

Representations Received in Response to Publication of Morley RPS Proposals

I express my concern as a resident of Marshall Road to note your decision to remove permit parking bays for pay and display use in Blinco Grove.

Yet again the scheme is poorly thought through, as was the case when the scheme was first introduced, and fails to address the already dire position of an acute shortage of permit parking in Marshall Rd. By introducing the scheme you immediately halved the available parking in that road which you chose to ignore when pushing through the scheme with little or no scrutiny and sparse publicity and ignoring too the last minute petition signed by residents with a vested interest in seeking an amendment to the scheme.

It remains an ever increasing problem to find a parking space throughout the day and evening resulting in me having to park further afield in Rock Rd and Blinco Grove.

If pay and display parking is required for the library I would ask you to disclose evidence of the need to justify your initiative at the meeting fixed for tomorrow.

At the very least, there should be no loss of existing permit parking bays and if pay and display areas are to be adopted these should be within combined zones.

I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting which I was only notified of this evening by the residents of xx Blinco Grove. Please however ensure that the contents of this email are communicated to those in attendance.

I would like to comment on the proposed changes to parking in the Rock Road – Blinco grove area.

1. Pay and Display. Please consider mixed resident's parking with metered charging (for a maximum of a 2 hour stay) for the eight proposed Pay and Display only places in Blinco Grove during the hours 10 am to 7pm. This mixed parking scheme is done in Rustat Road – within 100m of Rock Road.
2. If mixed parking is adopted, then this can be adopted at the top of Rock Road too to the benefit of the users of the small businesses on Cherry Hinton Road.
3. A limited (1 to 2 hour) parking provision for peripatetic teachers at Morley Memorial School could be made on one side of Baldock Way, where formerly both sides of the roads were used for parking at school drop off times.
4. Provide bicycle parking for Rock Road cycle users within the curtilage of the library. The front garden has recently been reorganised and there is room for 3 additional cycle places at least, and more on the grassed patch at the front; gardened margins could be retained to ensure an attractive frontage. This would be far safer than providing cycle parking on the road, where users (many are children) are exposed to traffic. Rock Road tends to get used as a short cut during busy times by car drivers, who presently encounter no physical constraints like speed control bumps.
5. I would like to know what the parked vehicle counts in the Morley zone are currently for school term-time use. There appears to be growing pressure on public parking in Rock Road and Blinco Grove. This is because since resident's parking was installed two years ago several more residents have devoted their front gardens to private parking and dropped curbs. This is damaging on two counts: first dropping the curb takes away more than one public on-street car parking space and means effectively that on-street parking in front of the property

is exclusive to that household (i.e., privatised). Second, it means if hard standing is installed there is additional water run-off during heavy rain which contributes to street flooding. This is a current problem with the lower end of Rock Road and anticipated to be an increasing problem with the growing climate emergency.

These issues were discussed with residents and councillor Amanda Taylor at a public meeting in Rock Road library on 5th September. I hope she will represent the residents' views expressed at that meeting faithfully.

Although I live within 100m of the proposed changes I did not receive a copy of the notice through my letterbox.

I am writing regarding the advertised proposed changes to the parking restrictions and provisions in the Queen Edith's (Morley) area under the reference PR0566.

I have very serious reservations in respect of the changes being proposed and equally significant concerns regarding the validity and rigour of the process through which the decision to make these changes has been made. I attended the meeting hosted by Councillor Taylor and I have read the supporting documents and notices provided. Neither have given any reassurance that the proposed changes are either warranted nor based on sound logic. On this basis I am strongly opposed to the changes being made as proposed and put forward that there must be a further process of more open consultation to reach a better resolution.

I would summarise my feedback as follows:

- According to Councillor Taylor there has been no recount of the total number of residents spaces in Morley, taking account of the reduction in residents parking as a result of the large number of dropped kerbs that have been installed during or since the permit scheme was announced and introduced. On this basis, if any part of the decision process relating to this change has taken account of the total number of spaces available to residents, as surely it must, and consequently the reduction that this change amounts to, then the information gathering and justification for the changes proposed is based on flawed and incomplete calculations. It is very clear that the number of spaces available to residents is already far fewer than had been originally advertised and this yet is another reduction.

- Again, according to Councillor Taylor there is no formal rationale for the number of spaces to be switched from residents to pay and display on Blinco Grove. If there is a requirement for P&D parking then surely starting with a smaller number would be sensible, especially if the purpose is to support library visitors. The library is not a large building, does not have significant visitors numbers and is intended to serve the local community. 8 spaces seems a gross overprovision. There must also be a question in respect of the timing of when P&D would be in operation since the library is only open on a reduced hours basis.

- Rock Road library is intended to serve the local community and, in line with countless city policies, visitors are encouraged to use public transport, bicycles and travel on foot - to reduce congestion and to support a better environment. It would therefore seem to be entirely against these policies to provide so much vehicle parking when the policy expressly discourages car trips.

- In respect of the proposed introduction of 'on road cycle parking' within one of the parking spaces immediately outside the library, I would draw your attention to the City Council's own policy on cycle provision (policy L17 of the local plan 2018) which states the following: "All cycle parking should minimise conflicts between cycles, motor vehicles and pedestrians". Short-stay cycle parking, e.g. for visitors or shoppers, should be located as close as possible to the main entrances

of buildings (no more than 10 metres)". Many of the visitors to the library on bicycles are parents with young children. I simply cannot see how a policy that puts cyclists parking on the road, undoubtedly putting them in harms way, can be seen as a suitable and preferable option to cycle parking provision within the grounds of the library itself. That section of Rock Road is also a 'rat run' and many cars do not pass at a sensible speed, further adding to the danger for young children.

- I would also highlight the ample space available within the library's front garden area that would provide a great space for a large cycle parking area. Only recently an area that has been cycle parking for more than a decade has been removed. Initially it appeared that more cycle parking was being added but it was simply relocated. The point here is that there is perfectly adequate and suitable space within the library curtilage to provide it's own cycle parking and no reason for another residents space to be lost for this purpose.

