point out that during the operational hours, many households won't be using the on-street parking as they'll have driven their cars to work - and in the evening any commuters using this parking will have left. At the moment this is an efficient use of parking space.

Given the many other problems in Cambridgeshire I think this is a serious waste of money which could be better spent on almost anything else within the 'transport improvements' heading, eg subsidising the park and ride bus fares, not to speak of the many greater problems such as homelessness.

I look forward to your reply.

Regards,

Hi

I would like to register my objection to the Benson North residents' parking scheme for the following reasons:

- I understand that the scheme is considered across whole areas and not per road - this is not delivering the best service for residents (see below).
- Of Sherlock Court respondents, less than 50% were in favour of the scheme. The part of Sherlock Road in front of Sherlock Court should therefore be exempt.
- Of Sherlock Road respondents, only 9% of respondents were in favour which is even more reason for the scheme to not go ahead.
- At the moment, there is a balanced mixed usage of on-street parking - commuters park there in the day (and there is still space) and residents park there the rest of the time. Making it residents' parking reduces the efficiency of space usage as many residents may not need a parking space there anyway - Sherlock Court and Sherlock Close have private car parks.
- Park and rides are all very well but the bus fares are expensive compared to petrol costs so there's no incentive.

I look forward to an adjusted or abandoned scheme.

Regards

Could we have confirmation of receipt of this email, please? Many thanks.

PRO549

1. We are opposed to a Benson north permit scheme.
2. The proposed restriction of Mon-Fri 9-12 would be of no benefit at all to the cul de sac end of Richmond Road.
3. Our problem is not with commuter parking but with community centre parking in the cul de sac, morning, noon and night, 7 days a week, which seriously disrupts cul de sac residents' lives.
4. Richmond Rd Residents Association (RRRA) committee is pushing for a Mon-Fri 9-12 restriction, which will solve problems that committee members and others have with commuter parking at the Huntingdon Road end of Richmond Road. This restriction will also allow community centre users to continue to park in our cul de sac end. RRRA committee is already talking to centre users about moving their groups from the mornings to times when parking will remain unrestricted.
5. The plans for mixed use bays near the community centre will further restrict our parking. We are opposed to these.
6. Please note that local residents were never consulted about or made aware of potential parking problems at the time of the community centre redevelopment a few years ago. Looking back over the planning information, we see that \_\_ of the Highways Dept had serious reservations about the development, citing potential increased traffic and lack of parking. He possibly had the wool pulled over his eyes by a response from a RRRA committee member who was pushing the development forward and who suggested that an increase in traffic and parking issues were most unlikely.
7. While we are strongly opposed to a permit scheme, if we were to have one the only restrictions that might be of some benefit to us would be Mon-Sat 9-11 am and 2-3 pm and 6-7 pm.
8. A 'Cul de sac. Access for residents only' sign would be helpful, to discourage community centre parking and also the frequent turning in the cul de sac and then speeding back up Richmond Road.
9. The community centre/RRRA needs to go green and require users to walk, cycle or use public transport, but they are not showing willing at all. Who can help us with this issue?
10. Permit schemes are a piecemeal approach to the city's traffic and parking problems.
11. Park and Rides are urgently needed on both Histon and Huntingdon Roads.

I am strongly opposed to the introduction of a parking scheme on my road, \_\_\_\_, and Eachard and Hoadly near by. I see no benefit of it, and have never had an issue parking here. Having talked to many of my neighbours, I find I am not alone in this opinion. The majority are against it, and only one resident said they were open minded and neither for or against. It seems as if residents of over crowded roads such as Oxford Road voted for this scheme in numbers, and their votes are pulling us in with them.

So to summarise, I do not want new parking restrictions on Woodlark Road, or those near by. And I would also reject double yellow lines and ugly signage as it will deface the area.

Yours sincerely

PRO549

Residents' parking Benson North Area Cambridge

Policy and Regulation Team

Thank you for your letter offering the opportunity to add comments to the proposed residents' parking scheme in this area.

I applaud the choice of timing restriction hours between 9.00 am and 12.00 noon and weekdays only but am concerned about the double yellow lines you mention; as there is a road calming proposition already which, if imposed, will reduce Oxford Road parking by ten spaces, is there really need for further restrictions?

I have strong objections to your rationing visitor parking permits to only 20 x 5 per year. All of us, but in particular the housebound need visitors without the complications of getting and paying for permits for them and then being unable to make any increase in being visited by those who care about them. (I am not confusing unplanned visits with designated care visits for which I know there are allowances.) I learn from residents who live in a restricted parking area that they find they receive many fewer unplanned drop in visits from friends and family because of your rationing scheme and the expense involved.

Have you worked out that £240 plus £52 each year is for all of us a large slice of our income and in particular for someone on a low yearly pension possibly living alone without the share of a partner's pension or income and from which s/he has to pay Council Tax, heating and water bills, electricity, insurance, house maintenance, daily running costs as well as possible taxi fares for essential journeys?

