

## **CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 24th January 2017

**Time:** 4.30pm – 7.35pm

**Present:** County Councillors Ashwood (substituting for Cearns), Kavanagh, Manning, Scutt (Chairwoman) Taylor and Walsh  
City Councillors Baigent, Bird, Blencowe (Vice-Chairman), Robertson and Tunnacliffe.

**Apologies:** Councillor Cearns

### **49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **50. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 1st NOVEMBER 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1st November 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

### **51. PETITIONS**

The Committee was advised that two petitions had been received unrelated to items on the agenda. The first petition was introduced by one of the petitioners, but there were too few signatures on the second petition to qualify for speaking rights.

#### **a) Sunday parking on the Kite**

A petition with 52 signatures, headed 'End free Sunday parking on the Kite'.

Liz Crow spoke in support of this petition, stating that on a Sunday, parked cars made access to their houses very difficult, particularly for wheelchairs and buggies. Sunday was a normal shopping day and should be treated as such.

#### **b) Parking on Clifton Industrial Estate**

A petition with 29 signatures, including a letter of support, stating 'We the undersigned, petition the Council to Install parking restrictions (in the form of double yellow lining) on the estate roads of Clifton Industrial Estate, Cambridge CB1 7EA as a matter of urgency.'

As there were no relevant reports on the agenda, there was no discussion of the petitions and the Chairwoman indicated that the petitioners would receive a written response to the petitions within ten working days.

### **52. RESIDENTS' PARKING POLICY**

The Committee received a report updating it on the progress of the Members' Working Group on residents' parking, and seeking endorsement of the proposed overarching Residents' Parking Policy and the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan.

Martin Lucas-Smith of Camcycle (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) spoke in support of the proposals; residents' parking should be treated as a strategic issue. He commented that there was a mismatch between City Deal spending on bus lanes and the continuing availability of free parking in parts of the city. Mr Lucas-Smith welcomed that the City Deal would pay for the first year's implementation as a capital cost, and suggested various other measures which should be introduced at the same time, including cycle parking, car club spaces and permits for traders. He also suggested that pavement parking should be phased out.

The Chairwoman explained that the Committee was unable to respond on any matters relating to the City Deal, as these were the responsibility of the City Deal Board and Assembly.

Lynn Hieatt of Smarter Cambridge Transport spoke to propose reviewing or developing some aspects of the proposals. Her remarks were a summary of her full written comments, which had been circulated to all members of the Committee in advance of the meeting.

Ms Hieatt said that the proposals contained much to be commended, and urged that they be put out to public consultation before being adopted. There was a risk of ending up with a patchwork of residents' parking schemes, particularly as a 50% threshold was needed to implement a scheme. She said that limited-wait bays could prove attractive and convenient, and commended the scheme adopted in Oxford, which was simple and cheap to install and enforce. Ms Hieatt suggested that the title of the scheme be amended to 'Neighbourhood Parking' because of its new features, and urged the Committee to be bold and imaginative with a policy that could play a significant role in solving Cambridge problems of pollution, congestion, danger and inconvenience; matters could not continue as they were.

The Parking Policy Manager introduced the report, the draft Residents' Parking Policy, and the draft Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan. Points noted by members included

- the policy set out a strategic plan that could be adopted across the county
- the City Deal Executive Board in principle, and subject to agreement of a business case, fully supported the Delivery Plan and funding of the associated implementation costs
- the operational hours of each scheme would be a matter for residents to determine locally
- the Delivery Plan identified zones in Cambridge for the creation of new residents' parking schemes; a revised map showing recent revisions to the zones was distributed [attached to these minutes at Appendix A].

Councillor Blencowe, Chair of the working group, said that the group had carried out its task as conscientiously and diligently as it could. He apologised that the report had not been ready earlier, but there had been issues to be resolved such as ensuring that upfront costs would not require residents to pay double in a scheme's first year of operation. There had been a good response from residents, which had informed the working group's thinking, as had the Mott McDonald survey. The group had tried to devise a process that would be able to respond to increasing and new pressures on parking, positively encouraging new schemes to come forward and not including those areas of the city which had shown no interest in residents' parking schemes. The Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee would be asked to endorse the proposed residents' parking scheme at its meeting in March.