In summary I believe that the changes as proposed fall a long way short on grounds of safety, environment, policy rigour and process, basic justification and fundamentally just not serving the needs of residents.

I look forward to hearing positive news in respect of alternative proposals. I am happy to be contacted on this email address for the purposes of a response to this submission.

I am writing to object to the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

Please could you clarify the reason for the proposed reduction in residents' parking spaces? Has there been a recalculation of the number of spaces required for the residents since the scheme was put into operation? A large number of parking spaces have already been lost because residents have converted their front gardens into driveways. The only recent census of parked cars in the area was for some reason undertaken in August, which is traditionally a month when most residents are away, so has undoubtedly underestimated the numbers. I do not agree that the area on Blinco Grove is under used in months other than August.

Has there been a consultation with the library about how many spaces they actually anticipate needing? I am surprised that an additional 8 spaces would be needed; there is only one comment in the library visitors' book regarding parking in the last 18 months. I do not believe that there has been an appropriate analysis. Furthermore, I understand from our councillor that the Morley only requires an occasional peripatetic music teacher to have parking, so eight new spaces seems an excessive number to accommodate this. The proposed cycle parking is also some way from the Rathmore club so would not be useful.

In particular, I object to:

- (i) the loss of the residents' parking space at the boundary of 67 Rock Road/Rock Road Library;
- (ii) the siting of bicycle racks on the highway in front of a public building used predominantly by families with young children; and
- (iii) the replacement of existing residents' permit holder parking spaces with new Pay & Display parking on Blinco Grove.

The grounds for my objection are that the proposed TRO does not comply with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Under the 1984 Act, a TRO should:

improve road safety:

This TRO worsens road safety by requiring children to stand in the road while getting on their bicycles. Rock Road Library is used by many parents with small children. Installing the cycle racks on the street rather than in the front yard of the library creates a hazard for young children who may run out into traffic while their parents are securing the bicycles.

preserve or improve the character or amenity of an area.

This TRO would add unsightly street furniture to an historic area. Furthermore, the residents of the area around Rock Road library have historically been extremely supportive of the library, campaigning successfully for its survival. It now seems remarkable that the library has not chosen to increase its own provision for bicycle parking in its ample front garden but instead is attempting to push the problem onto the residents, many of whom have already lost their front gardens.

reduce and manage congestion

Overall, the proposals result in a **net loss** of 6-7 residents' parking spaces. The gain of 2 spaces at the Cherry Hinton Road end of Rock Road is offset by the loss of 8-9 spaces (1 on Rock Road and 7-8 on Blinco Grove). Lack of parking spaces will result in drivers spending more time circling and looking for a space, **increasing congestion and air pollution**. The residents propose that, if the council persists with this proposal, there should become a mixed shared use of residents being permitted to park in the pay and display sites, in the same way that is in place in Rathmore Road.

For all these reasons, I believe the proposed TRO should be rejected.

It appears that the Council has prejudged the outcome of this application and intends to begin work before the Council meeting on 22nd October. This is unacceptable.

We live at xx, Blinco Grove, Cambridge. It has this morning come to our attention that you are proposing removal of a residents parking area on Blinco Grove, on the North side from a point 8 metres east of Rock road in an easterly direction for 38 metres.

To replace this area with new pay and display parking for 4 hour max stay between the hours of 10.00 and 19.00 hrs.

We use this area of residents parking on a daily basis and whilst we agree on occasion it is under-utilised, to convert it all to pay and display would cause us inconvenience as often it is the only free residents parking on Blinco Grove.

Would it not be a better compromise to convert half the proposed length to pay and display or have a mixed pay and display and residence parking area, as I believe is common in other areas? Should not the pay and display times be 10.00-18.00 as the library's latest closing is at these times, this would be more convenient for residents to find a parking space later.

I am writing to object to the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

In particular, I object to:

- (i) the loss of the residents' parking space at the boundary of 67 Rock Road/Rock Road Library and its replacement with bicycle racks;
- (ii) the replacement of existing residents' permit holder parking spaces with new Pay & Display parking on Blinco Grove.

The proposed TRO contravenes the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Under the 1984 Act, a TRO can be implemented to:

- *improve road safety*
- *preserve or improve the character or amenity of an area*
- *prevent use of a road by unsuitable vehicles*
- *prevent serious damage to the highway*
- *reduce and manage congestion*

The proposed TRO fails to meet any of these objectives. Indeed, the TRO i) actively **worsens road safety**, ii) **damages the character of the area** and iii) will **increase congestion** by making parking more difficult.

In addition, I have the following objections.

- **Loss of badly needed residents' parking spaces.** *This contravenes aim 5 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984: "to reduce and manage congestion".*

The Council pushed through the introduction of a residents' parking scheme under the pretext that parking was difficult for residents and that the scheme would make things easier. This has not been the case; parking is now significantly more difficult than prior to the introduction of the scheme. The residents' parking scheme has resulted in major loss of parking due to i) reduction in parking spaces in Marshall Road by 50% (by reducing parking to one side of the street only), ii) loss of a space adjacent to the Rock Road Library to a '30 minute no-return spot', and iii) the knock-on effect that many residents have converted their front gardens into driveways due to difficulty parking (eg numbers 68, 70, 71, 72, 73 Rock Road). It is illogical and contradictory for the Council to propose a further loss of residents' parking bays when the Council itself has only recently argued that parking is difficult for residents. Indeed, in its Statement of Reasons for the proposed TRO, the Council acknowledges that the Morley is "an area where there is high demand for resident parking".

Overall, the proposals result in a **net loss** of 6-7 residents' parking spaces. The gain of 2 spaces at the Cherry Hinton Road end of Rock Road is offset by the loss of 8-9 spaces (1 on Rock Road and 7-8 on Blinco Grove). Lack of parking spaces will result in drivers spending more time circling and looking for a space, **increasing congestion and air pollution**.

- **The proposed changes are unnecessary and a waste of public funds.**

There is ample space for cycle parking within the front yard of the Rock Road Library. The conversion of a parking space into cycle racks is unnecessary, unjustified and a waste of public funds. Furthermore, the existing cycle racks inside the library front yard are in the process of being removed. It appears that the Council have prejudged the outcome of this application and have inappropriately begun work by removing existing cycle racks without waiting for the outcome of the consultation process.