To sum up, I do not support a scheme which offers so little consideration for poorer and more vulnerable residents. Please don't tell me that you need this money to implement the residents parking scheme - if you cannot afford it without causing hardship for some - then don't do it.

Yours faithfully,

The prolonged process towards a parking solution for this road must be costing a disproportionate amount of public money, meanwhile the city's roads are crying out for renewal of road markings, especially for crossings. ...and as for the pavements.....

I see that no provision has been suggested for alternative parking arrangements for those who find the road so useful at present. I know it is a bit late in the day, but a single yellow line down one side of road might solve many problems besides being a lot cheaper.

To whom it may concern,

I write with respect to the proposed residents permit parking scheme, reference PR0549, in the Benson North Area. In particular the scheme for Sherlock Road, Woodlark Road and Eachard Road.

I would like to register my objection to the scheme on the following grounds:

1. The proposed parking layout along Sherlock Road and Woodlark Road is unsafe and I feel will provide higher risk of injury and accidents to pedestrians and cyclists. Please provide details of the road safety assessments and designers risk assessments that have been undertaken.
2. The scheme is unwarranted and sufficient alternative measures have not been investigated or proposed. No good reason or justification has been provided for imposing the scheme in this area. Whilst I recognise that there are parking problems in nearby roads, at present there is not a parking problem along the above mentioned roads. The only reason there will become a problem, is if a residents scheme is imposed on other surrounding roads and parking is displaced. Alternative schemes should be investigated fully, including a park and ride facility on this approach to Cambridge and charging travellers to enter the city as they are the cause of the issue rather than penalising residents for living here. Incentive scheme to discourage travel into the city and improving the public transport facilities which are woefully lacking on this approach to Cambridge and along the Huntingdon Road/A14 corridor, should also be considered first. These improvements should be brought in as a matter of first priority. The benefits to residents in this area have not been appropriately set out or conveyed.
3. As only 35% of the residents responded to the survey this is not representative of the community. This does not provide sufficient evidence of support for the scheme. The proposals should be acceptable to the greater proportion of the residents (not respondents) due to the restrictive and fiscal impact of the scheme. This has not been determined to date. Please provide details of the number of residents who responded from each road in the affected area and how many of the respondents supported, opposed or otherwise to the scheme for each road.
4. As a resident of the area for over \_\_\_ years and in the locality for more than \_\_\_ I have witnessed the consequential impact of similar ill thought out schemes before. We used to live on Richmond Road , where there was not a parking problem until the residents permit scheme was introduced on the roads from Halifax Road towards town. Once this scheme was introduced, parking was displaced (not just those entering the city, but also those living in the area and seeking free parking), further out. This proposed scheme will only displace parking somewhere else (not necessarily locally). The evidence is here that these schemes do not work and are self-fulfilling in perpetuating parking and traffic issues. There is no evidence to support the scheme, but there is evidence that introducing similar schemes causes more issues than they solve.
5. Alternative options have not been provided and therefore we have not had the opportunity to consider these and understand if they would be more or less acceptable. Please provide details of the alternatives considered and the reasons for rejection. The main cause of the issue is traffic entering the city. This proposal does not address the root cause of the issue, but penalises those that are not at fault.
6. It should be the developers of new schemes in the area via the appropriate levies and the councils that foot the bill for sorting out the traffic issues not existing residents who are not at fault. The developers of Darwin Green and Eddington should provide commuted sums and S106 money to allow parking and transport schemes to be implemented for the benefit of local communities. It is not clear whether these avenues have been pursued prior to taking the easy option of penalising existing local residents. Please provide details of the payments received from developers in the area and how these are being used to fund transport improvements that would negate the need for residents permit schemes, or provide funding that does not require funding by local residents.
7. The timing and duration of the consultation is too short and over the summer holiday period when many people are away. It would appear that the timing is deliberate to allow as few to respond as possible.
8. The impact of the upgrade to the A14 should be evaluated on completion to determine whether it has a positive benefit in traffic entering the city. Until the A14 works have been completed and a full evaluation can be concluded, no action should be taken.
9. If this was truly about discouraging traffic to enter the City and parking then the scheme would be made freely available to residents. Reducing traffic into the City is for the benefit of all residents and not just those in our locality. The cost of any parking scheme in the city should therefore be borne equally by all city residents not just those living locally. In addition no justification has been provided for the proposed parking permit fee. Please provide details of the business case for the scheme.
10. Details have not been provided on how households with more than three vehicles will be affected or what they are supposed to do with their vehicles. Please clarify how this will work.
11. The presence of double yellow lines and parking so liberally splattered along these attractive residential streets will be unsightly. It will change and spoil the character of these streets unjustly. Alternative layouts and options should be put forward for consultation and agreement by the residents. Please provide details of the alternative layouts considered, the reasons for rejection and for adoption of the preferred scheme.
12. The proposed layout of the scheme will pose problems for residents receiving deliveries, for visitors parking, loading and unloading of vehicles. This impacts our right to enjoy our homes and local environment. Please provide details of how this impact has been assessed and mitigated via the propose scheme.
13. The additional administrative burden and stress of having to remember to apply for permits and to ensure

that visitors are aware will have a negative impact on the wellbeing of me, my family and visitors, especially elderly relatives visiting. It effectively prevents visitors from coming at a time that is convenient, or having to leave at a time that is inconvenient. Please provide details of how the impact on the wellbeing of local residents and visitors has been assessed.

