

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS FOR THE ACCORDIA AND STAFFORDSHIRE STREET AREAS OF CAMBRIDGE

To: **Cambridge City Joint Area Committee**

Meeting Date: **17th April 2018**

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

Electoral division(s): **Accordia: Petersfield (County); Trumpington (City)
Staffordshire Street: Petersfield (County and City)**

Forward Plan ref: **Key decision **No****

Purpose: **To consider:**
The representations the objections received in response to the formal advertisement of parking controls in the Accordia and Staffordshire Street areas.

Recommendation: **The committee is recommended to:**

- a) Approve the parking controls in the areas shown in Plans A and B (Appendix 1) as advertised
- b) Authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to these parking controls as are necessary in response to the formalisation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- c) Inform the objectors accordingly.

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Nicola Gardner
Post:	Parking Policy Manager
Email:	Nicola.gardner@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 727912

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Cambridge continues to grow and develop. With this on-going prosperity comes increasing demands on limited on-street parking facilities. The ever-evolving demands on parking from those that live, work and visit Cambridge has seen the competition for free parking spaces soar and the level of congestion increase whilst air quality falls.
- 1.2 The removal of free parking within the city via the introduction of new Residents' Parking Schemes (RPS), aims to reduce congestion, cut air pollution, improve road safety whilst safeguarding local business/facilities and prioritise parking for those that live within Cambridge.
- 1.3 By encouraging the use of more sustainable methods of transport, the number of vehicles coming into the city should reduce and air quality improve, therefore enhancing the quality of life for residents and enriching the experience of those visiting this historic city.
- 1.4 Whilst 26 new RPSs have been identified, a phased implementation approach is being taken to minimise the impact on both residents and council resources.
- 1.5 Phase 1 consists of seven proposed residents' parking schemes. These schemes were selected as some level of informal consultation had already been undertaken by local Councillors. The schemes are Accordia, Staffordshire, Newnham, Coleridge West, Coleridge East, Victoria and Elizabeth.
- 1.6 The Greater Cambridge Partnership has committed to covering the costs associated with the consultation and implementation of all 26 schemes.
- 1.7 Due to the complexities of each unique area, all schemes have progressed at different speeds. The development of schemes proposed for Accordia and Staffordshire are furthest along and have reached the statutory consultation stage, which saw the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that underpin the schemes being formally advertised.
- 1.8 Statutory consultation for the Newnham and Coleridge West scheme proposals is due to commence within the next few months. With public consultation for the schemes in Victoria and Ascham due to take place in summer 2018. The final schemes for phase 1, proposals for Coleridge East and Elizabeth required further informal consultation and are programmed to commence the formal process in 2019.

2. MAIN ISSUES

2.1 Public Consultation

The public consultation for the proposed Accordia and Staffordshire schemes commenced on 23rd October 2017 and closed on 15th December (allowing for postal returns). Consultation documents (which included a detailed plan of the proposed restrictions) were sent to all households and business within the defined areas. The consultation included a public 'drop-in session' which gave residents the opportunity to discuss the proposed parking controls with officers.

- 2.2 The results of these consultations showed that the majority of those that responded, support the introduction of parking controls:

Scheme	% Responded	% Supported	% Opposed
Accordia	33%	87%	13%
Staffordshire	29%	96%	4%

All comments and suggestions received during this consultation period in relation to the proposed parking controls have been considered and incorporated into the parking plans that supported the TROs where feasible.

2.3 Statutory Consultation

On 2nd February 2018, the proposed parking plans for the Accordia and Staffordshire schemes were formally advertised in the Cambridge News; Plans A –B show the proposed parking controls. Letters were also sent to all households with the defined schemes. This consultation period closed on 28th February 2018.