- **The proposed changes are unsightly and contribute to a degradation of the historic character of the neighbourhood.** *This contravenes aim 2 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984: "to preserve or improve the character or amenity of an area".*

The area around Rock Road and Blinco Grove is extremely picturesque and has a unique character. The area is of historic architectural significance and contains many properties with period features. The proposed cycle racks, pay and display meters and signage would clutter the roads and pavements, spoiling the character and aesthetics of the neighbourhood.

- **Detriment to road safety.** *This contravenes aim 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984: "to improve road safety".*

Rock Road Library is used by many parents and small children. Installing the cycle racks on the street rather than in the front yard of the library creates a hazard for young children who may run out into traffic while their parents are securing the bicycles.

For all these reasons, I believe the proposed TRO should be rejected.

We are contacting you to object to the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). We are objecting to the loss of residents' parking space at the boundary of 67 Rock Road/Rock Road Library and its replacement with bicycle racks and the replacement of existing residents' permit holder parking spaces with new Pay & Display parking on Blinco Grove.

We understand that these changes have been proposed as a result of a survey by Amanda Taylor last summer and that there is a feeling that there is a need for short term parking for non-residents to visit the school and the library. To lose permanent residents' spaces for this seems a totally disproportionate response as they will only be required for at most a few hours during the some of the working day. We also feel that this goes against Council policy of encouraging citizens not use their cars around the city. It is illogical and contradictory for the Council to propose a further loss of residents' parking bays when the Council itself has only recently argued that parking is difficult for residents. Indeed, in its Statement of Reasons for the proposed TRO, the Council acknowledges that the Morley is "an area where there is high demand for resident parking".

There is plenty of space for cycle parking within the front yard of the Rock Road Library and by moving it into the side of the highway there is a safety issue for parents taking their children off their bikes and also the possibility of blocking the pavement while they are doing this.

To conclude: the proposed TRO contravenes the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Under the 1984 Act, a TRO can be implemented to:

- *improve road safety*
- *preserve or improve the character or amenity of an area*
- *prevent use of a road by unsuitable vehicles*
- *prevent serious damage to the highway*
- *reduce and manage congestion*

We think that the proposed TRO fails to meet any of these objectives. Indeed, the TRO i) actively **worsens road safety**, ii) **damages the character of the area** and iii) will **increase congestion** by making parking more difficult.

I wish to raise an objection to the proposed parking changes in Blinco and Rock Road. You have already taken away half of Marshall Road parking. I object to bicycles taking up a valuable space. There is room in the library front garden for at least 8 bicycles. To remove parking availability is going back on the original plans which is underhand. Give the library 2 more only. Do not take the residents right to park in their own road, they all pay council tax for this right. Likewise putting up the price of visitors parking is unfair. The streets are hardly ever cleaned efficiently and we have regularly 5 blocked drains at the end of Marshall Road. These cause flooding into some of the houses. I would suggest that the council money which we give you would be better spent on the basic road maintenance.

I support the additional cycle parking outside the library as this is much needed at peak times. I am concerned about the changing use of the seven spaces on Blinco Grove from residents permit to pay and display. We regularly use these spaces as there are not enough spaces on the other side of the road for all the houses in that stretch. We are a family with two young children and this would make it difficult for us to return in the day. We understand that a couple of pay and display spaces are needed. We would like to suggest either or both of the following amendments:

1. A reduction in the number of pay and display spaces to 2-3, leaving 4-5 as residents spaces (we are surprised that seven pay and display spaces would be used regularly and would be interested to see your research on this)
2. That the spaces are mixed use for pay and display and reside residents permit holders. If you believe that it is underused then it shouldn't make any difference if the bays are useable by a mixed pay and display and residents parking.

I understand that you have to balance the needs of a variety of users and look forward to hearing from you once you have completed the consultation.

At a neighbour's suggestion, a meeting was held in the library on Thursday September 5 to discuss the proposal and was chaired by Coun Amanda Taylor. Around 25 residents were present at the meeting and it was clear that every one of them were against the part of the proposal to convert 8 parking spaces in Blinco Grove from resident permit holders only to pay and display. The reason is that the spaces are well used and needed to absorb the overflow from Marshall Road.

Various aspects of the proposal were discussed. Approximately one year ago residents were invited to comment on resident permit parking but it was unclear as to how many households were/were not happy with the arrangements. However, Coun. Taylor did inform us that there was a shortage of parking for the library and the school although no survey was carried out to ascertain how many library users or how many from the school would be prepared to pay to park their cars.

If three parking spaces in Baldock Way, which is considerably nearer to the school than the 8-space bay, were converted to short term parking, this would accommodate the school's parking need for peripatetic music teachers, visitors, deliveries etc.

It has also been proposed to install a cycle parking rack in the road outside the library. There was, until recently, a cycle rack inside the library grounds but this has been removed in order to plant flowers. A cycle rack on the road immediately puts library users with children at considerable risk from passing traffic and would also be unable to accommodate cargo bikes. Surely the library should put the safety of the children before a few flowers ? After all, it is a library and not a botanic garden. Before too many flowers are planted I would strongly support the re-introduction of the cycle racks inside the library grounds. The creation of three short term parking spaces on the road immediately outside the library would then provide the parking requested for the library.

As to the 8 space bay under consideration : if my suggestions are adopted for the school and the library, is there really any justification for changing the bay from resident permit holders only ? It has been suggested that the bay should be altered to mixed pay and display or residents parking. However, the installation of a machine is presumably not without cost to the council and is there any evidence that the pay and display would actually be used ?

For xx years I have lived at xx, Blinco Grove which is situated immediately opposite the area currently restricted to residents parking but now proposed for pay and display. I am most strongly opposed to this new proposal.

The reason given is that the bay proposed for pay and display is underused. However, this is absolutely not the case and I find that more often than not, I am obliged to park in the area now proposed for pay and display as the road outside no. 76 is occupied by other vehicles, possibly due to overspill from Marshall Road.