In the course of discussion, members

- reported that there was a 50% level of support for a scheme in Staffordshire Street (zone 26). The problem there was of people parking to visit the Grafton Centre, whereas York Street was affected by railway passengers parking. Members were advised that the shading to indicate 50% support reflected the position as known at the time of writing the report. Councillor Walsh, the local County member, requested that the Staffordshire Street Area be included in phase 1 of the Delivery Extension Plan
- responding to the public speakers, expressed the view that the availability of free parking was working against efforts to reduce parking in the city, and said that it was anticipated that there would be legislation against pavement parking
- urged that the 50% support threshold for introducing a scheme be retained, as schemes needed to be self-financing; in areas where a large number of properties had off-street parking, residents would not want to purchase a permit
- commended the flexibility of the proposals compared with existing schemes; the Cambridge extension plan allowed for part-time possibilities, to be developed with local members' involvement to suit a particular area
- suggested that enforcing short-term parking bans need not be expensive because if the times were staggered around the city, one officer could move through several zones consecutively
- pointed out that the choice of time of day would be up to an individual area, which could not be compelled to adopt a different time from its neighbours. Officers advised that it would be more expensive to have officers available in a lot of short-term areas at once; commuters were well aware of parking restrictions, and it could be anticipated that some would simply move their cars around if times were staggered
- commented that dealing with enforcement on the boundaries of a scheme could be complicated by motorists claiming that they were unaware of different times applying in different areas
- noted that the working group had received presentations on a number of existing parking schemes, including those in Oxford and Edinburgh; these had informed their thinking.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) Endorse the Residents' Parking Policy (appendix A of the report before Committee)
- b) Endorse Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan (appendix B)

The Chairwoman thanked all the residents and residents' associations who had contributed to the development of the proposals by attending consultation meetings and participating in online and paper consultations. The Committee was also hugely indebted to the officers involved, Sonia Hansen and in particular Nicola Gardner; both residents and officers had the gratitude of the Committee.

### 53. TWO-WAY CYCLING IN ONE-WAY STREETS

The Committee received a report seeking its support for the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders to allow two-way cycling on restricted streets in Cambridge.

The Chairwoman reported that Helen Higgs of North Newtown Residents' Association had been prevented by illness from addressing the Committee. Her written submission was circulated to the Committee; the submission opposed the introduction of two-way cycling in Panton Street, St Eligius Street, Coronation Street, Norwich Street, and Union Road, for reasons including the large number of schools in the area and the narrowness of St Eligius Street.

City Councillor Nicholas Avery, a local member for Trumpington, addressed the Committee at the prompting of North Newtown residents. North Newtown was an area with many schoolchildren, and a lot of rat-running. He had no issue with two-way cycling in principle, but it was necessary to apply common sense and consider whether there was a clear view of the road ahead, and whether it was wide enough.

In the case of these particularly roads, local residents and Councillors had consistently queried their appropriateness. Looking at the Newtown roads in turn, Councillor Avery said that

- in Panton Street, the turn into and out of Lensfield Road was difficult; turning right into Panton Street from Lensfield Road was particularly awkward – he had recently observed two cyclists having difficulty there – and it was not appropriate to encourage schoolchildren to undertake the manoeuvre
- St Eligius Street was not very busy, but was very narrow, and parked cars made it impossible for other cars to drive up the road without driving on the kerb. The direction of one-way travel in Panton Street and Brookside was such that it seemed unnecessary to choose to cycle against the flow in St Eligius Street, so omitting St Eligius Street would not greatly inconvenience cyclists
- Coronation Street west of Panton Street was short and narrow, and a car would be in the road before a cyclist could see it
- Norwich Street had adequate width and visibility, and bigger gaps between parked cars, though Bateman Street nearby already had provision for two-way cycling in the same direction as was proposed for Norwich Street.

In summary, Councillor Avery was happy with two-way cycling in most cases, but the message from Newtown residents was that it was unsafe and undesirable for the particular streets identified.

Martin Lucas-Smith of Camcycle spoke to welcome the proposed changes. He said that these were some of the last few streets in Cambridge without two-way cycling, and there had been no indication from experience of the existing streets that the practice was unsafe. Two-way cycling was of great benefit because it enabled people to avoid longer routes safely and legally.

Mr Lucas-Smith expressed disappointment at the recommendation to exclude Willis Road and Brookside. There was no good reason not to allow two-way cycling in Willis Road, which would allow cyclists to get off Mill Road sooner, and the school run traffic congestion in Brookside should be dealt with by making it safer for all users, particularly children on bicycles. Newtown residents had not suggested any

alternative scheme, despite being invited to do so two years ago. He suggested that if in doubt about a street, the Committee grant approval for it on a temporary basis.