14. It is not clear how this scheme contributes towards the council's environmental policy. The introduction of a residents parking scheme will naturally displace parking to other parts of the city. This in turn will lead to an increase in pollution and carbon emissions by vehicles. It therefore does not support the zero carbon target the council has backed. Please provide details of the environmental impact assessment of the scheme and the steps that will be taken to mitigate any environmental issues as a result of implementation.

I look forward to your response and provision of the information requested.

Dear sirs,

I would like it to be noted that myself and my family are against the proposed parking scheme on Woodlark Road/Eachard Road/Hoadly Road/Sherlock Road. We feel that it is completely unnecessary, and even if the surrounding areas have parking controls, I do not believe that this will have detrimental effect on our roads. We do not currently experience a problem with parking or commuters on our roads, and we feel that to have parking restrictions would completely change the nature of our quiet, family-friendly area. I do not want to have to buy parking permits in case one of our friends unexpectedly pops by in their car, we do not want to see ugly yellow lines painted down our streets, and we feel that the area is far enough away from town not to attract commuter parking.

What's more, the split between those in favour and those against was so close that by going ahead with the scheme, you are going against the wishes of almost 50% of residents - this needs to be taken very seriously into consideration.

Our family only has one car and a driveway, so we would not need to buy a permit for ourselves - thus showing that our disapproval has nothing to do with our personal circumstances.

Please could you register our complaint/disapproval.

Your sincerely,



Dear \_\_,

I am writing to oppose the proposed Resident's Permit Parking Scheme in Benson North (reference PR0549).

In the statement of reasons for the proposal, it states that "[The proposed scheme] is intended to tackle issues associated with all day non-resident parking that denies parking spaces for residents and their visitors."

However, the logic behind this statement is flawed: it is never a problem to park in Benson North during the daytime, when there is plenty of space on the road. However, during the evenings and weekends, when it is predominantly residents parking anyway, there is sometimes not enough space. The proposed scheme will not affect these peak times and will simply serve to increase the cost of living in Cambridge unnecessarily, without addressing the relevant problem.

I therefore strongly object to the proposed scheme on two grounds:

1. it will not facilitate the movement of traffic, enhance safety for road users, or improve the amenities of the area, as these issues mostly need addressing during evenings and weekends when the scheme will not make a difference. Indeed, as the scheme may lead to a reduction in the total number of available parking spaces, it may make these issues worse during the hours when the scheme is not in operation.
2. The cost of the scheme is an additional burden on residents in the area, on top of the already-high cost of living in Cambridge. I believe this scheme is not required (and will not even tackle the relevant issues) and thus this additional cost to residents is an unnecessary tax on local householders.

Kind regards,

Dear Traffic Policy Team,

I wish to make a formal complaint about the consultation process for this traffic scheme.

Firstly the documentation sent to households earlier in the year was not detailed enough to spell out the consequences of the proposals.

In our case we assumed from the documentation that the traffic scheme would only produce changes during the hours of operation of the scheme and so voted in favour of the proposal.

In actual fact the addition of double yellow lines means that parking spaces in our road ( \_\_ ) will be reduced to 30 at all times and as there are usually 10-20 cars parked on the road at any one time I expect there will be occasions ( for instance when someone has a party) when there are no parking spaces available.

Understanding this would have affected people's view on whether to vote for a scheme or to leave parking as it is.

Secondly the formal consultation documents are difficult to access and understand.

The website (JPEG of my screen attached) does not contain a simple English written version of the proposals.

The consultee needs to find and understand the correct map.

The map does not have a complete key and it is unclear what "PPA" means at the Sherlock-Huntingdon Road Junction. I assume it means

" permit parking area" but this is not listed in the key and there is no explanation anywhere else.

It is not clear whether we will have marked parking bays down \_\_ or not. The changes from the original consultation are not highlighted and the online map has very small print which makes it difficult to read.

This initial web page refers to a link where comments can be submitted.

If I click on this link a map comes up - see the second attached JPEG.

This is a clear map but again does not explain the implications of the proposed scheme for living in \_\_

The button in the bottom left corner which says " submit views" does not work.

The government advice for consultations at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/691383/Consultation\\_Principles\\_\\_1\\_.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/691383/Consultation_Principles__1_.pdf)

says that consultations should be clear and concise and "Give enough information to ensure that those consulted understand the issues and can give informed responses".