Many of us put a lot of effort into establish the resident's parking scheme and we pay for this in the annual fee. The proposed change would completely wreck this arrangement, leaving several of us without a parking space at all.

If the principal idea behind the new scheme is intended for library users I would suggest that two short term (but free) spaces immediately outside the library on Rock Road are designated given that the library has its own cycle park.

I urge you not to adopt this idea as it simply will not work for the residents who actually live here.

With reference to the proposal for Pay and Display parking on Blinco Grove, near the junction of Rock Road, I wonder if you have considered adapting the space for both Resident and Pay and Display parking. This would offer a measure of flexibility that would otherwise not be available to users. Please give it some consideration.

Due to several objections to the proposal by residents to the proposal above. Amanda Taylor invited local Morley Parking Area residents to the meeting with her on Thursday 5 September at Rock Road Library to discuss the proposals.

As a result of a leaflet drop by myself and my partner __ the meeting was attended by about 25-30 residents. Can I add that Marshall Road and surrounding area had not received any notification of this proposal so this was the first they had heard of this.

That aside and further to Amanda Taylor's suggestion, I am writing to ensure Amanda is able to present the main gist of the residents suggestions and general consensus of what we believe would work well for us and for others using the library and school who are not from the area at the council meeting in October at Shire Hall.

There was overwhelming concern about losing so many parking spaces. __, myself some of the residents have conducted a count of cars in the proposed area (8 spaces) and it's averaging at 45% capacity (and this during a quieter period of the year).

The group at the meeting acknowledged that people should be able to access the library. However many including myself were perplexed why the council had not provided parking for its own school and staff. We hoped the council could consider providing parking designated parking area (as you find around the city for Doctors and the like) for staff or visiting staff on Buldock Way. The spaces would be term-time and school hours only, providing visiting staff or contractors with a council visitors pass.

If the idea behind this proposal was to review the scheme I am sure this could be taken into account, only two or three spaces need to be made available. Visiting music teachers would not have to walk half way up Blinco Grove with their heavy instruments for their music lessons.

The residents group at Rock Road Library came up with several options to reach a compromise to meet the short term parking needs, whilst providing residents with enough spaces for permit parking.

There was a consensus on one solution: the 8 spaces should be made available to both permit holders and pay and display ticket buyers. The hours of operation could remain as suggested (1000-1900). This would allow parking for both resident (with permits) and short term parking.

This would be identical to Rustat Road, the dual use parking system at seems to work well.

The group also felt that given the reason was for library visits and school visitors carrying heavy musical instruments that 2 hours for the play and display element would be more than enough.

This dual use has taken a bit of explaining to Amanda, all other attendees seemed to understand and were on the same page. We wondered if it has been confused with another mixed use option involving free parking on the spaces that the council discounted.

It was a lively meeting, however heartening to find out much people wanted participate and come up with a solution which seems sensible.

On a separate note, a number of attendees had health and safety concerns about the proposed on-road cycle parking. We felt children and toddlers should not be placed in a harms way. In other

words, not in very close proximity to moving traffic! Maybe a risk assessment should be carried out by the same team that manages risk to schools and nurseries.

Amanda has suggested compiling further data of numbers, which residents are happy to produce. In addition two or three representatives can attend the October meeting. I appreciate these are busy meetings, but we would like the opportunity to be heard and understood.

I would like to oppose the plan to convert the current permit bays to pay and display.

I live opposite the proposed area on Blinco Grove and currently park my car in the proposed area on a daily basis.

There are never enough spaces in other bays along Blinco Grove, and the proposed space fills up with cars not only from Blinco Grove, but from other Morley area roads, such as Rock Road.

The congestion will be increased, and pay and display only encourages more people to drive into the city. There are more residential cars than spaces at the moment, so reducing the number further will simply mean I have no where to park during the week when returning home.

The whole point of this scheme was to tackle the parking issue in area, this proposal is a step in the wrong direction and is going to make the problem worse than before, therefore it's not going to be value for money.

As a Blinco Grove resident for 10 years, living opposite the proposed parking bay area, I strongly object to the plan. Parking in this part of Blinco Grove is already at capacity, with most of the bays filled during the daytime and when returning from work. The proposed area is used regularly by residents from Blinco Grove itself and overspill from neighbouring roads which don't have enough permit parking capacity.

The current pay and display (at the top of Rock Road and Blinco Grove are currently underused, so adding more to the area is illogical. The proposed pay and display would lie empty most of the time, whilst residents struggle with parking, and their visitors forced onto expensive pay and display, as there certainly won't be enough space along the road.

We have a system that currently works and allows residents and their visitors just enough parking. Replacing such a long area (7 car spaces) with pay and display will simply mean not enough parking for residents.

I doubt very much that we can stop this, but wondered about a compromise. The council say they are converting this because it's currently underused and will provide space for library visitors. If that's the case, why not continue to allow permit holder to use the space, together with pay and display users? If they are right about it being underused, this shouldn't present a problem, but will also allow much needed residential access to parking too.

I have no idea why mixed use wouldn't work in the way I describe; non resident: pay and display, resident: permit. Both options currently exist on the road, and both options are currently

enforced. Was this particular option ever discussed, as opposed to the resident/non resident option you mention?

When you say there are new bays being considered, where would they be? I've walked Blinco Grove and I can't see where.

I have emailed the relevant address. As a community, we are willing to compromise, mixed bays (p&d/permit, not resident/non resident) or at the very least a reduction from 7 spaces to a few. However, we all feel let down. We pay for a permit (and visitor passes), and will now face a struggle to park, and we will. The current pay and displays stay empty the majority of the daytime. The permit bays are only underused at weekends...try parking down Blinco during the week.

I would like to lodge a final correspondence prior to the consultation deadline tomorrow. We invited local Morley Parking Area residents to the meeting with Amanda Taylor on Thursday 5 September to discuss the proposals. The meeting was attended by approximately 25 local residents.

Amanda kindly chaired the meeting, I will be reporting back separately. In summary, there was overwhelming concern about losing so many parking spaces. We have conducted a count of cars in the proposed area (8 spaces) and it's averaging at 45% capacity (and this during a quieter period of the year).