Accordia

2.4 The results of this consultation are:

Street	No. Households	No. Respondents	No. Objections	No. Comments
ABERDEEN AVENUE	89	3	3	0
ABERDEEN SQUARE	23	1	0	1
BROOKLANDS AVENUE	27	0	0	0
COPSE WAY	16	0	0	0
GILMOUR ROAD	9	2	0	2
GILPIN PLACE	22	0	0	0
GILPIN ROAD	36	1	0	1
HENSLOW MEWS	26	4	2	2
KINGFISHER WAY	108	1	0	1
LENNOX WALK	6	0	0	0
RICHARD FOSTER ROAD	10	0	0	0
WILKINSON PLACE	8	0	0	0
TOTAL	380	12	5	7
OUTSIDE AREA		5	4	1
OTHER CONSULTEES		1	0	1
GRAND TOTAL		18	9	9

2.5 Nine objections to the advertised proposals have been received along three written representations of support and six comments/suggestions. Appendix 2 shows full details of all the responses received.

2.6 The main underlying concerns raised in this consultation revolved around the proposed/existing double yellow lines, pavement parking, increasing the number of limited waiting bays and the potential impact the additional cost of residents/visitor permits will have on households within the scheme.

The proposed/existing introduction of double yellow lines (DYLs)

2.7 DYLs indicate that no waiting is permitted at any time. They are used primarily for safety and to prevent obstruction of the highway. DYLs are also used to:

- Protect the visibility at junctions.
- Maintain access for vehicles including larger vehicles such as refuse and emergency vehicles.
- Ensure the free-flow of traffic.

In relation to junction protection and in-line with the guidance offered in the Highway Code, DYLs at junctions will usually extend to a distance of at least 10m. This is to ensure clear visibility for drivers/pedestrians and unrestricted access for larger vehicles. In some situations, DYL's may be longer than 10m to protect access.

After reviewing the DYLS proposed for both junctions on Henslow Mews, the DYLS will be reduced. The DYLS will now only extend to just beyond the property access points on both sides of the road and at both ends of Henslow Mews (see below).



Pavement parking

2.8 The Council has a responsibility to keep footways safe to use, ensuring the safe passage for pedestrians, rather than to facilitate parking. Parking on pavements can cause a number of issues:

- Creates safety issues for pedestrians and can hide other vehicles, particularly on bends, narrow roads and at junctions.
- Creates an obstruction and hazard for the visually impaired, disabled, elderly and those with prams and pushchairs.
- Can cause damage to the pavements.

The Residents Parking Scheme Policy supports this view and as such, parking on footways would only be considered in exceptional circumstances where there is no impact on safety or pedestrian movement and where the underlying construction is suitable for vehicles. The pavements within the Accordia development are not designed to support the weight of parked vehicles.

Additional limited waiting bays

2.9 The scheme that has been proposed for Accordia is a Permit Parking Area (PPA). Unlike a traditional RPS, there are no marked residents' bays. Motorists with a valid permit may park anywhere within the scheme.. The aim of this type of scheme is that parking is self-managed, drivers take responsibility for parking appropriately and where parking is inappropriate, DYLS will be installed.

PPAs do not naturally lend themselves to a mix of marked and non-marked bays as such a mix could be deemed to be confusing to drivers and would require a significant increase in the level of signage. The limited waiting bays proposed in the centre of the Accordia development fall outside the two proposed PPAs that together form the Accordia scheme.

Whilst the proposed plans have been amended to reflect a reduction of DYLs on Henslow Mews, as this is a minor amendment and one that is less restrictive, it is permitted without the requirement to re-advertise. However the addition of extra bays is considered a major change and as such would require the TRO to be re-advertised and a further consultation undertaken.

The costs of residents' parking permits

- 2.10 As RPSs, by their nature, directly benefit those residents that live within the scheme, the cost associated with providing this service should be met by those that directly benefit and not the Council.

RPSs are not designed to generate an income for the County Council. Permit fees are set at a level to cover all associated scheme costs, including those related to the enforcement, administration and the maintenance of signs/lines. Permit costs will be reviewed annually and adjusted accordingly. Any surplus generated will be used to develop the service provided.