I do not think this consultation is clear and concise and it has not given enough easily accessible information to ensure that those consulted can understand the issues and give an informed response.

LGA advice on consultations at

<https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/guidance-and-resources/comms-hub-communications-support/resident-communications-4>

says that consultations should be clear and refers to additional government guidance which says that

"As far as is possible, consultation documents should be easy to understand: they should be concise, self-contained and free of jargon. This will also help reduce the burden of consultation. While consultation exercises on technical details may need to seek input from experts, when the views of non-experts are also required, simpler documents should be produced."

([https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/100807/file47158.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/100807/file47158.pdf))

For the reasons above I do not think that this consultation has been clear enough to give the residents of our road the opportunity to understand the proposals and so form an informed opinion.

Please do let me know if I need to forward this email on somewhere else.

Yours sincerely,

Response to the Public Consultation on revised proposal for Benson North.

<https://consultation.appyparking.com/Cambridge/0E9E50CC-104C-42B3-AE6B-31B259B3BB18/Benson%20north%20residents%20parking%20scheme/D2D1129C-0617-4CF0-A3C7-61FC21896730>

I think that the proposals for Sherlock Road are acceptable. Having noticed the other day just how many pieces of building work are going on round the square at the moment, ideally there should be some special consideration given to the needs of building contractors to park while at work. Otherwise they are likely to park anywhere.

I wish to object to this scheme in it's entirety.

I am a resident of \_\_ and have lived here since \_\_\_\_\_. We do not have a traffic or parking problem to solve. I object to the fact that my personal freedom to park outside my own house is being dictated by others who live nowhere near me, in streets some distance away.

In my opinion the scheme has been biased from the outset. It is favoured by households without off-street parking of their own or who have such large driveways which support several cars - all of whom who wish to rid their streets of commuters. The scheme targeted 1022 resident households. Only A SMALL FRACTION OF THIS NUMBER are households like my own who have a small attached driveway. So the fact is that the Victorian type houses with no parking of their own were ALWAYS going to be in the majority when voting for parking controls. I do not think that the roads of (Woodlark, Hoadly, Sherlock and Eachard, Winsor) should be a part of this scheme as we are by far under-represented - and the numerous residents of these streets who I have discussed the scheme with, feel the same way.

The initial document circulated was titled 'PARKING IN YOUR STREET - Have your say'. The fact that schemes proposed involved significant double yellow lines in my and neighbouring roads was A SURPRISE to many even after the initial consultation had taken place. There was NO VERBAL MENTION AT ALL OF DOUBLE YELLOW LINES BEING IMPOSED IN THIS DOCUMENT and only a powerful magnifier and sound mind made this information available. WHY WAS THIS HUGELY IMPORTANT INFORMATION ALMOST HIDDEN FROM VIEW?

This document - sent to everyone affected by this scheme also had no description, or even mention of a PPA. However, prior to the vote council officers informed certain folks on our road that a PPA WOULD NOT INVOLVE THE USE OF DOUBLE YELLOW LINES. ...But subsequently it appears they got it wrong. So we voted on Incorrect information given. Important factors were clearly omitted and if it had been obvious than I know for a fact that many more households would have voted AGAINST the scheme.

But I am now informed that the proposed parking scheme has now replaced by a PPA - so which privileged few decided this? Did I miss an other vote? how did this happen? Have the rules changed? I thought this was supposed to be a case of 'HAVE YOUR SAY'.....but is that only for the few?

I cannot help believing that the way this scheme has been communicated, that the preference of the council is to change the way things are now.

Finally, so I am now told I need to make a comment by the 27th August 2019. HOW? might I ask.

If I go to

<https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/roads-and-pathways/roadworks-and-faults/traffic-regulation-orders/>

which appears to be the portal entrance for this scheme, there is a sentence reading

-----  
Proposed TRO (Reference Number PR0549) - Proposed Residents Parking Scheme in Benson North area, Cambridge. Closing date for comment is 27 August 2019. You can also view a map showing the restrictions and submit comments here.  
-----

I ask you to click on the link 'here' and indicate to me WHERE I am supposed to make a comment on the scheme? There are no links, no explanations of how to do this - JUST A MAP with a 'search box ! I have attached a screenshot as proof.

How on earth can the council create such a poorly designed set of documents FOR SUCH A CRUCIAL PROPOSAL WHICH CHANGES PEOPLE'S LIVES? I can barely understand how many of the aged persons who live in this area are supposed to be able to negotiate, follow, understand and act upon the incomplete information that is being presented to us.

It is certainly my view that the scheme has been communicated in more detail to some people than others. Private emails here and there. Rather than an upfront clear communication to all as to why, what and how this was all going to proceed.

An example of this here..... I previously objected to the scheme directly to an email address supplied earlier on a communication.

