

**CAVENDISH AVENUE AND BALDOCK WAY, CAMBRIDGE**  
**CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

*To:* **Cambridge joint Area Committee**

*Meeting Date:* **24<sup>th</sup> July 2018**

*From:* **Executive Director, Place and Economy**

*Electoral division(s):* **Queen Edith's**

*Forward Plan ref:* **n/a** *Key decision:* **No**

*Purpose:* **To determine objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way, Cambridge**

*Recommendation:*

- a) Implement the restrictions in Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Blinco Grove section) as published.**
- b) Implement the restrictions in Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Hills Avenue section) as published.**
- c) Inform the objectors of the decision.**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>	
Name:	Richard Lumley
Post:	Assistant Director, Highways Service
Email:	richard.lumley@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 703839

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1** The Council has published proposals for two parking restriction schemes in Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way, Cambridge under the Local Highways Improvement (LHI) scheme. The proposals have been requested by local residents and are supported by local Councillors. The two proposals are as follows:-
- 1.2** Proposal 1 - Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Blinco Grove section). The proposal is for No Waiting at any time (double yellow lines) over relatively short lengths of Cavendish Avenue to keep its junction with Lady Jane Court clear of parked cars and maintain access into Lady Jane Court. On this length of Baldock Way the proposal is for No Waiting at any time on the whole of the west side of the road, a shorter length on the east side and a new disabled badge holder parking space outside Morley Court. A drawing showing the extent of the proposed restrictions can be found in Appendix 2.
- 1.3** Proposal 2 - Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Hills Avenue section). The proposal is for No Waiting at any time (double yellow lines) on both sides for the full length. In addition, it is planned to install knee-high fencing to protect the verges and footways. A drawing showing the extent of the proposed restrictions can be found in Appendix 3.

## **2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO) PROCESS**

- 2.1** The TRO procedure is a statutory process that requires the highway authority to advertise, in the local press and on-street, a public notice stating the proposal and the reasons for it. The advert invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a minimum twenty one day notice period. There is also a requirement to consult with certain organisations, such as the emergency services, and others affected by the proposals.
- 2.2** TRO proposal 1 was advertised in the Cambridge News on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2018 and the statutory consultation period ran until 6<sup>th</sup> April 2018. The statutory consultation on proposal 1 resulted in the receipt of 8 written representations, 3 of which were objections. These have been summarised in the table in Appendix 3 and the officer responses to the objections are also given in the table.
- 2.3** TRO proposal 2 was advertised in the Cambridge News on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2018 and the statutory consultation period ran until 8<sup>th</sup> June 2018. The statutory consultation on proposal 2 resulted in the receipt of 5 written representations, 3 of which offered unqualified support and 2 were generally supportive, but put forward an alternative type of restriction. These have been summarised in the table in Appendix 4 and the officer responses to the objections are also given in the table.

## **3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

- 3.1** **Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**  
There are no significant implications for this priority.

### **3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

### **3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

## **4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

### **4.1 Resource Implications**

The necessary staff resources and funding have been secured through the Local Highway Improvements process.

### **4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

There are no significant implications for this category.

### **4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications**

The statutory process for this proposal has been followed.

### **4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications**

There are no significant implications for this category.

### **4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications**

The statutory consultees have been engaged, including County and District Councillors, Police and other emergency services. Notices were placed in the local press and were also displayed on the roads where it is proposed to implement the restrictions. The proposals were available to view in the reception area of Shire Hall.

### **4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement**

Relevant Councillors engaged with residents at an early stage, prior to the publication of statutory notices, and were given the opportunity to comment as part of the statutory process. No adverse comments were received.

### **4.7 Public Health Implications**

There are no significant implications for this category.