The Highways and Community Infrastructure committee (H&CI) in February 2018 approved the introduction of a 'standard' scheme. This scheme is operational Monday to Friday, between 9am and 5pm at a charge of £52 with an additional fee of £1.25 charged per hour for each additional hour of operation. This proposed 'standard' permit charge aims to cover the basic costs of enforcement, administration and maintenance. The fee of £12 per visitors' permit (which allows 5 visits) was also approved. The permit pricing structure will be implemented in April 2018.

The times of operation for this scheme were discussed with the local County Councillor and formed the basis of the public consultation document. The public consultation showed that 67% of those that responded felt that the proposed hours (Monday to Saturday, 9am to 5pm) best reflected the times parking problems arose.

The residents' permit cost for this scheme is £62 and visitors' permits will be £12.

Staffordshire

- 2.11 The results of this consultation are:

Street	No. Households	No. Respondents	No. Objections	No. Comments
ATHLONE	9	0	0	0
DONEGAL	16	1	0	1
ENFIELD	12	0	0	0
GLENMORE	9	0	0	0
HOLLYMOUNT	9	0	0	0
STAFFORDSHIRE St	22	0	0	0
TOTAL	77	1	0	1
OUTSIDE AREA		2	2	0
OTHER CONSULTEES		1	0	1
GRAND TOTAL		4	2	2

- 2.12 Two written objections to the advertised proposals have been received and two written representations of support were also received. Appendix 3 shows full details of all the response's received.
- 2.13 The main underlying concern raised in this consultation involved the households within Bray. The public consultation proposed that Bray should be included within the Staffordshire RPS. However, the households of Bray are already part of the Petersfield RPS and as such not eligible for permits within this scheme. This oversight was corrected at the statutory consultation stage.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The proposed scheme has the flexibility to balance needs of both residents and the local community.
- It will prioritise parking for residents.
- The removal of free parking will improve traffic flow and reduce congestion and pollution.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- A balanced parking provision will offer residents and their visitors' prioritised parking.
- A RPS offers a range of permit types which includes free medical permits, a free Blue Badge Holder permit and Health worker dispensation.
- The removal of free parking should reduce congestion and should have a positive impact on air quality levels.
- Improved pedestrian access by removing pavement parking.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Careful consideration needs to be given to the requirement for Blue Badge holder bays to accommodate the needs of both residents and visitors to Cambridge that hold valid Blue Badges.
- Any valid Blue Badge holder is permitted to park in both residents' and pay & display bays across the city without time limitation.
- Blue Badge holders can apply for a free Blue Badge Holders Permit.
- Improved pedestrian access by removing pavement parking.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

The Greater Cambridge Partnership have committed to covering the costs associated to the implementation of the Accordia and Staffordshire RPSs. The subsequent on-going costs are covered by permit fees.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The introduction of a RPS carries the following key risks:

- Failure to adequately manage on-street parking will increase congestion and undermine road safety.
- Failure to cover the cost associated and ongoing charges will have a negative impact on budgets.

These can be mitigated by:

- Balancing the needs of residents, local business and the local community to keep traffic moving, improve pedestrian safety and reduce the risk of accidents on the road network.
- Applying suitable pricing structures, where appropriate, to ensure that all operational costs are covered.

The Council also has a general obligation under s122 of Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984 when exercising any functions under it to “secure expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway”.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

Community Impact implications attached, see appendix 4

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

Interaction with the local County Councillor and residents has been essential to ensuring the proposed scheme best meets the needs of the local community.

4.7 Public Health Implications

The proposed RPSs will reduce congestion and encourage the use of more sustainable travel options for visitors, which will have a positive impact on air quality and therefore an impact on public health.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Paul White
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	No response to date Name of Legal Officer: Jatinder Sahota
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	No response to date Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Silk/Joanne Shilton
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	No response to date Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
<i>Residents' Parking Policy</i>	https://ccc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/Residents%27%20Parking%20Scheme%20Policy.pdf?inline=true
<i>Cambridge Residents' Parking Scheme Extension Delivery Plan</i>	https://ccc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/Cambridge%20Residents%27%20Parking%20Schemes%20Extension%20Delivery%20Plan.pdf?inline=true