I received a reply from Cllr Claire Richards who wrote:

-----

" 'I have secured County agreement for your area to be a PPA if the scheme goes ahead if that is what residents want'

-----

But I now understand that our area is to be a PPA - so which residents were asked? - which roads? and how were they asked? I was not asked if it was what I want? why not? why was this not voted on? and by the way - WHAT IS A PPA? PPA was not even mentioned in the original consultation

This process has been insufficient from the outset in so many ways, and in my opinion it should be re-evaluated.

Yours,

We don't want yellow lines in woodlark road because it would be too restrictive. Most of us have more than one family vehicle but only 1 off road parking space and many have no parking spaces.

Reference: PR0549

Dear sir/madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed residents parking scheme.

Having lived on \_\_ for the last \_\_ years, I have had no problems ever parking close to my house. The cost and administration of the proposed scheme is an unnecessary burden on residents and their visitors, which will reduce the quality of life in the area.

Yours faithfully,

To whom it may concern,

I wish to voice my objections to this proposed residents parking scheme. As it stands, currently, we have not had any issues parking. The introduction of the scheme would, by my calculations, reduce the available parking on our road ( \_ \_ ) by 8 spaces. Possibly creating a problem.

In my opinion this parking scheme is providing a solution to a non-existent problem upon our road.

Many thanks,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the proposed TRO reference PR0549 on the following grounds:

**Safety** - the scheme will reduce parked vehicle numbers, which will in turn reduce the number of potential hazards visible to drivers travelling along the roads in question. This is likely to lead to an increase in traffic speeds, regardless of the 20mph limit that is in place, due to drivers' perception that the road has fewer hazards and it is therefore acceptable to travel at higher speed. This is likely to increase speed differentials between cycles and motorists (because cyclists won't increase their speed), which increases risk of collisions and the severity of injuries when they do occur. If certain areas have been identified as needing yellow lines to solve an existing accident risk, that would seem sensible, but the parking restrictions proposed would seem to offset those benefits by introducing new risks.

**Unnecessary restrictions** - the proposed scheme will stop 'the common man' from parking in streets occupied by large and expensive dwellings, many of which have their own driveways and space for a number of vehicles, and therefore have no need for a residents' parking scheme. The scheme would therefore appear to be a deliberately punitive measure targeted at those who cannot afford to live in Cambridge and who must rely on their vehicles to get to work, especially those who cannot afford to Park and Ride each day. It would also seem to reinforce the mistaken belief that a resident should be able to park on the public highway directly outside their house because that is 'their' parking space, when of course such a thing does not exist.

**Lack of alternative parking** - To expand on the above point, if people are parking in the streets listed to allow them to get to work in a reasonable time and with reasonable ease, it must be because there is inadequate alternative options available for them. For example, if people are parking and walking to sites near to but west of the city centre, they cannot change to P&R because the buses do not go anywhere near that area. And if they are forced to use P&R to park their vehicles because on-street parking is removed from the listed streets, they will be forced to walk what appears to be at least double the current distance they are walking now, perhaps a mile or more, with the associated increases in time and negative impacts on quality of life if they are spending more time away from their homes and/or families. Some may well feel forced to purchase bicycles in an attempt to 'park and cycle', which it is likely some people currently parking on-street can ill afford, and said bicycles often appear to be targets for theft if left overnight at P&R sites and in other areas.

**Impacts on business operations** - Businesses located in the area, for example, such as Aecom in Storey's Way, will rely on on-street parking to cater for business visitors. As already mentioned, there are no viable alternative options available due to P&R buses not servicing the area, which will negatively impact business operations.

**Timing of the consultation** - it appears that the consultation has been launched and run over a period in the year when many people who will be affected (including workers on their summer holidays and students who have travelled long distances to Cambridge in their private vehicles at the start of term, who have left for summer already and will be forced to make other, more costly and inconvenient arrangements) are unlikely to see the very few, very small and difficult to read, notices that have been put up on lampposts in the area. An period of consultation that has been extended to mitigate this issue is ineffective if those affected are not present to see the notices.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Policy and Regulation Team

I do not feel the current provision of mixed use bays is sufficient for our needs, and I believe this scheme is in its current form threatens the existence of our business, and a community facility in this area of Cambridge.

What we require is enough parking to provide for -

1. Those who drive due to poor public transport a distance greater than 5 miles - staff, patients and therapists.

Bus services are unreliable - see report here

2. Those who are acutely disabled, who come to our clinic for resolution of pain, and need to park adjacent to the clinic.

Each hour we have 4 therapists, 4 patients and 1 member of staff in the clinic, allowing for changeover the number of patients maybe 6-8, when one patient arrives before the other leaves.

This gives a potential maximum of 13 spaces required each hour, or 11 on the road, and 2 off street. We do provide 13 cycle racks for cyclists, and these patients tend to come from within the city, but those

patients who travel from outside the city need a reliable effective means of accessing the clinic.

In addition, there are those who travel to the clinic to make use of the studio meeting room.