The Project Officer set out the background to the proposals and responded to points made by speakers.

- in Willis Road, there was a planter that restricted the space available to put in a marked cycle path; as it would have been for local rather than strategic use, the proposal was not being put forward for approval
- in Brookside, there tended to be a solid line of parked cars, whereas in St Eligius Street there were gaps between parked cars, provided space for cyclists to pull in
- Panton Street was quite a strategic route; a large number of people already cycled against the flow, and the intention was to make this easier and safer
- St Eligius Street was very narrow, with cars driving on the footway; it was impossible to walk with a bicycle, so the one-way meant that a long detour was necessary. Cycling against the flow would be no different from a narrow street with two-way cars; it would be necessary to give way to cars coming in the opposite direction
- in Romsey, the issue was getting to homes without a detour, as there was not enough space on the pavements to push a bicycle. The safety audit had raised questions of narrowness, but similar streets had cars in both directions.

The Committee proceeded to examine and vote on the proposals for each street, grouped by electoral division. [The decisions are recorded by division, and summarised for clarity at the end of this minute.] The Chairwoman emphasised that the Committee would not be stating that two-way cycling would be happening in particular streets; that decision would be based on the outcome of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation process.

**Petersfield**, recommendations a) to d), Guest Road, Collier Road, Emery Street/Road, Perowne Street

Speaking as a local City member, Councillor Robertson welcomed the initiative, provided that there was clear signage at the entrance of the roads to show that cyclists were allowed to ride against the flow of traffic; there was a recognition that people were already doing this anyway.

Speaking as County member for Petersfield, Councillor Walsh said that people often turned into Perowne Street rather dangerously; the proposal would improve safety.

It was resolved unanimously to support the advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders in order to allow two-way cycling in the following streets:

- a) Guest Road
- b) Collier Road
- c) Emery Street/ Road
- d) Perowne Street

**Romsey**, recommendations e) to j), Sedgwick Street, Catharine Street, Thoday Street, Ross Street (from St Philip's Road to Mill Road), Hemingford Road, Argyle Street

Councillor Baigent, a local member, spoke in favour. He said that there were problems with two-way cycling, but the proposals would improve safety for something that was already happening. Cars would travel more slowly because of

the need to be aware of oncoming bikes; because of the narrowness of the pavements, people often crossed the road, or pushed buggies along the roadway.

Speaking as County member for Coleridge, the neighbouring electoral division, Councillor Kavanagh said that the proposals would make matters safer for all. He welcomed the inclusion of Thoday Street, recalling that its residents had voted to have two or three car spaces changed into cycle parking spaces.

It was resolved unanimously to support the advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders in order to allow two-way cycling in the following streets:

- e) Sedgwick Street
- f) Catharine Street
- g) Thoday Street
- h) Ross Street (from St Philip's Road to Mill Road)
- i) Hemingford Road
- j) Argyle Street.

**Market**, recommendation p), New Square

In the absence of member comment, the Committee proceeded directly to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order in order to allow two-way cycling in the following street:

- p) New Square.

**Trumpington**, recommendations k) to o), Panton Street, St Eligius Street, Coronation Street (west of junction with Panton Street), Norwich Street, Union Road

Speaking as local County member, Councillor Ashwood recalled Councillor Avery's remarks, and said that she would prefer to see all the Newtown proposals removed from the list. She would however have supported two-way cycling in Brookside, because it was a straight open road with good visibility.

Councillor Ashwood said that some of the houses in St Eligius Street opened straight onto the pavement; it was dangerous to step out of them because of cars driving along the pavement. She was appalled at the thought of cyclists turning right into Panton Street from Lensfield Road, and had very serious concerns about the safety of children on the roads, given the large number of schools embedded in the area and the lack of space for even single-way cycling at some times. She urged the Committee, in view of the City Deal's efforts to ease congestion, and the parking review, to support the local members in rejecting the Newtown proposals. Councillor Ashwood added that City Councillors Avery and O'Connell agreed with her; it was not that they were opposed to cycling, but they were concerned about these streets.

