

Accordia - Objections/Comments

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
1	Aberdeen Ave.	<p>I refer to your letter of 1 February 2018. I live in __ Aberdeen Avenue and I will be directly affected by some of the proposed Plan (ref ACC/GA/101 Rev D). I am sending this letter by email as I am currently abroad.</p> <p>I support the concept of a Resident Permit Parking scheme. Because my wife and I are old (__) but still very active we need 2 small cars and use the garage and space outside our mews house for the 2nd car parking. Therefore parking for visitors is very important. No problem with paying for visitor parking.</p> <p>BUT this must be reasonably close to our home. The proposed plan restricts unreasonably the provision of visitor spaces near our home and I therefore object to the current revision of the Plan.</p> <p>I strongly urge that the 3 car spaces alongside building 18 in Henslow Mews be retained and a yellow line is not painted alongside building 18. Large vehicles are able to negotiate the corner and proceed into Henslow Mews without difficulty under the current position of no yellow line. These spaces are very valuable as there is very limited proposed space for parking in the Aberdeen Avenue.</p> <p>It is very important that slow speed and cautious driving is retained for safety reasons. Creating unduly wide spaces will not enhance safety.</p> <p>I do hope that you will amend the draft proposal to restore the 3 parking space.</p>	Against
2	Aberdeen Ave	<p>In response to your letter dated 1st February 2018 (Reference PR4037) I would like to object to the proposed signing and lining plan. (Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D).</p> <p>I wholeheartedly support the provision of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme for Accordia however the excessive introduction of further double yellow lines is unnecessary particularly in the locations highlighted on the attached Accordia Plan. I would like like the following noted:</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows "Existing double yellow lines" opposite No.26 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.51 Aberdeen Avenue (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity currently exists to park one vehicle opposite No.26 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows "Existing double yellow lines" opposite No. 18 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.17 Henslow Mews (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>the opportunity exists to park one vehicle opposite No.18 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D introduces “Proposed double yellow lines” along the northern elevation of No.21 Henslow Mews (highlighted pink on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). There are currently no yellow lines in this location and the ability currently exists to park 3 vehicles in this location. It is accepted that a limited extent of yellow lines could be introduced on the eastern corner so that the footpath remains unobstructed and vehicles can safely negotiate the turn when travelling in a south westerly direction. A limited extent of new yellow lines as shown on the attached revised plan extract would prevent any vehicular conflict but also retain precious car parking spaces for Accordia residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>The areas identified above do not warrant the need for further additional yellow lines on highway safety grounds and it is requested that the introduction of new yellow lines be kept to a minimum and implemented in accordance with the attached Plan reference “Henslow Mews south revised plan”.</p>	
3	Aberdeen Ave.	<p>In response to your letter dated 1st February 2018 (Reference PR4037) I would like to object to the proposed signing and lining plan. (Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D).</p> <p>I wholeheartedly support the provision of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme for Accordia however the excessive introduction of further double yellow lines is unnecessary particularly in the locations highlighted on the attached Accordia Plan. I would like like the following noted:</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No.26 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.51 Aberdeen Avenue (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity currently exists to park one vehicle opposite No.26 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No. 18 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.17 Henslow Mews (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity exists to park one vehicle opposite No.18 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D introduces “Proposed double yellow lines” along the northern elevation of No.21 Henslow Mews (highlighted pink on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). There are currently no yellow lines in this location and the ability currently exists to park 3 vehicles in this location. It is accepted that a limited extent of yellow lines could be introduced on the eastern corner so that the footpath remains unobstructed and vehicles can safely negotiate the turn when travelling in a south westerly direction. A limited extent of new yellow lines as shown on the attached revised plan extract would prevent any vehicular conflict but also retain precious car parking spaces for Accordia residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>The areas identified above do not warrant the need for further additional yellow lines on highway safety grounds and it is requested that the introduction of new yellow lines be kept to a minimum and implemented in accordance with the attached Plan reference “Henslow Mews south revised plan”.</p>	
4	Henslow Mews	<p>I have been an active supporter of designing and implementing a parking scheme in the Accordia development for many years but I do not support the scheme as it stands. My reasons are that the current proposals have not been thought through properly in the area of Henslow Mews and the proposals will make parking, congestion and safety worse in this area than they are now. My reasons are set out below.</p> <p>Yellow line extensions around the corners of Henslow Mews East, both at the North and South Corners combined with new yellow lines along Henslow Mews East wide pavement area reduce available parking by approximately 8 spaces. In addition yellow lines along the most easterly edge of this road serve no purpose and will be an eyesore for an area designated as ‘green space’ and in a conservation area.</p> <p>Although there is a limited amount of commuter parking in this area currently, the reality is that most of the parking here is by residents. I live in the centre of this area (Henslow Mews East) and the main issue is that of anti-social long term parking by residents such that there is very limited space for visitors to this area that is within easy walking distance to our properties and if the proposals are implemented as planned it will be made significantly worse. I have raised this point previously and the counter arguments I have been given are as follows – to which I respond below:</p> <p>Visitors can be accommodated by purchasing visitor passes I have no objection to purchasing visitor passes, but if there are no spaces available due to long term resident parking in this area then visitor passes are of little use.</p> <p>Excluding non residents from parking on Aberdeen Avenue will free up space for residents who currently park on Henslow Mews East This is completely unproven and untested. It is very likely that residents that are currently parking in an anti-social way will NOT change their habits and those who currently suffer the consequences will have the circumstances worsened by greater competition for space.</p> <p>Extending yellow lines around the corners of Henslow Mews is required to allow large vehicles and emergency vehicles to pass</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>The current proposal very sensibly has made a compromise along Henslow Mews South and North such that yellow lines are not being proposed here. I applaud the design for doing so. It is expected that residents will 'self manage' as they have been since the development was first occupied. The result of this is that occasionally a large vehicle has difficulty is passing. Emergency vehicles have access through the emergency slip road so this is not an issue. I do not see why the same compromise cannot be reached for the corners of this road, thereby allowing 4 extra spaces. Residents do not park in these areas such as to restrict vehicles that are attending their own properties. I repeat that the issues are caused by parking along the Mews themselves, not the corners and as a resident occasionally affected I am happy to accept the status quo.</p> <p>Yellow lines are required along the raised pavement areas to stop parking as parking is never allowed on pavements. Vulnerable pavement users must of course be protected. This area of pavement however is sufficiently wide to allow a vehicle to park and for a full width pedestrian passageway and seems a perfect space to extend parking if such spaces are needed. In addition, by allowing parking along the section of narrow pavement, the scheme is inviting continued anti-social parking by residents on the pavement as occurs now, thereby causing difficulty for vulnerable pedestrians and of course giving an inconsistent message regarding pavement parking.</p> <p>My last area of comment / objection is that if the proposals are implemented as planned, access to my garage (a shared undercroft for 4 houses) and those of others, could be badly compromised by resident parking on both sides adjacent to the gate and on opposite sides of the gate facing. This currently only occurs if an inconsiderate commuter parks here: residents do not. If there were no new lines on Henslow Mews East and around the corners as planned, I would be happy that residents continue to self manage, however, if the lines are implemented, then competition for space will mean that residents are more likely to park anti-socially resulting in reduced access to our garages.</p> <p>In summary, for this area of the scheme, the proposals will make access and parking more difficult, not better. If the scheme were altered such that the additional yellow lines in this area were not included I could fully support the scheme. If these views are ignored however and the scheme goes ahead, then to maintain garage access then lines will need to be even further extended to protect garage access.</p>	