I do believe that we are also a Community facility (as defined by Cambridge City Council), as we have a studio room that is available to be rented to any member of the community, and we are the registered address of Cambridge Community Land Trust, a Community Benefit Society. In addition a number of our therapists receive referrals from community organisations including the NHS, and Maggie's cancer care. I would be happy to share with you the details. As such I do feel that this strengthens our case for dedicated pay and display bays (not mixed use) near to the clinic. I have contacted the relevant department at Cambridge City Council to add The Therapy Room as a community facility on your website.

We have 2 off street parking spaces (3 if one car blocks another) - therapists and staff carry equipment, washing, supplies and do often use these spaces. When the forecourt is unavailable, they park on the street, and the current provision of mixed use bays for a 2 hour maximum stay would not be available to them as they stay for a minimum of 4 hours.

I see our need (and other business residents and community facilities on Oxford Road) is for six dedicated (not shared with residents) pay and display bays (9am-12pm) on Wentworth Road which is the closest available parking

for those who are in acute pain (not eligible for a blue disabled badge) Mixed use bays could potentially be filled with residents vehicles with no necessity for them to move to allow pay and display parking in the operating hours 9am-12pm.

There is a precedent for the allocation of pay and display bays for the use of a Chiropractic clinic (Cambridge Chiropractic Health Centre) which also has off street parking, on Hamilton Road in Cambridge.

I will be forwarding a petition that is currently being gathered from patients, clients, and therapists of the clinic and residents before the end of the statutory consultation period. Could you please advise me where I should send this too, as it is a paper document.

Thank you \_ - could you please tell where I should deliver our petition too.

Thank you - will the petition need to get to you before the end of the consultation period in order to be considered?

Thank you \_.

Could you tell me when the statutory consultation finished and decisions are made.

We are towards the end of our lease, the building needs repairs and we need to decide whether to renew the lease or not, and without adequate parking provision The Therapy Room will struggle to survive.

I appreciate your help.

Dear \_,

I am a \_ \_ at The Therapy Room at 25 Oxford Road.

I have been working here since \_\_\_\_ and i have witnessed this local business grow and become real essential for our local community, county and for providing me with a job as well as many others in the clinic. I realised that all sides and options must be considered but I want to highlight the fact that the solutions outlined by the council seem relatively excessive in light of what is required and damaging towards the clinic.

I talked with my other colleagues at The Therapy Room and our concerns for the residents parking zone are outlined below:

1. It is to be too stringent on local parking for patients by removing all road parking options nearby to the clinic. Due to the clinics' success and outreach many patients come by car because of poor public transport access and because of need due to being in pain. It is vital we have road parking for them. If the parking measures are excessive (too long hours and not enough/close enough parking for the clinic) then relaxing them at a later date once the harm to the community has been noticed will have already damaged the clinic in ways that would take a long time to recover from. It is better to start lighter and then increase limitations as necessary, especially as the majority community has not recognised a major issue with parking but sided with preference for residential parking in the area.

2. The proposed 9am-12pm hours will certainly limit commuters but has negative impacts too - it will hamper tradesmen in the street, attendants of St Augustine's, visitors to local residents (especially small gatherings in the day which my elderly neighbour enjoys with her friends) and will certainly challenge the clinic. What I would like to propose is two hour long windows on either side of the street 9.30am-10.30am on one side and 1.30pm-2.30pm on the other side thus preventing people from using the road to park on and walk to work, which from attending residents meetings is the largest concern. It would meet all parking issues head on whilst allowing the concerns for the clinic and local residents about the challenges surrounding the scheme to be put to bed.

This style of residents parking is done in Colchester to prevent people parking and walking to the train station in Mile End Road, it works extremely effectively.

3. Paid for mixed bays - I understand that mixed bays have been proposed for Wentworth Road and Richmond Road to improve ease of access for the church which comes across as a rather cruel cost to implement on a place that benefits the community in many ways. Furthermore if residents choose to park in these bays all day there will be no incentive to move and there will be no flow of parking spaces which may make it difficult for those to attend the church and activities there. Potentially some bays need a limit of how long they can park there for, possibly a "2 hour limit." Similarly the same would go for the clinic but those spaces would be too far for patients who are in pain. What I proposed in point 2 would allow parking to flow and allow people to still enjoy the local services.

4. Traffic calming measures - although these are a good idea they will put further pressure on parking in the area due to further reduction in numbers of spaces. One width restriction on Windsor Road is surely enough, there have been issues with Emergency services getting down the roads as it is, please don't oversee the bigger picture, peoples lives ought not to be negatively impacted by the measures and currently from what is being proposed it will have many detrimental effects on the community.

Please consider the two short windows time slots for two sides of the road, residents wouldn't need to move through the day due to permits but this strategy would keep a steady flow for visitors, tradesman, church goes and patients to the clinic without a negative effect on parking for the residents and would certainly reduce parking strains on the road. If there are still complaints then hours may be adjusted to find tighter constraints to appease this but I do not believe there to be a major parking issue at present nor in the last 32 years.