## Appendix 1 – Locations of Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way



**Key**

- Existing diagram 1018.1 road marking
- Proposed diagram 1018.1 road marking
- Road marking to be removed by scabbling
- Lighting column

**Notes**

- All measurements are in metres unless otherwise stated
- Road markings must be compliant with TSRGD 2016.
- Double yellow lines, 75mm thick to be laid in thermoplastic paint
- 19.10m of diagram 1018.1 to be removed along with 44.53m of diagram 1028.1 (H-bar marking)
- Disabled parking bay to be located on 5-6 Morley Court, 6.8m long x 2.4m wide.
- Exact locations to be marked up on site prior to being installed by CCC rep.

**Cambridgeshire County Council**

**Local Highways Improvement**

**Cavendish Avenue Baldock Way Parking Restriction**

**Table 1: Scheme Ref. CA 661A**

Sign Ref.	Weight	20.2
Sign Ref.	Weight	20.2
Letter colour	WHITE	32mm
Background	BLACK	25mm
Border	Class R38 Microperlite	0.08m <sup>2</sup>

**Diagram 1018.1: Cavendish Avenue**

The diagram shows a plan view of Cavendish Avenue, a residential street. The street is marked with a double yellow line (DYL) along its length. A proposed parking bay is marked on the left side of the street, adjacent to Lady Jane Court. The bay is marked with a blue 'P' sign and a wheelchair symbol. The bay is 6.8m long and 2.4m wide. The street is flanked by residential buildings. A north arrow is located in the bottom left corner of the diagram.

**Diagram 1028.1: Cavendish Avenue**

The diagram shows a plan view of Cavendish Avenue, a residential street. The street is marked with a double yellow line (DYL) along its length. A proposed parking bay is marked on the left side of the street, adjacent to Lady Jane Court. The bay is marked with a blue 'P' sign and a wheelchair symbol. The bay is 6.8m long and 2.4m wide. The street is flanked by residential buildings. A north arrow is located in the bottom left corner of the diagram.

## Appendix 3 – Proposal 2 - Restrictions in Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Hills Avenue section)



#### **Appendix 4 – Objections and Representations to Proposal 1**

No.	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Officer Response
1	The current level of on-street parking in Cavendish Avenue and Baldock Way is a result of parking controls introduced in adjacent roads. (This issue was raised in 5 responses)	The Morley residents parking scheme was introduced towards the end of 2017 and it is likely that some parking has transferred to Cavendish Avenue and Baldock Way. The current proposals are intended to address parking displacement issues created by that scheme. In addition, the Cavendish Avenue/ Baldock Way area is also included in the wider Cambridge residents parking scheme programme, so it will be more fully assessed for a residents' scheme in due course.
2	Additional lengths of double yellow lines are needed in Cavendish Avenue to fully tackle the parking issue. (This issue was raised in 2 responses)	The proposals seek to strike a balance between tackling obstructive parking, but still retaining some on-street spaces. Additional double yellow lines would result in further migration of parking to other roads. This would also involve a further publication/consultation exercise. The more comprehensive potential scheme described in 1 above would also help.
3	The proposed restrictions in Baldock Way will limit the parking space available to visitors to the school and others needing to park in the road. (This issue was raised in 2 responses)	The restrictions will result in a net loss of spaces, but will mean that the parking is better managed and less likely to cause the road and footways to be obstructed. The local County Councillor is currently undertaking an informal survey of residents in the Morley area to see if they would be happy for a few residents' bays to be converted to short-stay spaces. School visitors should not need to park in Baldock Way as the school has its own car park.
4	The restrictions proposed for Cavendish Avenue will simply move the parking to other roads. (This issue was raised in 1 response)	It is inevitable that the introduction of parking restrictions will result in the migration of parking to other roads, but it is difficult to predict what roads might be targeted. The proposals for Cavendish Avenue cover short lengths of road to address concerns about junction parking, so are required on road safety grounds.