The group acknowledge that some feedback had been received regarding the need to provide short stay (pay and display) in the area (although the numbers weren't high) and the gain of two spaces at the top of nearby Rock Road. The group discussed several options to reach a compromise, something to meet the short term parking needs, whilst providing residents with enough spaces for permit parking.

There was clear consensus on one solution: that the 8 spaces be available to both permit holders and pay and display ticket buyers. The hours of operation could remain as suggested (1000-1900). This would allow parking for both resident (with permits) and short term parking. This is currently in operation in many other parking areas (including a similar section along nearby Rustat Road). The group also felt that given the change reason was for library visits and school visitors, that 2 hours for the play and display element would be more than enough.

This dual use has taken a bit of explaining to be honest (I think it has been confused with another mixed use option involving free parking on the spaces that the council discounted), so I hope this makes sense.

As you can imagine, it was an emotive meeting, but the solution raised seems sensible.

On a slightly separate issue, I also need to mention that there were serious concerns raised about the proposed on-road cycle parking – it was felt this was dangerous, and parking should be moved into the library grounds.

Amanda has suggested compiling further data of numbers, which we can do, and a couple of representatives can attend the October meeting. I appreciate these are busy meetings, but we would like the opportunity to be heard.

I am a resident of Blinco Grove, and live at number x. I was present at meeting recently in the library at Rock Road, with a number of other residents during which the proposed changes for the parking scheme at Blinco Grove were discussed.

During the meeting it was clear that most residents were concerned that the proposed new bays on Blinco Grove were going to reduce available parking for residents. It seemed clear also that the survey which was done about the availability was done over a period of time during summer when it is likely that there was less use of residents bays. Therefore it is not correct that the bays are underused.

During the meeting a suggestion was made that if pay-and-display bays were going to be introduced this should be for less than seven or eight cars, and also it should be dual use, meaning that residents should be allowed to park there at any time on the basis of their residents parking permits. It was also suggested that the period for pay and display use should be two hours not four.

This is a fair flexible solution, and I strongly support it.

Please could you let me know if I can provide any further detail, and please can you informed of the present position.

Thank you for the notice of the proposed changes on the parking restrictions for the Morley area. I've had an opportunity to look at the proposal online and would like to request that one additional matter be considered in the specific context of PR0566.

As the householder or x Rock Road I share with my immediate neighbour at x Rock Road (who I understand has also written to you) an inability to park across the entry to our houses due to there being, at the moment, in front of our houses a double yellow line rather than a single, continuous white line (as exists for the other houses in the street). From examining the Drawing that forms part of the Proposed TRO it's clear to me that you intend to cancel the double yellow line on the other side (the odd-numbered side) of Rock Road and I'm asking, therefore, if the Proposal could also include cancelling the double yellow lines on our side as well (and replacing them with a single white line) so that we could use such space for parking when required. You will know that currently the permissive single white line stops at x Rock Road. Rock Road is a wide street and allows parking on opposite sides of the road.

In all other aspects the elements of this Proposed TRO have my full support, especially as they relate to the library. I think that the recent developments in parking restrictions in our area have been very helpful to the local community and believe that the extension of the even-numbered permissive white line to include numbers x and x Rock Road would add to local options.

I am writing to object to the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

I was part of the group who were against the original introduction of the Morley residents parking scheme but, having lived with it now, feel it has been a success overall given the range of opinions originally held. I mention this to show that I am a convert and have therefore personally demonstrated the principles of accepting compromise and changing of views. **However, I do have serious concerns about the proposed alterations to the scheme outlined in the current TRO. I**

did attend the consultation meeting with Amanda Taylor on 5th September in the Rock Road library so will reference that within this objection.

Objection to conversion of 7-8 spaces to Pay & Display

Although the scheme works now it is in a precarious state of balance. Rock Road and Marshall Road were particularly badly hit by the Morley scheme, especially the section between Hartington and Blinco due to reduction in real spaces on Rock Road (including the provision for the library [which is understandable and necessary]) and removal of half the spaces on Marshall. This has shifted further pressure onto this stretch of Rock Road and spill-over onto the sections of Blinco either side of Rock Road. This includes the section of 7-8 spaces adjacent to No 74 Rock Road, which are currently proposed to be Pay and Display. Removal of these spaces for use by residents in the hardest hit part of the Morley scheme seems unfair and provocative. It will add further to pressure for residents in the immediate area for accommodating parking of not only their own cars but also their visitors.

Furthermore I would highlight the following:

The TRO consultation has taken place over a quiet period of the summer. Even in this period, local residents on Rock Road judged daily use of these 7-8 at 40-50% ie approximately 4 spaces used daily in a quiet time of the year. No data has been provided by the council to support such a large shift of spaces over to Pay & Display, which would completely block use of these spaces to residents

Amanda Taylor explained that the school had requested 1 hour parking for music teachers and other visitors. This could probably be accommodated by 2 Pay & Display spaces in this stretch of Blinco Grove. One could make the point (as Amanda did) that the school should sort out parking on its own premises for music teaching provision

The creation of 2 residents spaces at the Cherry Hinton end of Rock Road does not address the pressure in the system at the Marshall/Blinco end of the road. Added to this is the proposal to remove another space for library cycle parking

Objection to conversion of 1 space outside the library for bike parking

I was really surprised to see the proposal to convert space on the road for cyclists when there is potentially so much space in the library. In particular note the following:

I believe this will pose a risk to cyclists having to dismount and move around their bikes on the edge of a road with closely passing traffic. This will be particularly exacerbated if the idea of this is to provide space for the larger bikes with integrated child carriages - having children getting in and out of these on the edge of the road poses a real risk to their safety. In this regard it contravenes aim 1 of the TRO to 'improve road safety' and seems counter-intuitive when you consider the point below

If feel there has been a missed opportunity for the council in combination with the Friends of Rock Road Library (FRRL) to make better provision **within the grounds of the library**. The FRRL have in fact just moved racks to create a new flower bed, when there is plenty of attractive frontage and the garden round the back, and this flower bed could have been used to double on-site bike parking without need to expose people to risk parking bikes on the road. [I was a founding member of the FRRL so am entirely supportive of them, the reason for their formation and their good intents, but feel this is poorly thought-through. I am no longer a member of the committee after _ years of involvement as_].