Your sincerely,

Dear \_

Re; Parking consultation for Benson North 01662 Oxford/Windsor Rd

The Therapy Room is a multi-disciplinary clinic that has been established for 12 years situated at 25 Oxford Rd.

Patients visit the clinic for a wide range of treatments including:

- Psychodynamic counselling
- Hypnotherapy
- Osteopathy
- Chiropractic
- Manual lymphatic drainage
- Acupuncture
- Functional medicine
- Private GP services

There are currently over 20 practitioners and 2 administrative staff working from the building. There are over 8,500 patient visits to the Therapy Room every year representing a very important community amenity. Many of these patients are limited by mobility and pain issues and require to be able to park close to the clinic.

I would urge you to please take care to evaluate the parking requirements of patients coming to visit the clinic to ensure there is adequate parking provision for them. If not I fear for the survival of the clinic.

Yours Sincerely

Dear Sir/Madam,

I work as a \_ at the Therapy Room on Oxford Road, and I am worried about the impact an implementation of resident parking will have both on clients and the staff of the clinic.

The Therapy Room (providing work for more than 15 people) is a very successful clinic and we have clients driving in from all over Cambridgeshire. Many of our patients have chronic pain and restricted ability to move and would not be able to visit the clinic if there were nowhere to park outside the clinic. The clinic is well established and is part of the community, helping people get back to good health. I have numerous clients who have been on the brink of not being able to work, who have after treatment been able to go back to their full time employment. This has a massive impact on both their personal health and the community as a whole.

I understand the wish to restrict commuting people from using Oxford Road as their daily free parking to get access to Cambridge, but I think there are ways in which that could be achieved which still allows parking for clients and staff of the clinic.

An option that would keep commuters away but still allow tradesmen, visitors to residents and clients of the clinic to get access could be a one-hour window on either side of the street when parking is not allowed, unless you have a resident permit (so that residents don't have to get out and move their car).

I have worked at the clinic for \_\_\_ years and I have noticed that parking has become busier over the years as resident parking has been implemented on streets closer to town. However, I believe that the above suggestion would avoid commuters to park for the day, without negatively impact the residents and visitors to local businesses.

Yours sincerely,



Dear \_\_,

As a \_ working in The Therapy Room \_\_\_\_\_ I wish to offer a response to new proposal for parking in Oxford Road and Windsor Road area.

The new proposal will have a negative effect on my business and seriously interfere with the viability of a community resource which is clearly required by the residents of Cambridge.

Taking into account the legitimate requirements of the residents of the area I would suggest :

Due to the clinic's success and outreach many patients come by car because poor public transport access and because of their needs due to some discomfort and pain.

It is vital to provide some parking access for such temporary visitors.

However it is better to consider two hour long windows on either side of street - 9-11 one side and 1-3 the other side.

This will prevent people from using the road to park on and walk to work.

This method has been used effectively in other areas of neighbouring counties where similar problems have occurred.

If the council could start with these restrictions then it would be possible to increase limitations as necessary, especially as the majority of residents have not recognised a major issue with parking but supported a preference for residential parking in the area.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sirs,

As a \_ at The Therapy Room at 25 Oxford Road. I do not feel that the detrimental effects of new parking regulations on our clinic have been considered at all. We are a key local business that not only serves the local community and county (and beyond) but provides work for more than 15 people. I am fully self employed, running my clinic exclusively from the therapy room seeing at least 20 patients a week there. Many of them are not well and cannot walk long distances. Our waiting room is usually packed so the two spaces in the drive will not suffice for this vulnerable demographic.

My concerns for the residents parking zone are outlined below:

1. It is to be too stringent on local parking for patients by removing all road parking options nearby to the clinic. Due to the clinics' success and outreach many patients come by car because of poor public transport access and because of need due to being in pain or very ill, for example, with cancer or heart disease. It is vital we have road parking for them. If the parking measures are excessive (too long hours and not enough/close enough parking for the clinic) then relaxing them at a later date once the harm to the community has been noticed will have already damaged the clinic in ways that would take a long time to recover from. It is better to start lighter and then increase limitations as necessary, especially as the majority community has not recognised a major issue with parking but sided with preference for residential parking in the area.

2. The proposed 9am-12pm hours will certainly limit commuters but has negative impacts too - it will hamper tradesmen in the street, attendants of St Augustine's, visitors to local residents and will certainly challenge the clinic.

What I would like to propose is two hour long windows on either side of the street 9.30am-10.30am on one side and 1.30pm-2.30pm on the other side thus preventing people from using the road to park on and walk to work, which from attending residents meetings is the largest concern. It would meet all parking issues head on whilst allowing the concerns for the clinic and local residents about the challenges surrounding the scheme to be put to bed.

This style of residents parking is done in Colchester to prevent people parking and walking to the train station in Mile End Road, it works extremely effectively.