5	The yellow lines in Cavendish Avenue will effectively provide parking spaces for taxis and coaches. (This issue was raised in 1 response)	Drivers are permitted to park on double yellow lines for short periods, such as for loading/unloading. Taxi and coach drivers could use them for short duration stops, but should not be parking there for longer periods. Strong enforcement action may be required to ensure that this does not become common practice.
6	The extent of the restrictions proposed for Lady Jane Court are greater than required for a road of this type. (This issue was raised in 1 response)	There are already double yellow lines covering the immediate junction area of Lady Jane Court and Cavendish Avenue. However, there have been instances of vehicles being parked further into the Court, which restricts access, particularly for wider vehicles.
7	General support for the double yellow lines in Baldock Way but there are still concerns about parking in the the remainder of that road, including verge parking. (This issue was raised in 1 response)	At present double sided parking takes place in Baldock Way, with many cars parked partially on the footway. Although the footways are relatively wide, the parked cars still create problems for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users. The proposed restrictions covering the whole of the west side will result in single sided parking which should be fully on the carriageway. The restrictions on the east side mainly cover dropped kerb accesses. Proposal 2 will go some way towards addresssing this and the work mentioned in 1 above would look at these additional lengths of road.
8	It is suggested that 30 minutes limited waiting to introduced in Baldock Way which would remove commuter parking but still allow visitors to park. (This issue was raised in 1 response)	That could be a solution, but the proposed double yellow lines would still be needed to tackle the issue of double-sided and footway parking. Short-stay parking would prevent commuter parking which would result in further displacement to other roads. Such a proposal would require an additional publication/consultation exercise.
9	The introduction of a residents permit pakring scheme in the area would be a better solution. (This issue was raised in 1 response)	As for the response to item 1. Any wider residents permit parking scheme would require an extensive consultation process and support from a majority of residents.



## **Appendix 5 – Representations on Proposal 2**

1	<p>If double yellow lines are introduced there will be nowhere for visitors, contractors and delivery drivers to park. This will be a particular concern for those properties with little off-street parking. The main parking problem occurs during the working week, so single yellow lines would mean that people could park there overnight and at the weekend.</p> <p>(This issue was raised in 2 responses)</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed restrictions would stop parking at all times on all days of the week. However, yellow line type restrictions do allow loading/unloading to take place at any time, so deliveries would be largely unaffected. The Council's residents parking scheme policy on road widths is that a clear width of 3.1 metres is required to enable larger vehicles, such as a fire appliance, to pass and a width of 1.8 metres is allowed for a parked vehicle. Hence, an overall width of 4.9 metres is required to allow on-street parking to take place. This length of Baldock Way is only 4 metres, so is not sufficient to allow any parking to take place. If overnight/weekend parking was allowed, larger vehicles are likely to be forced to mount the kerb to get through, thereby continuing to cause verge damage.</p>
2	<p>The current parking is mainly as a result of the recently introduced Morley parking scheme, students, commuters and builders' vehicles.</p> <p>(This issue was raised in 2 responses)</p>	<p>The Morley residents parking scheme was introduced towards the end of 2017 and it is likely that some parking has transferred to Baldock Way. See Appendix 4, item 1.</p>
3	<p>The parked cars create a hazard to emergency vehicles, pedestrians and damage the verges.</p> <p>(This issue was raised in 1 response)</p>	<p>This is mainly due to the width of Baldock Way which is insufficient to safely accommodate parked vehicles. The proposed restrictions are intended to address these problems.</p>

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
<b>Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	n/a Name of Financial Officer: n/a
<b>Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?</b>	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Hannah Edwards
<b>Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?</b>	No comment Name of Officer: Sarah Silk/Joanne Shilton
<b>Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Stuart Keeble

Please include the table at the end of your report so that the Chief Executive/Executive Directors/Directors clearing the reports and the public are aware that you have cleared each implication with the relevant Team.

### **SOURCE DOCUMENTS GUIDANCE**

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Objections and other written representations (redacted)</b> <b>Draft Traffic Regulation Order</b>	Vantage House, Washingley Road, Huntingdon PE29 6SR