Having been in the room at Amanda Taylor's consultation at the library, **what I would propose is:**

Conversion of the 7-8 spaces by 74 Rock Road into mixed use Pay and Display or Residents Parking. This means anyone with a resident's permit could use it freely as they can now, but also, any spaces free could be used for Pay & Display. This should meet the needs of the school for visitors.

A similar scheme operates on Rustat Road, so seems operable and within Council experience Pay and Display maximum time could be limited to 2 hours to meet most needs (extra library parking, school visitors etc)

This proposal was accepted by the vast majority in the consultation with Amanda Taylor, so this should be given strong consideration. It shows residents are willing to compromise and this would appear to meet everyone's needs.

If this is not possible, I feel residents need to be brought into further discussion around the nuances of any other proposal made by the council given the significant compromises we have already shown in adapting to the original scheme to meet the needs of the wider Morley community. The alternative Amanda Taylor discussed at the consultation was for 2-3 Pay & Display bays and the rest (4-5) given over to residents parking (matching the usage at the quiet period of assessment noted above.

Reconsideration of the on-road parking of bikes on safety grounds, with movement of any additional required bike parking spaces within the grounds of the library

It is unclear how many extra spaces are required and how this has been established

Safety is paramount here and the current proposal is unsafe

The library needs to use its space optimally to meet the broadest needs of the community, compromising on one fewer flower beds for the safety of bike users

I trust these objections to the TRO will be considered properly and compromises sought.

I am writing to object to the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

Please could you clarify the reason for the proposed reduction in residents' parking spaces? Has there been a recalculation of the number of spaces required for the residents since the scheme was put into operation? A large number of parking spaces have already been lost because residents have converted their front gardens into driveways. The only recent census of parked cars in the area was for some reason undertaken in August, which is traditionally a month when most residents are away, so has undoubtedly underestimated the numbers. I do not agree that the area on Blinco Grove is under used in months other than August.

Has there been a consultation with the library about how many spaces they actually anticipate needing? I am surprised that an additional 8 spaces would be needed; there is only one comment in the library visitors' book regarding parking in the last 18 months. I do not believe that there has been an appropriate analysis. Furthermore, I understand from our councillor that the Morley only requires an occasional peripatetic music teacher to have parking, so eight new spaces seems an excessive number to accommodate this. The proposed cycle parking is also some way from the Rathmore club so would not be useful.

In particular, I object to:

- (i) the loss of the residents' parking space at the boundary of 67 Rock Road/Rock Road Library;

- (ii) the siting of bicycle racks on the highway in front of a public building used predominantly by families with young children; and
- (iii) the replacement of existing residents' permit holder parking spaces with new Pay & Display parking on Blinco Grove.

The grounds for my objection are that the proposed TRO does not comply with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Under the 1984 Act, a TRO should:

improve road safety:

This TRO worsens road safety by requiring children to stand in the road while getting on their bicycles. Rock Road Library is used by many parents with small children. Installing the cycle racks on the street rather than in the front yard of the library creates a hazard for young children who may run out into traffic while their parents are securing the bicycles.

preserve or improve the character or amenity of an area.

This TRO would add unsightly street furniture to an historic area. Furthermore, the residents of the area around Rock Road library have historically been extremely supportive of the library, campaigning successfully for its survival. It now seems remarkable that the library has not chosen to increase its own provision for bicycle parking in its ample front garden but instead is attempting to push the problem onto the residents, many of whom have already lost their front gardens.

- reduce and manage congestion

Overall, the proposals result in a **net loss** of 6-7 residents' parking spaces. The gain of 2 spaces at the Cherry Hinton Road end of Rock Road is offset by the loss of 8-9 spaces (1 on Rock Road and 7-8 on Blinco Grove). Lack of parking spaces will result in drivers spending more time circling and looking for a space, **increasing congestion and air pollution**. The residents propose that, if the council persists with this proposal, there should become a mixed shared use of residents being permitted to park in the pay and display sites, in the same way that is in place in Rathmore Road.

For all these reasons, I believe the proposed TRO should be rejected.

It appears that the Council has prejudged the outcome of this application and intends to begin work before the Council meeting on 22nd October. This is unacceptable.

Thank you for your letter about this. We appreciate that you are responding to the needs to the school and library as important parts of our community but are worried that as residents of this area we will be greatly impacted by this proposal.

We are concerned about the creation of seven pay and display spaces where residents currently park on Blinco Grove. We often park in these spaces when arriving home with our young children in the day, both on weekdays and at the weekend.

We would support either a reduction in the number of pay and display spaces to two or three which should be sufficient for the odd visiting contractor, library volunteer or music teacher; or seven spaces that are mixed use allowing both pay and display and residents to park there in the daytime

These solutions would not only provide some necessary pay and display spaces but would also cause residents less stress and hassle. I would like to provide an example of the hassle this would cause our family. We often go out in the car with our two young children on a weekend and return in the middle of the day when spaces are very hard to come by. We would likely be forced to park in the pay and display spaces in question (though of course the restrictions would not be active at

this time) as there is very rarely any other space in the road. We do not drive to work on a Monday morning and if we did not remember to move our car before 10am we would be issued with a parking fine. This is an unacceptable situation for us.

I also worry that too many pay and display bays would encourage more traffic to the area and fewer people walking or cycling. This could also include people with no connection to the area that park here for Addenbrookes or town (this happens at the weekend and 4 hours would be sufficient to do this)

We are concerned about plans (as per reference above) to convert an area of parking along Blinco Grove to Pay & Display only bays.

While we understand the need for this provision, we would ask that the proposed number (7 or 8) be reduced.

While we do manage to find parking at the moment, we are rarely able to park in our own street near our home; we have accepted this situation - but we do feel that a further reduction in permit parking spaces is likely to exacerbate the situation.

We would be grateful if you could give due consideration to our serious concerns.