In discussion, members

- suggested that the proposals for St Eligius Street and the northern end of Panton Street be removed or delayed, in view of the concerns expressed by the Residents' Association; St Eligius was too narrow for two-way cycling to be safe or sensible

- expressed surprise that the proposals did not restrict traffic movement, as it was cars rather than bicycles which were the problem in these streets; if St Eligius Street was open only to bicycles, there would be no difficulty with two-way cycling
- pointed out that it was necessary to consider the proposals in front of the Committee on this occasion, as it was impossible to know what developments there would be in the years ahead
- suggested that the advertising of TROs should proceed for Panton Street, Coronation Street, Norwich Street and Union Road; while the Committee had expressed some concerns about these streets, the proposals could then be judged in the light of the TRO consultation responses
- suggested that allowing two-way cycling in Brookside, a clear, open road, would improve access to St Mary's School without introducing two-way cycling in St Eligius Street or Panton Street.
- noted that resources were not available to conduct a wider review of traffic in general. There was an issue with rat-running in Newtown, and cyclists were already cycling round the area against the flow of one-way streets
- queried whether the fact that people were already cycling illegally against the flow was a reason to legitimise the practice.

The Committee proceeded to vote on each Trumpington division street in turn.

#### k) Panton Street

It was resolved by a majority not to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to allow two-way cycling on Panton Street.

#### l) St Eligius Street

It was resolved unanimously not to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to allow two-way cycling on St Eligius Street.

#### m) Coronation Street

It was resolved by a majority to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to allow two-way cycling on Coronation Street (west of junction with Panton Street).

#### n) Norwich Street

It was resolved by a majority to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to allow two-way cycling on Norwich Street.

#### o) Union Road

It was resolved by a majority to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to allow two-way cycling on Union Road.

The Committee then considered whether or not to support the recommendation not to progress any changes to Willis Road and Brookside.

#### q) Willis Road

It was resolved by a majority to agree not to progress any changes to Willis Road.

r) Brookside

It was resolved by a majority not to agree not to progress any changes to Brookside.

The Chairwoman then put the question whether the Committee supported the advertising of a TRO for Brookside.

It was resolved by a majority to support the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order to allow two-way cycling on Brookside.

In summary, the Committee resolved

- 1) to support the advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders in order to allow two-way cycling on the following streets:

- a) Guest Road
- b) Collier Road
- c) Emery Street/ Road
- d) Perowne Street
- e) Sedgwick Street
- f) Catharine Street
- g) Thoday Street
- h) Ross Street (from St Philip's Road to Mill Road)
- i) Hemingford Road
- j) Argyle Street
- m) Coronation Street (west of junction with Panton Street)
- n) Norwich Street
- o) Union Road
- p) New Square
- r) Brookside

- 2) to agree not to progress any changes to the following streets:

- k) Panton Street
- l) St Eligius Street
- q) Willis Road

**54. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER REPRESENTATION ASSOCIATED WITH ASCHAM ROAD, GURNEY WAY AND ATHERTON CLOSE, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the representation to the installation of prohibition of waiting restrictions on Ascham Road and at its junctions with Gurney Way and Atherton Close, West Chesterton. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

Members noted that once a TRO had been advertised, it was not permissible to introduce a more onerous restriction, but it was possible to reduce the proposed restriction. Consultation feedback had suggested that the proposals were more severe than necessary, and approval was being sought for an amended scheme. An improved print-out of Appendix 4 was circulated, with apologies for the poor quality of the appendix included in the report.

In discussion, Councillor Tunnacliffe, a local member, endorsed the modified proposal.



It was resolved unanimously to

- a) Implement the proposed restriction over a lesser extent, as detailed in this report before Committee
- b) Inform the representor accordingly

**55. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH COURTNEY WAY AND METCALFE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine objections to the installation of proposed Prohibition of Waiting parking restrictions on the corner of Courtney Way/Metcalf Road, West Chesterton. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

Members noted that, as with the previous TRO, there was a possibility of reducing the length of the proposed restriction. The proposal had been intended to keep the whole junction clear of parked vehicles using a one-off funding opportunity to do so; if the Committee decided to proceed with the lesser restriction and it subsequently proved necessary to introduce the wider restriction, a fresh consultation process would be required, involving further expenditure.

In discussion, Councillor Tunnacliffe, a local member, said that modifying the proposed configuration was not entirely clear-cut. Councillor Scutt, also a local member, said that the concern had been that cars should not be parked where they would impede access to the school; the three houses where it was proposed to reduce the restrictions had got up a petition in support of the modification. Members noted that the school had not submitted any formal response to the TRO consultation, but was aware of the proposals.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) implement the proposed restrictions over an amended lesser extent, as detailed in the report before Committee
- b) inform the objectors accordingly.