5	Henslow Mews	<p>In response to your letter dated 1st February 2018 (Reference PR4037) I take this opportunity to object to the Proposed Signing and Lining Plan (Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D).</p> <p>Whilst I support the provision of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme for Accordia the excessive introduction of further double yellow lines is unwarranted and unnecessary particularly in the locations highlighted on the attached Accordia Plan.</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No.26 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.51 Aberdeen Avenue (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity currently exists to park one vehicle opposite No.26 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No. 18 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.17 Henslow Mews (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity exists to park one vehicle opposite No.18 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D introduces “Proposed double yellow lines” along the northern elevation of No.21 Henslow Mews (highlighted pink on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). There are currently no yellow lines in this location and the ability currently exists to park 3 vehicles in this location. It is accepted that a limited extent of yellow lines could be introduced on the eastern corner so that the footpath remains unobstructed and vehicles can safely negotiate the turn when travelling in a south westerly direction. A limited extent of new yellow lines as shown on the attached revised plan extract would prevent any vehicular conflict but also retain precious car parking spaces for Accordia residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>The areas identified above do not warrant the need for further additional yellow lines on highway safety grounds and it is requested that the introduction of new yellow lines be kept to a minimum and implemented in accordance with the attached Plan reference “Henslow Mews south revised plan”.</p>	
6	No Address Provided	<p>Having recently moved to the area am aware that during day time hours in the week the majority of spaces are taken up by non residents and as much as i partly see the need for exclusive resident parking i object to this course of action due to the proposed cost of £62pa as a huge fee to the majority of residents who are in social housing and already struggling financially, aware some are on long term ESA benefits and have difficulty enough keeping their cars on the road with insurance, tax, repairs etc without the need for more costs, personally, i will see this as a struggle to afford, with the need for a vehicle for work purposes and taking children to school etc. i don't see the option of not having a car as possible.</p> <p>Am interested to know if there was a proposed cost when residents were originally asked about the options?</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
7	No Address Provided	<p>I write concerning the above proposed TRO for the Accordia Estate in Cambridge. I note a response rate of 33% with 87% in favour of the scheme. I am certain all the neighbours have noticed the liberal use of the streets here as free parking for commuters and local workers, and many agree something needs to be done. Imposing a resident permit area is one solution. However, it is one that is affordable only for those living in the high market value properties comprising 60% of the estate. I wonder whether many of the responses received were from these address, with a minimum response from the 40% based in affordable housing. For us, a £61 annual fee, open to change and thus increase, is extortionate. To add insult to injury, what is the point of having a five day £15 permit or a £3 daily permit for visitors but not an annual permit for regulars such as good friends and family I would most sincerely hope you would not expect three sets of grandparents to pay £61 for each of their cars to visit, that's £240 for immediate family only. Oh yes, and _____ non resident parent, £300, £1000 over three years, I am lost for words!?</p> <p>With a total of 379 properties at an average of £300 (conservative estimate) per annum income for the scheme will be £113,700. This is merely a reasoned guesstimate. How would the operational costs be broken down on an annual basis? Is there a reasonable estimate of the costs?</p> <p>What exactly is going to prevent the annual review of fees leaving residents in the same situation as those in Sheffield where they have seen hikes of 240% for residents and 400% for visitors since the schemes were introduced in 2012?</p> <p>I think once more residents have been made aware of the potential costs in more detail, the benefits of having a fewer commuters enforced in this way, may seem less evident.</p> <p>I also mean to ask what would happen to the already private parking behind Gilpin Road ___ this is already private and therefore should not be subject to the order?</p>	Against
8	No Address Provided	<p>In response to your letter dated 1st February 2018 (Reference PR4037) I take this opportunity to object to the Proposed Signing and Lining Plan (Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D).</p> <p>Whilst I support the provision of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme for Accordia the excessive introduction of further double yellow lines is unwarranted and unnecessary particularly in the locations highlighted on the attached Accordia Plan.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows "Existing double yellow lines" opposite No.26 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.51 Aberdeen Avenue (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity currently exists to park one vehicle opposite No.26 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No. 18 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.17 Henslow Mews (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity exists to park one vehicle opposite No.18 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D introduces “Proposed double yellow lines” along the northern elevation of No.21 Henslow Mews (highlighted pink on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). There are currently no yellow lines in this location and the ability currently exists to park 3 vehicles in this location. It is accepted that a limited extent of yellow lines could be introduced on the eastern corner so that the footpath remains unobstructed and vehicles can safely negotiate the turn when travelling in a south westerly direction. A limited extent of new yellow lines as shown on the attached revised plan extract would prevent any vehicular conflict but also retain precious car parking spaces for Accordia residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>The areas identified above do not warrant the need for further additional yellow lines on highway safety grounds and it is requested that the introduction of new yellow lines be kept to a minimum and implemented in accordance with the attached Plan reference “Henslow Mews south revised plan”.</p>	
9	No Address Provided	<p>In response to your letter dated 1st February 2018 (Reference PR4037) I take this opportunity to object to the Proposed Signing and Lining Plan (Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D).</p> <p>Whilst I support the provision of a Residents Permit Parking Scheme for Accordia the excessive introduction of further double yellow lines is unwarranted and unnecessary particularly in the locations highlighted on the attached Accordia Plan.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No.26 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.51 Aberdeen Avenue (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity currently exists to park one vehicle opposite No.26 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D incorrectly shows “Existing double yellow lines” opposite No. 18 Henslow Mews and extending along the southern elevation of No.17 Henslow Mews (highlighted yellow on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). The existing double yellow lines do not extend as far as shown on the plan and the opportunity exists to park one vehicle opposite No.18 Henslow Mews. This position should remain unchanged and the existing yellow line should not be extended in this location. The current</p>	Against

