

# Cambridge Joint Area Committee: Minutes

Date: 18 September 2024

Time: 4:00 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.

Venue: Council Chamber, Guildhall, Cambridge

Present: City Councillors: Dave Baigent, Naomi Bennett, Richard Robertson, Martin Smart, Katie Thornburrow, Karen Young  
County Councillors: Alex Beckett, Gerri Bird, Alex Bulat, Elisa Meschini, Neil Shailer and Philippa Slatter

## 16. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mike Black (substituted by Councillor Bulat) and Councillor Rosy Moore (substituted by Councillor Smart).

Councillor Smart declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 4 (Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Waiting Restrictions on Riverside, Cambridge), as an acquaintance of one of the public questioners for that item.

Councillor Baigent declared a general non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Camcycle).

## 17. Minutes – 29 July 2024

While discussing the minutes of the previous meeting, it was confirmed, in relation to Minute 12 (Consider Objections to Proposed Residential Parking Scheme in Milton Road Area, Cambridge) that an exclusive email address would be set up to receive comments about the scheme following its implementation and in the build-up to a review after six months.

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 29 July 2024, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The Committee noted its action log.

## 18. Public Questions and Petitions

The Committee was informed that two public questions had been received and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item. It was noted that both questions related to Agenda Item 4 (Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Waiting Restrictions on Riverside, Cambridge).

## 19. Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Waiting Restrictions on Riverside, Cambridge

The Committee received a report which proposed the installation of waiting restrictions on Riverside in Cambridge.

Kate Finefrock was invited to address the Committee. Drawing attention to issues that had arisen with campervans parked on Riverside, Ms Finefrock suggested that people regularly used Stourbridge Playground as a toilet and had been involved in altercations with residents of the adjoining houses. She expressed concern about the number of accidents involving the vehicles and passing cyclists or pedestrians, and noted that her bins could not always be emptied due to the restricted access. Acknowledging the impact of the measures, she supported the proposals as an improvement to the safety of the area.

Sharon Stanley was invited to address the Committee. Noting that the proposals were trying to overcome issues that had been evident for many years, Mrs Stanley argued that the waiting restrictions would only displace vehicles further up Riverside or onto narrower side streets, such as Stanley Road. Objecting to the proposals, she suggested that the installation of additional signage prohibiting the parking of certain vehicles, as used in other cities, along with the installation of parking bays to prevent perpendicular parking, could help overcome the issues without removing parking spaces for Riverside residents that did not have off-road parking available.

Councillor Alex Bulat, County Councillor for the Abbey division, was invited to address the Committee. Highlighting how long residents had been waiting for a solution to the ongoing problems and acknowledging that it was not possible to find a scheme that would be supported by everyone, Councillor Bulat expressed her support for the proposals that had a majority support as the result of extensive consultation, and she paid tribute to the high level of engagement from residents in the various consultations that had been held over the years. Notwithstanding, she highlighted residents' concerns about the potential displacement of vehicles to surrounding streets, particularly given the lack of a resident parking scheme in the area, and suggested that the scheme should be monitored following its installation, if implemented. If negative consequences were identified, such as the displacement of vehicles to nearby streets, she suggested that additional measures should be developed, although she expressed concern about the length of time it would likely take to develop such measures.

Councillor Naomi Bennett, City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the committee. Noting the extensive consultations held between residents of the area and the local City and County Councillors, Councillor Bennett also emphasised how long residents had been waiting for parking issues to be resolved on Riverside. Drawing attention to complaints that had been received about people using Stourbridge Playground as a toilet or dumping site, she also emphasised that during the busiest periods, regular accidents occurred with cyclists and pedestrians because of the campervans parked on Riverside alongside Stourbridge Common.

While discussing the report, individual Members:

- Expressed concern about the displacement of anti-social behaviour, such as the use of nearby parks as a toilet or dumping site, and suggested that such issues should be included as part of wider considerations of community safety, and it was acknowledged that community safety officers were aware of the problems and were addressing them separately.
- Acknowledged the potential displacement of campervans and other vehicles to nearby streets but expressed concern about the size of the waiting list for housing in Cambridge, noting that some NHS workers were currently residing in campervans on Riverside. It was suggested that targeted assistance should be provided to help people living in such circumstances.
- Queried why the proposals did not include yellow lines for the whole section of Riverside. It was clarified that the scheme sought to ensure some resident parking remained on Riverside, without causing additional displacement to that which was already anticipated.
- Suggested that kerb blips could be used to prevent waiting, as well as parking, although it was noted that such an addition to the scheme would require a further consultation to be carried out. It was also emphasised that the ongoing problems were related to overnight parking, rather than waiting, and it was argued that disabled residents relied on being able to temporarily park in order to receive transportation and deliveries.
- Confirmed that double yellow line restrictions extended to the middle of the road, which meant that vehicles would not be able to park in the middle of Riverside. It was also confirmed that blue badge holders were able to park on double yellow lines.
- Noted that the installation of perpendicular parking bays on Riverside alongside the entrance to Stourbridge Common could present a challenge to the ongoing development of other schemes, such as the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Greenways scheme that was planned to pass through this location.
- Suggested that a larger scheme, such as a residential parking scheme (RPS), could be more effective in overcoming the issues, although it was noted that previous discussions about the introduction of an RPS had not resulted in a scheme, while the LHI programme would not be able to provide sufficient funding for larger schemes.
- Clarified that the final decision on whether to approve the installation of the proposed waiting restrictions would be made by the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability, rather than the Committee.
- Considered how the scheme should be monitored if its implementation was approved and agreed that local members would be able to raise concerns if issues such as displacement were identified as problematic. It was also suggested that the

Local Highways Improvement programme should be improved to make it easier and quicker for projects to be developed and implemented.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Recommend that the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability, in consultation with the local Member, approve the installation of the waiting restrictions, as advertised.