I write in relation to your Public Order notice to further amend the parking restrictions in the Queen Edith's (Morley) area of Cambridge as follows:-

- Blinco Grove – to replace existing resident permit holder parking spaces with new pay & display parking (4 hour max. stay Mon-Fri 10am-7pm) on the north side from a point 8 metres east of Rock Road in an easterly direction for 38 metres.
- Rock Road – to replace existing no waiting at any time with new resident permit holder parking (Mon-Fri 10am-7pm) on the east side from a point 12 metres south of Cherry Hinton Road in a southerly direction for 12 metres.
- Rock Road – to replace existing resident holder parking space with new cycle parking from the boundary of no.67 Rock Road and the Library for 5 metres in a southerly direction.
- Rathmore Road – to replace existing resident holder parking space with new cycle parking from a point 17 metres south of Cherry Hinton Road for 5 metres in a southerly direction.

I do not believe that the proposals you make are in the interests of the residents of the area. I am concerned that you have implemented changes in recent times without due consideration, that no consideration of the impact of those changes has been made and that these further changes will put additional pressure on the residents of the area and impact on the overall environment within which we live. I have seen no evidence to suggest that these proposals are well thought through or have been considered in light of impact evaluation. Having such ill-thought through restrictions will denigrate the values of our property and the attraction of new owners to the area. This is unacceptable and with so much other important work to do in our city and surrounding areas I wish that you would put your focus and money on those more important issues - if you need an example, then how about school funding, the state of the roads and the safety of the roads, the provision of public transportation to reduce the congestions on roads.

I hope that you will consider the protestations you receive and consider moving this off of your priority list and focus on things which will have a greater impact on our wonderful city and the areas within which we live.

Thank you for your note regarding the planned changes to on-street parking restrictions in my area.

I live xxxxxx the library at xx Rock road and have several concerns about the planned changes:

1. My main concern, even before I became aware of these planning applications, is that the speed and volume of cars on Rock road makes an on-road bike park dangerous. In my opinion there has been an increase in speed since resident parking was introduced because with many residents (including ourselves) dropping their kerb and the road opening up there is no longer any visual impediment to increasing speed towards the corner with Blinco grove. I'm not aware of any specific measuring of speed that I can use as evidence but am increasingly concerned about the safety of my road in this regard. In addition many cars use Rock road as a cut through between Cherry Hinton road and Hills road, particularly at peak times, increasing the volume of traffic. People with young children and cargo bikes are far better off using the off-road space in front of the library than an on-road space. I do not understand why the library have in the past month dug up some of their off-road bike parking to replace with flowers.

In this context Rathmore is a much less busy road and probably the same issues don't apply.

2. I would like it to be clarified exactly who the bike parking is for - will there be a sign indicating for library users only or can it be used by any community member who wishes to park their bike? I write this in the context of certain library (?committee?) members' attitude to us parking the odd bike by chaining to the library railings which has verged on aggressive. Having clarified with parking attendants that I am free to park my bike there I don't understand their attitude.

3. Regarding car parking in the road.

There is not enough parking for residents in the community as it is without taking away further spaces. I object to the creation of the bike space on rock road and the pay and display spaces on Blinco in this context as well.

The proposed new pay and display bays on Blinco would be far better off at the site of the proposed new residents parking on Rock road in any regard as this would then serve the shops and pharmacy on Cherry Hinton road in addition to the library.

I am writing to you in connection with the plans to convert an area of parking on the corner of Rock Street and Blinco Grove to solely Pay and Display Parking. This would remove a stretch of parking for residents which currently can fit 7 to 8 cars. I understand that this is for the library and the school.

I'm surprised that this is related to the school which has its own car park and deliveries and visitors have ample room to park there.

I have to say that this proposal is incredibly disappointing. I really enjoy and support the Library but losing this parking on Blinco Grove would cause real difficulties for residents living there. As it stands (with the 7 -8 parking spaces) we often struggle to park on our road. We often have to park

on Baldock Way or further afield (on Cavendish Road). We have a young family and it is incredibly frustrating to have to pay for residents parking and have to walk ten minutes to get to our car.

Removing this amount of parking would also impact on our ability to have visitors – my elderly mother (and my husband's) come and help with child care every week. We already pay for visitors permits to enable them to park nearby and again this will severely impact on their ability to park near us.

I understand that there is a precedent (on Rustat Road for example) to have a mixture of pay and display as well as residents parking. Has this been considered here? Are there any other areas where this could be installed?

In summary losing this number of spaces is going to cause considerable difficulties for the residents of Blinco Grove and seems very unfair given that we are already now having to pay for parking and to have visitors. I don't feel it balances out the needs of the library where it seems unlikely that they will have 7-8 visitors driving at any one time. As mentioned before, the school already has its own car park.

I'm dismayed that after almost two years of satisfactory operation, there are plans to change the Morley RP arrangement.

With the help of Councillor Amanda Taylor, we fought long and hard over a period of nearly two years to get RP for the Morley area, delivering leaflets to local residents and organising polls of their opinions. Because the Council insisted on restricting parking on Marshall Road to one side of the road, there was a group of residents which objected to the original scheme citing insufficient parking. The residents' RP committee tramped the Morley area streets counting the number of cars parked at various times of the day, and concluded that there was just sufficient room. As a result, the scheme went ahead.

Some 60 cars were displaced from parking in Marshall Road and so a significant number of residents in Marshall Road were inconvenienced (some very inconvenienced), and now there are proposals to shrink one of the principal Marshall overflow bays. Were Marshall Road residents included when the Council sent out its letter regarding TRO566? If not, why not? Also, the original RP scheme included a bay outside the library designated as a limited waiting bay (for library users). Why didn't this appear when the scheme was implemented? Could it be because the pre-RP library survey indicated very little use of the library by car drivers?

I contest the statement that the length of Blinco proposed for Pay-and-Display is underused. Living opposite these bays I often see them full, and not just on a weekend, although there is a lull during school holidays. They provide some temporary parking space for visitors and workmen during the day, and Marshall overflow during much of the rest of the time. I have to use them myself when the bays outside 74/76/80 Blinco are occupied. The Statement of Reasons says that these bays are underused. Did anyone from the Council gather any proper data on their usage, or is it simply the opinion of the Library/Morley school?