**56. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH HURST PARK AVENUE, AT ITS JUNCTION WITH MILTON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objections to the installation of prohibition of waiting on Hurst Park Avenue, West Chesterton. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

Michael Page, Chair of Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association, spoke to welcome the proposed prohibition of waiting, and to query the lack of officer engagement with the dental practice opposite and adjacent to the affected area. He stressed that nobody on the estate wanted any further delay in implementing parking restrictions; the only difference of opinion concerned the length of the lines.

Sara Payne, Chair of Dalegarth Residents Company Ltd, spoke to urge the Committee to extend the proposed parking restriction on the south side of Hurst Park Avenue to just beyond the entrance to the Dalegarth flats, and to install some

restricted parking just beyond the dental practice on the other side. The restriction on the south side would alleviate the problems of drivers emerging from the Dalegarth flats, whose vision was currently blocked by parked cars, and the restriction opposite would enable refuse lorries to access the flats without difficulty.

Introducing the report, the City Council Senior Engineer explained that these proposals were part of the same West Chesterton package as the preceding TRO [minute 55 refers]. He apologised if he had misunderstood any commitment to go back to local residents. Informal consultation had taken place in summer 2015, along with discussions with local members, and the decision had been taken to move forward with the proposals contained in the report. There was concern that patients attending the dental surgery would be unable to park nearby; encouraging surgery staff to park off the surgery forecourt could release five or six spaces there.

The Senior Engineer said that there was often a solid line of parked vehicles throughout the working day on one or both sides of the road, with considerable pavement parking on the surgery side because of cars parked on the opposite, Dalegarth, side. Restricting parking near the junction with Milton Road would keep the junction area clear. Opinion in the road varied as to the best length for the double yellow lines, whether longer or shorter or as proposed and consulted on.

In reply to Mr Page's question whether officers were empowered to contact significant objectors directly, the Senior Engineer said that there was nothing preventing direct contact in this case except a lack of resources. Local members had been happy to proceed with the scheme proposed, which had been developed at their suggestion.

In discussion, members

- commented that the question of length of restriction was finely balanced; reducing the length slightly on the Dalegarth side would allow more space for dental visitors
- there was no guarantee that any additional spaces on the road would not be occupied by other vehicles, unconnected with the dental practice
- noted that the present pattern of parking permitted passage of emergency vehicles, but only because of footway parking; the Senior Engineer could not recommend that footway parking continue
- noted that any attempt to increase the proposed restriction would require the whole TRO advertisement process to be re-run, whereas the scheme as proposed, or a lesser scheme, could be introduced almost immediately.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) implement the restriction as advertised
- b) inform the objectors accordingly.

Councillor Scutt, local County member for West Chesterton, thanked the Senior Engineer and all the residents involved for their efforts to develop all the TROs for West Chesterton [minutes 54, 55 and 56 refer].

**57. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH FANSHAWE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objection to the installation of No Waiting at Any Time on parts of Fanshawe Road. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the response to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the one objection received.

Speaking as local County member, Councillor Kavanagh commented that the objection contained an internal contradiction, and reported that the residents of Bancroft Close and Sterne Close were very supportive of this proposal to improve the safety of Fanshawe Road, which was a rat run.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) implement the restriction as advertised
- b) inform the objectors accordingly

**58. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH LANSDOWNE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objection to the installation of No Waiting at Any Time on Lansdowne Road. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

Bobby Reddy, a resident of Lansdowne Road, spoke to explain that, while he broadly supported the parking scheme, he objected to the proposed signpost setting out the single yellow line being placed outside his property. A post in this position would adversely affect the view from, and the value of, the property, which had been recently renovated and landscaped. He had hoped that an existing telegraph pole could be used for the signage, but had learnt that this would not be possible because the sign would then be more than 15m from the start of the single line. Instead, he suggested that the double yellow line be lengthened to end within 15m of the telegraph pole (a stretch of road where parking was anyway impossible), so no new sign would be needed; the other residents of the street would support this approach.

The Service Manager - Local Projects confirmed that officers had looked at the telegraph pole and found it to be too far from the end of the restriction. Mounting the plate on this pole would make the whole line unenforceable, and extending the double yellow lines would make the restriction more onerous than that advertised, which would require a fresh consultation process. Mr Reddy confirmed that the problem lay with the height of the proposed signpost, rather than the size of the sign. The Service Manager explained that on the footway, a sign had to be 2.1m high for the safety of passers-by, but it would be possible to work with a resident to mount the sign on a fence or property; this could then be lower because there would be no risk of a pedestrian striking their head on it.