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>arrangements do not result in a vehicular conflict and/or a road safety hazard and therefore should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drawing Number ACC/GA/101 Rev.D introduces “Proposed double yellow lines” along the northern elevation of No.21 Henslow Mews (highlighted pink on the attached Henslow Mews south plan). There are currently no yellow lines in this location and the ability currently exists to park 3 vehicles in this location. It is accepted that a limited extent of yellow lines could be introduced on the eastern corner so that the footpath remains unobstructed and vehicles can safely negotiate the turn when travelling in a south westerly direction. A limited extent of new yellow lines as shown on the attached revised plan extract would prevent any vehicular conflict but also retain precious car parking spaces for Accordia residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>The areas identified above do not warrant the need for further additional yellow lines on highway safety grounds and it is requested that the introduction of new yellow lines be kept to a minimum and implemented in accordance with the attached Plan reference “Henslow Mews south revised plan”.</p>	
10	Gilmour Rd	<p>This is an email to register strong approval for the proposed residents parking scheme for the Accordia area: the scheme as proposed would benefit the residents hugely (more space around the houses, less risk to children because cars frequently on the move at school run time as people try and find space to park) and it would also help discourage people from driving into the centre and so ease congestion overall.</p> <p>My family and I very much hope the parking scheme will be implemented.</p>	Support
11	Aberdeen Sq	<p>I'm responding to the Notice dated Feb'18.</p> <p>The Notice highlights the possibility of a Car Club bay within the scheme. I welcome this enhancement, as a well run car club reduces overtime the number of privately owned vehicles parked on the road for significant periods of time and provides the opportunity for members of the club to make use of a range of no/low emission vehicles for their journeys.</p>	Support
12	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	<p>THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 13) ORDER 2018</p> <p>THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 14) ORDER 2018</p> <p>Thank you for your ‘e’ correspondence in relation to the above named proposal. Please accept this as confirmation and acknowledgement of receipt.</p> <p>What is intended has been fully examined by the traffic management unit.</p>	Support