Whilst priority for cycle users is in general a good thing, it seems silly to me that the cycle racks that were in the library grounds at the front of the library have been removed to make space for lawn and flower beds, whilst at the same time valuable parking space is to be consumed by placing cycle racks on the road. Surely the Library is a facility first and foremost. Making it an attractive facility is fine, but this smacks of form-over-function.

My alternative proposal

Library.

Living close to the library and being a regular library user, I note that the disabled bay immediately outside the library is hardly ever occupied. Since disabled users can park anywhere, would it not be sensible to add this to the existing RP-bay there and make them both limited waiting? If there are insufficient cycle-racks at the library, reinstate the ones which have been removed rather than consume a valuable parking slot which would then become unavailable 24/7.

Morley school.

It would seem to me to make much better sense to create a free limited-waiting area with a single yellow line (not pay/display) along a length of Baldock Way just opposite the school. This currently has double yellow lines down one side, but is largely unmarked on the other. Such an area would provide several short-stay spaces and would thus also accommodate some of the school pickup traffic (which regularly uses RP bays on Blinco when it shouldn't), and would prevent its use by day-long commuter parking, which I thought was to be 'discouraged'.

I'm writing to provide feedback on the proposed parking restriction changes in the Queen Edith's (Morley) Area with reference number PR0566.

Breaking the amendments down into their four parts, I have no comments to add on the proposed cycle parking in Rathmore Road nor on the additional permit holder bays in Rock Road.

The proposed cycle parking stand in Rock Road sounds like a good idea and I think it aligns well with the local plan for Cambridge, in particular section 8.7 and encouraging use of access to Rock Road library via bicycle rather than car.

My only concerns are with the loss of residents parking along Blinco Grove. The 38 metres represents about 8 parking spaces, and while the changes to Rock Road will result in one extra residents parking space, it's not clear to me that the loss of 7 parking spaces is justified, especially in that location.

The statement of reasons contains the statement that this length of road appears "under-used" but doesn't quantify this. While I'll admit that there are usually a couple of free spaces along that 38 meter stretch, I've never seen it entirely empty and on busy days (such as Mondays) it is sometime full.

Even with the current level of residents parking, we find people parking across our driveway on Blinco Grove about once a month.

I'm also concerned that there hasn't been any apparent consideration of how the extension of the residents parking scheme to Baldock way and beyond might impact the use of the residents parking in the area.

I also wonder why the new pay and display parking is around the corner from the building most likely to be visited on the road (Rock Road Library) rather than in front of it. If traffic modelling has

shown that there is a need for encouraging more people to drive to Rock Road Library then why is the new parking not closer to Rock Road Library?

Finally why has the decision been made to covert the residents parking to pay & display and not have the length as dual-use, either for residents permit holders or for pay & display?

This is regarding the proposed TRO (PR0566) on Blinco Grove. I live at xx Blinco Grove and have concerns about the proposed change outside our property to change all the bays opposite to solely pay and display. This would severely reduce the number of spaces available to residents. We often have to use these bays for family members who visit and have purchased visitor permits to do this. Changing it to pay and display would make parking quite tricky for anybody visiting for more than an hour or so. I understand the need for more pay and display areas – although I would say the pay and display available at the end of the Blinco Grove, next to the Rock Road pub, is rarely used when we pass it. I would ask that this proposed area is changed to mixed pay and display and permit holders to try and balance the needs of residents and visitors of the library and school.

I am writing to object to the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

I live at xx, Rock Road, opposite the library, and so would be immediately impacted by the changes proposed. The introduction of residents parking has benefited the area overall but had detrimental impact for the immediate area where I live – the end of Rock Road joining Blinco Grove. We lost 'on-road' parking spaces due to more restrictions, bay marking and the new pay & display bay outside the library. We now have 2 spaces outside the library that are not available for residents during the scheme hours, even during the 1 x full day and 2 x half days the library is closed during the week (valuable spaces held on road for no purpose). Plus, the overspill from Marshall Road residents (due to lost parking spaces on Marshall) has put more pressure on the available spaces in our immediate area.

Since the parking scheme has been introduced there have been times when I have had family and visitors having to park on Hartington Grove- something that never happened before the scheme was introduced. It is my belief that the changes proposed will add to this pressure so that something that just about works now for residents will not work at all.

Some specifics:

1. Objection to conversion of spaces to Pay & Display on Blinco Grove

These are the places that mean the scheme just works; they enable the area to absorb overspill from Marshall Road. My son lives with us and this is where he parks his car. At times there is no space there and so he has to park across the end of our driveway to avoid parking 2 roads away. Loss of spaces on Blinco will make his, and any visitors, parking very difficult.

I do not believe there should be a priority given to people coming in to the community to use the library. It is meant to be a community library – if so, most people would walk or cycle with the minority needing to drive. We should not be encouraging more cars from outside to drive in to the area – this was the purpose of introducing the residents scheme in the first place. If access for

less mobile people is an issue then, at most, 1 or 2 spaces could be converted on Blinco which should be for shared pay & display and residents. This would give the flexibility needed whilst still prioritising residents.

2. Objection to conversion of 1 space outside the library for bike parking

In addition to loss of parking for residents, as mentioned above, I believe this is would put any users of on road bike parking at risk. 3 houses opposite the proposed space have cars manoeuvring on and off their driveways at all times – the road is not wide enough to keep cars and people/children at a safe distance from each other.

The library has a large garden area, including a front garden. Whilst I applaud the development of the garden space around the library as community space, and the front garden is looking lovely and full of flowers, I do not believe that flowers should be prioritised over people and safety! There is plenty of room in the library front garden to accommodate more cycle parking (reinstate the bike racks just removed?????) without impacting residents.

I recognise we need to balance the needs of community amenities and residents, but do believe the current proposals move too far towards amenities, encouraging non-residents to drive and park in the area. More priority should be given to residents.

I trust these objections to the TRO will be considered.