Members expressed sympathy for Mr Reddy's position, and noted that local City member Councillor Holt had expressed support by email for the suggestion of installing either a new pole or painting the current one. Members suggested that officers work with Mr Reddy to resolve the issue of signage, and it was proposed that this be reflected by the addition of a third element to the Committee decision.

It was proposed, and agreed unanimously, that the recommendation be amended by the addition of 'c) urge that reasonable steps be taken to address the signage issue raised during the consultation.'

It was resolved by a majority to

- a) implement the restriction as advertised
- b) inform the objectors accordingly
- c) urge that reasonable steps be taken to address the signage issue raised during the consultation

**59. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH MARINER'S WAY, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objection to the installation of No Waiting at Any Time on Mariner's Way. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

Andrew Mangeot, a resident of Chichester House flats, spoke in support of the proposed restriction of waiting because it would improve safety for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians and improve access for emergency vehicles to the Chichester House end of Mariner's Way, and improve access to the Chichester House car park.

At the Chairwoman's request, comments received by email from Mike Hawes were circulated to the Committee. In his view, the proposals were wholly unnecessary, as there was already excellent emergency vehicle access to Eights Marina via Cutter Ferry Lane, and for Chichester House from Elizabeth Way Bridge.

Speaking as local County member, Councillor Manning said that he supported the proposed TRO, both in terms of the size of the area covered and the amount of consultation. He had spoken to many residents in both Marina Way and Capstan Close; some Marina Way residents had wanted no waiting at any time down the whole of Marina Way, and the present scheme represented a compromise solution. The majority of residents, in his experience, did want something to be done.

It was resolved to

- a) implement the restriction as advertised
- b) inform the objectors accordingly

**60. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH NEW STREET ACCESS ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objection to the installation of No Waiting at Any Time on New Street Access Road. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

Members noted that Mr B of St Matthew's Gardens had registered to speak but had not submitted the required summary of his remarks in advance. Instead, his wife had emailed members of the Committee. The email and accompanying map were circulated to members. The Chairwoman read out the email, which alleged that due

process had not been followed in advertising or consulting on the proposed TRO, and which queried the process by which Local Highway Improvement (LHI) initiative funding was secured for a project involving a private/ non-highway road.

The Service Manager – Local Projects explained that the LHI scheme had been promoted by the local Councillors. A large number of vehicles parked on the footway beside the access road, blocking access for pedestrians. The adjacent carriageway was not highway, but the landowner had agreed to allow restrictions at that point. The footpath was public highway, so the use of LHI funding was acceptable.

The Service Manager described the advertising process followed. A press notice had been published in the Cambridge News on 19 October 2016, a notice had been placed on site on the same day and a letter drop had been carried out in the vicinity to homes thought likely to be affected by the proposals. In addition, statutory consultees such as the Police had been consulted. These measures meant that statutory obligations to ensure adequate publicity for the scheme had been met.

Mr B said that the notice had not been posted on site until 30 October, and four properties had been omitted from the letter drop. The Service Manager said that the statutory process did not require a letter drop. In future, his team would be taking photographs when notices were posted, showing the date of posting.

Councillor Robertson, a local City member, said that this initiative had come about as a result of residents' complaints about pavement parking; the Police had been putting cones on the pavement as a temporary measure for the last year to stop it. He strongly supported the proposed TRO.

In the course of discussion, members

- pointed out that it was not uncommon for LHI funds to be used on private land
- suggested that if it was being alleged that due process had not been followed, the proposal could not be approved
- said that it was reasonable to assume that officers had carried out their duties properly; the Policy and Regulation team had confirmed to the Service Manager that the site notice was put up on the same day as the notice went into the newspaper
- observed that the objections raised had been responded to in the committee report and at the meeting.

Summing up, the Chairwoman said that the Committee had noted and taken into account the allegations and objections raised in reaching its decision on the Traffic Regulation Order.

It was resolved by a majority to

- a) implement the restriction as advertised
- b) inform the objectors accordingly

**61. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH SLEAFORD STREET, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objection to the installation of No Waiting at Any Time on Sleaford Street. Members noted the background to the proposed scheme, the responses to the statutory consultation process, and officer comment on the responses.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) implement the restriction as advertised
- b) inform the objectors accordingly

Chairwoman