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>With regard to the proposed waiting restrictions, it being recognised and acknowledged 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.</p>	
13	Gilmour Rd	<p>May I first of all say a big Thank You for all the very comprehensive work that you have done and especially for keeping residents like myself so well informed. I am most grateful.</p> <p>I look forward to a successful outcome of the consultation process concerning the introduction of residents parking on the Accordia development where I live. As I write this I have counted 6 office workers cars parked in Gilmour Road this morning!</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate this may be a little late in this process I would like to draw your attention to a related matter that I brought to the notice of the Highways Department and Police a long while back. Both were helpful but unable to resolve the issued.</p> <p>In the cul de sac of Gilmour Road I believe that 7 allocated parking bays will be created (or are proposed at this stage).</p> <p>The plans that I have seen create 5 spaces facing towards Brooklands Avenue and 2 facing the gardens towards Shaftsbury Road.</p> <p>These are fine and well situated but will that stop additional cars (perhaps with residents permits displayed) parking where there aren't any marked bays?</p> <p>The photograph above shows the daily occurrence outside of my own house. There will always be one car parked alongside my garage wall where no bay is proposed and another car parallel parked in effect in the middle of the road. The middle of the road vehicles which are often very large 4 x 4's make it all but impossible for delivery vehicles to gain access to mine or my neighbours property and without any doubt would totally obstruct an emergency vehicle if one were needed.</p> <p>I would very much hope that a single yellow line at the very least could be created beside my garage wall (where the blue car is in the photo) and ideally a hatched yellow box where the black car is to prevent this selfish and obstructive double parking in the centre of the road.</p> <p>Lastly I note that households will be able to apply for up to 3 parking permits. This seems at odds with a policy of restricting cars on Cambridge roads. In Gilmour Road and Moreland Place we have 18 houses which will have 7 allocated residents parking bays. I agree with the siting of the bays but I also know that one of the residents has 3 vehicles which are invariably parked in the cul de sac, the largest of which usually in the middle of the road and that resident should they apply for 3 permits will take up almost half of the allocated spaces. Wouldn't 2 per household make more sense?</p> <p>Thank you for your time. I shall now walk into the town centre leaving my one car in the garage!!</p>	Comment