3. Paid for mixed bays - I understand that mixed bays have been proposed for Wentworth Road and Richmond Road to improve ease of access for the church which comes across as a rather cruel cost to implement on a place that benefits the community in many ways. Furthermore if residents choose to park in these bays all day there will be no incentive to move and there will be no flow of parking spaces which may make it difficult for those to attend the church and activities there. Potentially some bays need a limit of how long they can park there for, possibly a "2 hour limit." Similarly the same would go for the clinic but those spaces would be too far for patients who are in pain. What I proposed in point 2 would allow parking to flow and allow people to still enjoy the local services.

4. Traffic calming measures - although these are a good idea they will put further pressure on parking in the area due to further reduction in numbers of spaces. One width restriction on Windsor Road is surely enough, there have been issues with Emergency services getting down the roads as it is, please don't oversee the bigger

picture, peoples lives ought not to be negatively impacted by the measures and currently from what is being proposed it will have many detrimental effects on the community.

Having worked on Oxford Road for \_ years I very much understand the balance required - parking in the area has always been busy but never impractical. The solutions outlined by the council seem short sighted, relatively excessive in light of what is required and damaging towards the clinic. Please consider the two short windows time slots for two sides of the road, residents wouldn't need to move through the day due to permits but this strategy would keep a steady flow for visitors, tradesman, church goers and patients to the clinic without a negative effect on parking for the residents and would certainly reduce parking strains on the road. If there are still complaints then hours may be adjusted to find tighter constraints to appease this but I do not believe there to be a major parking issue at present nor in the last 32 years.

Many thanks,

Dear Cambridgeshire County Council,

THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 38) ORDER 20\$\$

Thank you for your 'e' correspondence in relation to the above named proposal. Please accept this as confirmation and acknowledgement of receipt.

What is intended has been fully examined by the traffic management unit.

With regard to the proposed waiting restrictions, on the assumption the locale falls within a CEA and therefore not subject to police enforcement, on behalf of the Chief Officer, the police have no comment to make.

Yours Sincerely,

Dear \_

Thank you for your circular letter about the statutory consultation on Residents' Parking (RP) for Benson North.

In spite of some explanations from Officers we are still not clear about all the differences between an RP and a Permit parking (PP) scheme.

We understand that for PP the signage required is less and that the parking areas need not be demarcated by white lines.

We are confused about:

(i) Parking across dropped kerbs

What is the difference between RP and PP in the rules for residents of a property parking across their own dropped kerb? What is the rationale for the difference? Are others, whether they are permit holders or not, allowed to park across dropped kerbs?

Are the rules different during restricted and unrestricted parking hours?

Are these rules different for dropped kerbs with H-bars, compared with those without?

(ii) Parking where there are neither double yellow lines nor driveways

With RP, white lines mark the ends of each stretch of road for parking. Does the rule against parking outside the white lines apply only during restricted parking hours or is this the same at all times of day, the only difference being that a permit is required during restricted times? Do the limitations apply only to the vehicle's wheels or to the full width and length of the vehicle?

With PP, is the location of parking restricted other than by the rules about double yellow lines and driveways, and the need for a permit during restricted hours? i.e. is there slightly more of the road-side available for parking?

We would be grateful for a description of all the differences between the two schemes please. This could be done by e-mail. Alternatively, we would be happy to come to Shire Hall if it would be easier to talk about this en face. If you would prefer to phone our numbers are: \_\_, -, \_ of WIRE; \_\_, \_\_, \_ of WIRE).

Kind regards

\_ and \_

(on behalf of the Committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association, WIRE)

ATTN

— — — —

These comments replace ours of 20th August, which contained a typographical error. Please destroy the previous version.

The committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE) welcomes the introduction of Residents' parking in Benson North.

We have the following concerns:

1. Windsor Road between Oxford Rd and Histon Road

The committee objects to the reduction in the chicane effect of the proposed parking layout compared with the present arrangements. Traffic is relatively heavy in this part of the road and there can be inappropriately fast driving.

2. Windsor Road between Oxford Rd and the boundary with Darwin Green

The committee objects to the multiple changes of the side of the road where parking will be allowed in this cul-de-sac part of the road. We are aware of various views about the best layout. Some are backed by more evidence than others. We place highest priority on access for large vehicles (eg. emergency vehicles and refuse lorries), and safety for cyclists. We also note that there is less traffic in this part of the road, and that the possibility of speeding is reduced the closer one gets to the dead end of the cul-de-sac. Some large vehicles are unable to turn at the end of the road and have to reverse in one direction. Repeated changes of side of the parking therefore create difficulties for large vehicles, and may also be less safe for cyclists. The committee proposes that the number of changes of the side of the road on which parking is allowed should be minimised. This applies more strongly the closer one is to the cul-de-sac end of the road.

3. The committee requests discussion of permit parking in the cul-de-sac.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

The Committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE)

22.08.2019

(Letter separate - scanned)