

## Consider Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions in Headly Street, Eagle Street and Hazell Street, Cambridge

To: Cambridge Joint Area Committee

Meeting Date: 29 July 2024

From: Executive Director of Place and Sustainability

Electoral division(s): County Council divisions within Cambridge: Petersfield  
City Council wards: Petersfield

Executive summary: These roads form the Ironworks residential development, which was built on the site of the former Mill Road Council depot. The proposal would prohibit parking on most lengths of the three roads, with the exception of a small number of on-street parking spaces. The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the feedback received to the publication of these proposals and consider whether the parking restrictions should proceed.

Recommendation: The Committee is asked to:

Recommend that the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability, in consultation with the Local Member, approves the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order on Headly Street, Eagle Street and Hazell Street, as set out in the report.

### Officer contact:

Name: Gary Baldwin  
Post: Policy & Regulation Engineer  
Email: [gary.baldwin@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:gary.baldwin@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

### Officer contact:

Name: Ross Jones  
Post: Cambridge City Council  
Email: [ross.jones@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:ross.jones@cambridge.gov.uk)

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The Ironworks residential development was built on the site of the former Mill Road Council depot. The development was intended to be a low traffic / minimal parking neighbourhood. The width, layout and shared surface arrangement of the roads are not conducive to high levels of on-street parking. An underground off-street car park was built as part of the development, but residents are required to apply for and pay for a space.
- 1.2 Due to the planning vision and layout of the streets, it is necessary to prohibit on-street parking on most lengths of Headly Street, Eagle Street and Hazell Street. This is intended to create a street scene that is less dominated by motorised cars and more suited to cycling and walking.
- 1.3 At present, parked vehicles are causing health and safety concerns, and are blocking designated crossing points. Persons using mobility aids and push chairs are impacted by vehicles parking along pavements and are having to use the road. Vehicles are blocking access to garages and emergency vehicle access concerns have been raised. It is suspected that train station parking is contributing to the current parking issues. The proposed parking restrictions would prohibit parking on most lengths of road and would address most of these issues.
- 1.4 It should be noted that the Ironworks development is at present private. There is no Section 38 Agreement in place and, at present, no formal notification has been served. However, the highway authority is prepared to adopt the streets and is exploring ways of achieving this with the developer, but there is no absolute guarantee that the development will become adopted public highway and it may remain private. It is legally possible for the Council to enforce parking restrictions that are supported by a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on an unadopted road.

## 2. Main Issues

- 2.1 Before introducing new on-street parking restrictions there is a statutory requirement for the Council to publish a notice of intention to inform interested parties of the proposed TRO. This process invites the public to formally object to or submit other representations on the proposals in writing within a minimum 21-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 The original proposal was for parking to be prohibited on all lengths of all three roads. The required notice was published in the Cambridge News on 7 January 2024, and the statutory consultation period ran until 29 January 2024. Additional information was available on the Council's website, in Cambridge Central library and notices were posted on-street. That prompted the receipt of 72 written representations, including 14 objections (12 wholly objecting and 2 partly objecting); 54 offering support (44 wholly supporting and 10 partly supporting); and 4 neutral responses.
- 2.3 It was subsequently decided that the original plan should be amended to provide the following:
  - (i) Eagle Street – three parking spaces (30 minutes maximum stay) and a car club space. These are intended to provide short-stay visitor parking and encourage car sharing.

(ii) Hazell Street – one parking space (3 hours maximum stay) and a disabled persons parking bay. These are primarily to provide parking outside the community centre.

- 2.4 The revised proposals were published in the Cambridge News on 1 May 2024, and the statutory consultation period ran until 23 May 2024. That prompted the receipt of 24 written representations, including 4 objections (2 wholly objecting and 2 partly objecting); 17 offering support (13 wholly supporting and 4 partly supporting); and 3 neutral responses.
- 2.5 Hence, in total over the two rounds of consultation, 96 representations have been received, including 18 objections, 71 offering support and 7 neutral responses. It should be noted that there is some repetition of responses, with a number of people offering feedback on both the original and revised proposals.
- 2.6 The reduction in the number of representations, including objections, indicates that the revised proposals overcame some of the opposition, but it is difficult to categorically state that. The lower number of responses to the revised proposal received may suggest a degree of “consultation fatigue”.
- 2.7 The written representations received are attached at Appendix 4. The main issues raised have been summarised in the table in Appendix 3, with the officer responses also given in the table.
- 2.8 In summary, due to the layout of the street in the Ironworks development and overall planning objectives of the site, it is essential that on-street parking controls are implemented. Otherwise, it is likely that the streets would be cluttered with parked vehicles, which would make walking / cycling difficult and result in vehicular access to the whole development being compromised.

### 3. Significant Implications

#### 3.1 Finance Implications

The works would be funded by the developer.

#### 3.2.1 Legal Implications

The statutory processes relating to the requirement to publish and consult on such proposals have been followed.

#### 3.3 Risk Implications

There are risks, as with the majority of parking schemes, that parking displacement could occur to outside the Ironworks development following implementation. However, most of the streets in the surrounding area have residential parking schemes already in place or are planned, so parking opportunities in nearby streets are limited. Due to the original low traffic vision for the development and planning consent, if the parking restrictions are not introduced, there is a risk that both Councils could be challenged on the fact that the original plans for the site have not been fulfilled.

### 3.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

The protected characteristics likely to be affected by this proposal are Age, Disability, Pregnancy/Maternity and Sex.

**Age:** Less mobile people without access to off-street parking, may have to park further away from their home, meaning that they would have to walk further to/from their car. However, the double yellow lines should ensure that the streets remain clear of parked cars, so may provide an opportunity to stop outside their home for short-stay purposes, such as for loading/unloading and picking up/setting down passengers. There is off-street parking available in the private underground car park.

**Disability:** Due to the loss of on-street parking, disabled people living on these streets may find parking more difficult. However, blue badge holders are permitted to park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours, so the yellow lines may effectively provide them with short-stay parking that might otherwise have been taken up by others. In addition, there is a disabled person parking bay proposed for Hazell Street.

**Pregnancy/Maternity:** Those who are either pregnant or have babies/young children and have no access to off-street parking, may have to park further away from their home. This could create difficulties walking to/from their car in the later stages of pregnancy or when carrying babies. However, the double yellow lines may provide more opportunities to stop outside their home for short-stay purposes, such as loading/unloading and picking up/setting down passengers.

**Sex:** The proposed restrictions could mean that drivers have to find parking further away from their homes and women may feel vulnerable walking home, particularly during the hours of darkness.

It should be noted that in all the above cases, there should never have been an expectation that residents, tenants and visitors would be able to park on-street, due to the original planning objectives for the site.

### 3.5 Climate Change and Environment Implications

The lack of on-street parking is a barrier to multiple car ownership and may encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport. This has the potential to reduce congestion and improve air quality.

## 4. Source Documents

None