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
14	Gilpin Rd	<p>I am writing concerning the above proposal PR0437. I am a resident on Gilpin Road and have been for over ten years. There has been an increase in people using our streets for parking so I can understand the reasoning behind the plans.</p> <p>Could I ask the following questions?:</p> <p>1) Why not Monday to Friday? Many other streets near us in Cambridge are Monday to Friday, which I can absolutely understand as they are working days and hours. There isn't an issue on the estate on a Saturday and that is naturally a key time for visitors. Please just keep the restrictions for weekdays if they are going ahead. It doesn't seem fair to have to pay £3 per car for someone to visit when there isn't an issue on a weekend at all. There are plenty of bays where people can park safely off road, they have NEVER all been full in the ten years I have lived here. Residents pay mortgages, as well as service charges and council tax. The potential costs of this scheme really will start adding up fast.</p> <p>2) Do I have to pay £62 for a space in my designated resident parking bay? I couldn't see the answer to this on the proposal. I park my car in the bay reserved for my private property as that is the 'drive' attached to my flat (which is in a block of 3 flats). If I do have to pay for my bay now isn't it slightly unfair to charge me for what is actually mine? Apologies if this is not the case.</p> <p>Anyway, I hope you will consider the points above. The situation is not the residents' doing, it is commuters and local businesses that do not provide adequate parking, so anyway in which you can limit the cost of it to us is really gratefully received. We all pay mortgages and council tax. I also pay a significant monthly service charge so adding £3 per visitor every weekend will really start to mount up. As well as the £62 annual fee that will only ever increase year on year. Surely Monday to Friday, similar to Hills Road is reasonable to move forward if the plan has to go ahead.</p> <p>Personally, I would rather put up with the cars mid week and not implement the scheme at all. It is selfish of these non-residents to clog up our streets but I know I will feel really cross everytime I have to pay the council to park my own car at my own house or have my friends and family visit.</p> <p>I hope to hear from you soon. Feel free to call on the number below or reply to this email. Thank you for your time in reading this email and considering my point of view. I have genuinely been really happy living here, please don't change that!</p>	Comment
15	Henslow Mews	<p>Our home is ___ Henslow Mews on the Accordia development in Cambridge.</p> <p>Please could we suggest two small improvements to the parking proposal for our area?</p> <p>1. Limited waiting bays on Henslow Mews East. As per the existing proposal, the number of available parking spaces in the Henslow Mews East area will be significantly reduced. The remaining spaces will most certainly be occupied by "long term" (days-weeks) on-street resident parkers, leaving no spaces at all for visitors or tradespeople.</p>	Comment