## 20. Pavement Parking, Red Routes and Resident Parking Schemes Delivery Plan Update

The Committee received an update report on various elements of parking policy relevant to the city of Cambridge, including resident parking schemes (RPSs), pavement parking pilots, red routes and the development of a Greater Cambridge Integrated Parking Strategy.

While discussing the report, individual Members:

- Welcomed the report and development of a holistic approach to parking issues across the city, highlighting that councillors and members of the public appreciated knowing about forthcoming consultations in advance.
- Highlighted the importance of developing Park & Ride sites to act more as travel hubs for all modes of transport, suggesting that further services, such as cafés, bike repair centres, taxi ranks, click and collect points, dry cleaning, parcel collection points, as well as longer operating hours, could increase their usage and help alleviate time poverty by promoting trip chaining. It was confirmed that the feasibility of such possibilities were being considered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), alongside how the sites could connect to the wider transport network, although it was emphasised that there were restrictions due to them all being situated within the greenbelt.
- Expressed concern about the length of time it was taking to develop the West Romsey RPS and test it with residents, noting that the area was extensively used for parking purposes due to surrounding areas having had separate RPSs implemented, which caused extensive problems and difficulties for residents. Members were informed that the potential loss of 500 currently compliant car parking spaces if pavement parking was prohibited had caused difficulties in the development of a scheme, as the minimum carriageway width could not accommodate double-sided parking across much of the area. Work was ongoing to identify a solution that could allow a scheme to be fully developed, and it was noted that the Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London (PATROL) Joint Committee was keen to extend parking enforcements currently adopted in London across the wider country.
- Expressed concern about high levels of pavement parking and the impact on pedestrians, particularly on roads such as Mill Road, and requested further information on how it could be controlled. Members were informed that pavement

parking could only be monitored when relevant parking restrictions, such as yellow lines, were in place at the location, while a grace period also meant that it was difficult to enforce, and that Civil Enforcement Officers were unable to issue a ticket to the majority of cars parked on the pavement due to these restrictions. Pilots were being developed to trial alternative methods to tackling the issue, for example through the use of signs, road markings or street furniture, depending on each individual situation. Members suggested that an increase in the number of Civil Enforcement Officers could be financed by the fines that they issue to illegally parked vehicles.

- Requested a timeframe for the development of the pavement parking trials being developed by the GCP, given the funding and legislative restraints. It was clarified that neither the County Council nor the GCP had any unallocated funding for the trials, although they could be supported by the reprioritisation of funding within existing budgets, while developer contributions could also provide an additional resource. It was anticipated that the Integrated Parking Strategy would be presented towards the end of 2025.
- Suggested that cost-effective measures, such as the installation of bollards or cycle-racks, could be implemented in areas prone to pavement parking problems, such as Mill Road, although it was acknowledged that some pavement areas were privately owned, making installations in such areas difficult. It was also noted that improvements to the public realm were being developed and would be considered further once a decision had been made by the County Council on whether to instal a modal filter on Mill Road bridge.
- Confirmed that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the proposed York RPS had been drafted and local Members had agreed to it being advertised. However, due to a consultation backlog, there would be a delay before the TRO could be advertised.
- Clarified that the public consultation for the Wilberforce Road area RPS was expected to open in late September 2024, rather than 2025 as stated in paragraph 2.11 of the report.
- Highlighted the cost of advertising TROs in newspapers and other outlets, and suggested that more modern, more effective and cheaper ways of advertising them could be used instead, to reduce the financial burden on already limited resources, although it was acknowledged that such changes would need to be approved by the government.
- Drew attention to the danger of electric bikes and electric scooters using pavements, although it was acknowledged that the police were responsible for enforcement of such infractions. Notwithstanding, it was noted that the government was considering legislation on the use of electric bikes and electric scooters.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note and comment on the report.

## 21. Cambridge Joint Area Committee Agenda Plan

While discussing the committee's agenda plan, individual Members:

- Clarified that a report on the York area RPS would be presented to the committee once the TRO consultation had taken place, although it was suggested that this would not occur before the meeting in March 2025.
- Requested a future report on the potential improvement and redesign of the security barrier on King's Parade. **Action required**
- Requested that the Cycling and Pedestrian Schemes Update report due to be presented to the committee at its meeting in December 2024 could include information on barriers to active travel, such as disabilities and time poverty. **Action required**

Chair  
18 December 2024