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
		<p>The proposed "limited waiting" bays in the square on Aberdeen Avenue are really some distance away. Please could you therefore incorporate 1-2 additional limited waiting bays on Henslow Mews East (ideally at both ends)? Please note that our concern does not relate to the availability of parking permits for visitors or tradespeople - this is irrelevant, because there will not be any space for them to park! It is (unfortunately) extremely unlikely that the requirement to pay a small fee to obtain a permit will be an effective deterrent to long-term resident parkers (responsible for most antisocial parking on Henslow Mews).</p> <p>2. Parking regulation on Henslow Mews South. As per the existing proposal, no provision is made to regulate antisocial parking on Henslow Mews South (or indeed Henslow Mews North, although that is generally less of a problem). This sometimes obstructs access, occasionally for cars, but more often for larger vehicles e.g. for refuse collection. Our main concern, of course, is for emergency vehicles e.g. fire appliances. Whilst we understand that drivers are themselves responsible for parking in such a way that they do not obstruct the highway, please be aware that this requirement is often ignored in practice - and that, should there be a fire on Henslow Mews, there is the potential for disaster (which is not fully mitigated by access from Shaftsbury Road).</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration. We really appreciate all the thought, time and effort devoted to this scheme by you and your colleagues.</p>	
16	Henslow Mews	<p>I would be grateful if you could help me with an enquiry in relation to the resident parking scheme in accordia.</p> <p>I am in support of this proposal, and would like to clarify how far the double yellow lines that will be placed opposite ___ Henslow Mews (alongside the side of 51 Aberdeen Avenue) will extend, as it is not clear from diagrams I have seen.</p> <p>I would like to add that cars parked in this area (alongside 51 Aberdeen Avenue) do cause obstruction to the access of garages in this area in Henslow Mews.</p>	Comment
17	Kingfisher Way	<p>I am writing in regards to the proposed residents' permit parking scheme in Accordia Area, Cambridge. I was one of the residents that agreed to the scheme because of the parking problem, high air pollution, litter and the noisy and unsafe area due to unsensible commuters that park in a resident area which used to be eco-friendly.</p> <p>Looking well at the plan, I realised that there is a proposed double yellow line in front of No. 37 (if I am correct).</p> <p>I support the scheme, however losing the space which people used to park in is inconvenient. I hope I am wrong as I may not have seen the map properly. However if this is not the case, I would really appreciate taking into consideration this matter, of not restricting the residents by adding extra double yellow lines as they will only create an uncomfortable area for accessibility.</p>	Comment

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
18	No Address Provided	<p>With regards to the above parking scheme...we are very supportive of this scheme in general but did have a few points to make.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We don't understand why additional yellow lines are needed. If the scheme is designed to reduce cars coming into Accordia to park then the additional yellow lines should not be needed? If they aren't there now and it isn't causing an issue to traffic/pedestrians, why to add them? It seems like making extra work for the sake of it. 2. I understand each household can apply for 3 permits...can one permit be purchased for visitors (to hand out when a visitor arrives) or will each permit require a registration number? 3. There are some oddly wide pavements within Accordia which are very different to other pavements. Can this be taken into account when reducing pavements parking? It does not inhibit pedestrians or cause a danger to other road users (which I understand is the reason for prohibiting it). 	Comment

Staffordshire - Objections/Comments

	Address	Objection/ Comments	Representation
1	Bray	Statutory letter returned with annotation. Do not approve as Bray was originally included as shown on the leaflets. This has now been removed and residents of Bray are not entitled within any scheme.	Against
2	Bray	As a resident of the East Road estate since 1983, for many years I have found it increasingly difficult to park my car locally, and have looked forward to the formation of a residents' parking scheme. I attended a recent meeting with Councillors and other residents, in which it was agreed that there would be ample space in Staffordshire Street for all those wishing to take part in such a scheme, including residents of Bray. I am therefore extremely upset to discover that Bray is now being excluded, apparently on the basis that ONE other resident was (erroneously) given a permit for the Petersfield scheme. I very much hope that this exclusion will be reversed.	Against
3	Donegal	I am a resident of ___ Donegal, Staffordshire street, Cambridge. Having missed the opportunity to vote for the residents parking scheme I would like to add that both I and the resident of ___ Donegal are both in favour of the proposals. Parking for residents and visitors is really difficult as I'm sure your aware. Thankyou	Support
4	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 13) ORDER 201\$ THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AREA) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2017 (AMENDMENT NO. 14) ORDER 201\$ 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, it being recognised and acknowledged 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.	Support

COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Directorate / Service Area		Officer undertaking the assessment	
Place & Economy		Name:	Nicola Gardner
Service / Document / Function being assessed		Job Title:	Parking Policy Manager
Traffic Managers – Introduction of Residents’ Parking Schemes (RPS)		Contact details:	01223 727912
Business Plan Proposal Number (if relevant)			
Aims and Objectives of Service / Document / Function			
<p>The removal of free parking within the city via the introduction of new RPSs, aims to reduce congestion, cut air pollution, improve road safety whilst safeguarding local business/facilities and prioritise parking for those that live within Cambridge.</p> <p>By encouraging the use of more sustainable methods of transport, the reliance on vehicles coming into the city will reduce and air quality improve, enhancing the quality of life for residents and enriching the experience of those visiting this historic city.</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan (LTP) highlights the importance of managing traffic and the space available both efficiently and effectively, to enable the delivery of the continued growth and development of sustainable communities across the county. This document augments this plan by illustrating the conditions where RPSs may be considered, along with their key operational aspects. It sets out an approach to be applied across Cambridgeshire.</p>			
What is changing?			
<p>These RPSs have been designed to, meet the evolving needs of the local communities in the Accordia and Staffordshire Street area by enabling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved parking facilities for city residents and short stay parking for visitors to local shops and businesses. • Reduced availability of free, unrestricted parking within the city. • Prioritisation of parking space to residents and other permit holders. <p>The Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board has agreed to fund the consultation and implementation costs.</p>			
Who is involved in this impact assessment?			
<p>e.g. Council officers, partners, service users and community representatives.</p>			
<p>The Residents’ Parking Scheme Policy which supports the introduction of these schemes was developed to address parking issues and future challenges within Cambridgeshire that affect access and/or residents’ vehicular parking availability. It created a framework for the consideration of the introduction/extension of formalised RPSs. A Member Working Group was established to help develop this policy along with stakeholders.</p>			

Member Working Group

Cllr Kevin Blencowe (Chair) – Cambridge City Council
 Cllr Jocelyne Scutt – Cambridgeshire County Council
 Cllr Amanda Taylor – Cambridgeshire County Council
 Cllr Noel Kavanagh – Cambridgeshire County Council
 Cllr Donald Adey – Cambridge City Council (replaced Cllr Catherine Smart)
 Cllr Dave Baigent – Cambridge City Council (replaced Cllr Anna Smith)

Stakeholders

Residents' Associations
 Universities
 Trade Associations
 Disability Group
 Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations (FeCRA)
 Smarter Cambridge Transport

Parking Services Team
 Policy & Regulation Team
 Finance Team
 Mott Macdonald (Parking Survey)

The implementation process includes a number of public consultations:

Public Consultation - this included a survey being send to all households/businesses within the defined scheme area. Feedback received from this consultation helps us to develop a parking plan that meets the needs of the local community and forms the basis of the statutory consultations.

Statutory Consultation – this includes formally advertising the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) that underpins the RPS. Whilst consultation details are sent to all households/businesses within the defined scheme, this consultation is open to the wider public.

What will the impact be?

Impact	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Age		X	
Disability	X		
Gender reassignment		X	
Marriage and civil partnership		X	
Pregnancy and maternity		X	
Race		X	

Impact	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Religion or belief		X	
Sex		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
The following additional characteristics can be significant in areas of Cambridgeshire.			
Rural isolation		X	
Deprivation			X

Positive Impact

There will be a positive impact on valid Blue Badge holders as blue badge holders are permitted to parking within any RPS for an unlimited time period. A valid blue badge must be displayed correctly at all times.
 A RPS offers a range of permit types which includes free medical permits, free Blue Badge Holder permits and Health worker dispensation.

Negative Impact

Permits are chargeable. The cost of a residents' permit will depend on the complexity on the scheme.

Neutral Impact

The protected characteristics are not relevant as no distinction is made when delivering the service.

Issues or Opportunities that may need to be addressed

None identified.

Community Cohesion

If it is relevant to your area you should also consider the impact on community cohesion.

Neutral impact.