

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES

- Date:** Tuesday 22nd October 2019
- Time:** 4:30pm – 6:50pm
- Venue:** Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge
- Present:** City Councillors: R Robertson (Chairman), A Martinelli, C Payne, M Sargeant and M Smart
- County Councillors: L Jones (Vice-Chairwoman), N Harrison, N Kavanagh, I Manning, A Taylor and J Whitehead
- Apologies:** City Councillor N Massey and County Councillor E Meschini

54. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor Meschini (substituted by Councillor Whitehead) and Councillor Massey.

There were no declarations of interest.

55. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4TH JUNE 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 4th June 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

56. CAMBRIDGE CITY LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PANEL MEMBERSHIP

The Committee received a report asking it to agree membership of the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) Member Assessment Panel for the 2020/21 Programme.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree membership of the Cambridge City Local Highways Improvement Member Panel, consisting of County Councillors L Jones, N Kavanagh and I Manning and City Councillors A Martinelli, R Robertson and M Sargeant; and
- b) Agree that a member of the panel who is unable to attend a panel meeting be authorised to nominate another member of the same Council to attend as a substitute or alternate.

57. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS FOR THE BENSON NORTH AREA

The Committee received a report which contained the objections received in response to the formal advertisement of parking controls in the Benson North area. Members were informed that 60 written responses had been received throughout the statutory consultation, 35 of which objected or strongly opposed some elements of the scheme, 14 of which supported the scheme and 11 of which presented no clear preference. It was noted that the majority of concerns revolved around the installation of double yellow lines and the parking provisions around the Therapy Rooms on Oxford Road and officers' considerations of these objections were also included in the report. It was suggested that the introduction of a Resident Parking Scheme (RPS) would ease parking demand, while the mixed bays would continue to provide flexibility for the local community. Members were reminded that as the Highway authority, the Council was required to ensure the safety of all those that used the highway, including pedestrians. The Parking Policy Manager noted that free, unlimited parking encouraged people to drive in to the city and the scheme was part of a wider approach to promote alternative and more sustainable forms of transport while reducing congestion and improving air pollution.

Dr Fiona Head, a resident of Woodlark Road, was invited by the Chairman to speak on her concerns related to the parking controls. Dr Head suggested that air pollution was negligible in the area and that the scheme would not make any difference in that regard. She noted that if implemented, the parking controls would leave over 60 houses with only 10 parking spaces available for visitors, which would have an inevitable impact on their social life and the vital support needed by some residents. Dr Head argued that the current parking layout created a natural chicane that forced cars to travel below the speed limit, but without parking on both sides, as proposed in the scheme, the road would be clear and cars would travel at a greater speed, thus endangering cyclists, pedestrians, children and other road users. Dr Head also expressed concerns over the consultation, which she suggested had only received such a high level of support because the inclusion of double yellow lines had not been made clear in the documents.

The Chairman invited Mr David Parry, a resident of Eachard Road, to address the Committee. Mr Parry argued that the parking problem in the Benson North area was restricted to commuter parking during working hours and that the scheme did not address that fundamental problem, suggesting that there was no need to negatively impact on residents outside of the peak hours. He also noted that clearing parked cars from one side would open the road up and allow cars to travel at an increased speed, thus provoking a further problem that the scheme had failed to address.

Ms Angela Lattimore was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee on behalf of the Therapy Room, an Integrated Health Clinic based on Oxford Road. Ms Lattimore informed Members that one of the original reasons for selecting the location for the clinic had been the ample parking facilities, given that patients, who were visiting for medical attention and assistance, generally were not Blue Badge holders. Doctors attending at the clinic would also suffer from being unable to park at their place of work. She suggested that journeys by public transport could take up to five times as long as by car and that the bus services were unreliable. Noting the community resource that the clinic also fulfilled by providing meeting room space and having a license to host training programmes, Ms Lattimore advised Members that the parking controls might force the clinic to close.

The committee received written statements from Teddy Brookes, Gail Stevens and the Committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE), the contents of which are attached as **Appendix 1** to these minutes.

Councillor Richards spoke as the local County Council Member for Castle, noting that the scheme also affected Newnham and Arbury. She paid tribute to the work carried out by the County Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership, as well as to members of the public for their participation in the consultation process. In expressing her support for the scheme, Councillor Richards emphasised the need to ensure sufficient parking facilities for local residents and organisations in the area, noting that the placement of mixed bays had emerged as a result of consultations with those in the affected area. She also suggested that a review should be carried out one year after any implementation.

While discussing the report and objections to the TRO, Members:

- Considered whether it would be preferable for a review to commence after six months, rather than one year, although the Parking Policy Manager noted that reviews usually occurred after twelve months to allow for the changes in parking behaviour throughout the calendar year to be observed. Some Members suggested that the review should consider the removal of some streets from the scheme. Officers clarified that a review could include the reclassification of bays, but indicated that removing double yellow lines would be problematic.
- Suggested that the streets included in the scheme were too varied in their layout and that they suffered from different issues to one another, with an example given that some of the streets afforded driveways to residents. Some Members suggested that the same situation applied across the city, while others argued that the scheme should have been split into various smaller, more targeted schemes.
- Acknowledged concerns raised by the public speakers about the lack of clarity regarding double yellow lines in the consultation stage, with one Member noting that 12 of the 34 residents that had responded to an informal consultation had agreed that they had been unaware of their inclusion. It was also observed that residents were asked to vote on the basis of an unrevised map that did not reflect the final layout of the scheme. Officers were requested to ensure that future consultations were clearer and easier to read.
- Expressed concern that a resident had encountered difficulties when visiting Shire Hall to view plans of the scheme.
- Observed that certain streets had objected in greater numbers to other streets from the beginning of the consultation, such as Sherlock Road, where 91% of residents opposed. It was noted that all the streets in the "square" (comprised of Sherlock Road, Sherlock Close, Woodlark Road, Hoadly Road and Eachard Road) had opposed at levels exceeding 50% and therefore that area should have been removed from the scheme. Officers suggested that leaving an area such as the "square" outside the scheme would lead to displaced people parking there, thus creating a problem that it would be too late to resolve through the scheme, as any additions to the implemented scheme would require a reconsideration of the whole scheme. It was proposed that the "square" could be removed from the scheme and then added back in after the review if considered necessary. Officers clarified to Members that those currently in the scheme would have to vote on whether to allow new streets to join,

although it was acknowledged that the scheme could be implemented in stages throughout a two-year period.

- Established that replacing double yellow lines with single yellow lines would represent a significant change to the proposals and therefore could not be considered at such a late stage in the process without repeating consultations.
- Considered implementing the scheme without signage at first and then adding signs after a review, but officers noted that the signage would need to be installed when the scheme was implemented.
- Acknowledged the concerns raised by the Therapy Room and suggested that more effort should be made to support the clinic. Some Members considered that it had sufficient private parking facilities and access to mixed use bays, noting that the scheme was designed as a resident parking scheme and not a business parking scheme. Other Members argued that the clinic was not a business, as it was providing a health service to patients who required medical assistance.
- Clarified that there were mixed use parking bays on Wentworth Road and Richmond Road. When asked whether it would be possible to include additional pay and display bays on Oxford Road close to the Therapy Room, officers informed Members that they had been placed on Wentworth Road due to the lack of frontage, which reduced the demand for parking by residents and therefore the levels of objection. Councillor Richards informed the Committee that she had informally consulted residents of Oxford Road and the preference had been for the bays to remain as indicated on the plans.
- Considered the inclusion of St Christopher's Avenue in the scheme, during which discussion Members:
 - Identified the road as an unnecessary inclusion of the scheme given that the whole street consisted of dropped curbs, which meant that parking was already illegal.
 - Noted that it had been included despite 80% of the road's residents asking to be excluded from the scheme. The Chairman observed that the report did not include any objections related to St Christopher's Avenue but it was suggested that the residents had considered their initial strong objections to be sufficient.
 - Recalled that when the 26 resident parking scheme zones had been initially decided by a mixed group of Councillors, it had been agreed to require a 50% approval threshold across the whole of the scheme. Therefore, it was argued that calling for the removal of certain streets from the scheme based on their high objection rates was contrary to the over-riding and original spirit of the process. It was noted that such changes had not been permitted in previously implemented schemes and that it would set a precedent that could jeopardise current and future schemes, although some Members considered such a precedent reasonable in order to act on the concerns of residents.
- Discussed the role of the Committee, with some Members suggesting it was only required to make strategic decisions and not micromanage, while others considered it the Committee's duty and responsibility to discuss the detail of each scheme.
- Noted that all parking schemes provoked support and opposition, although experience in other areas that had already implemented schemes demonstrated that they were

effective and popular with local residents, including with some of those who originally objected. However, it was acknowledged that neighbouring streets that were not included in schemes were likely to suffer from increased levels of parking as a direct result of the displacement of vehicles due to parking controls.

The following amendment to the recommendations was proposed by Councillor Payne and seconded by Councillor Manning (addition in bold).

The Committee is recommended to:

- a) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the area shown in Appendix 1 (Benson North plans 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4);
- b) Hold a review of the parking controls after six months;**
- c) Authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO); and
- d) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Subsequently, the following amendment to the recommendations was proposed by Councillor Payne and seconded by Councillor Manning (addition in bold):

The Committee is recommended to:

- a) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the area shown in Appendix 1 (Benson North plans 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4);
- b) Hold a review of the parking controls after six months;
- c) Publish the Traffic Regulation Order for the whole area but to not implement it in Sherlock Road, Sherlock Close, Woodlark Road, Hoadly Road, Eachard Road or St Christopher's Avenue until an evaluation had been carried out after the six-month review;**
- d) Authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO); and
- e) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the area shown in Appendix 1 (Benson North plans 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4);
- b) Hold a review of the parking controls after six months;
- c) Authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO); and
- d) Inform the objectors accordingly.

58. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME AMENDMENTS IN QUEEN EDITH'S (MORLEY) AREA

The Committee received a report which contained objections and other written representations to proposed amendments to the residential parking scheme in various roads in the Queen Edith's (Morley) area. A review of the scheme had been carried out following the completion of twelve months after its implementation in Autumn 2017, with the major issue identified as a need for further car and bicycle parking spaces. Members were informed that of the four proposed amendments to the scheme, only two had received objections and they focused mainly on the loss of resident parking.

The Chairman invited Mr Liam McKay, a resident of Blinco Grove, to address the Committee. Mr McKay expressed support for the overall scheme, noting that it had helped local residents. However, he considered that losing 8 resident parking bays, as indicated in the proposals, was unnecessary and would be problematic for residents who would have to either move their vehicle at 10am or struggle to find space when returning from work in the afternoon. Mr McKay suggested to the Committee that a survey carried out by residents indicated that residents' vehicles occupied an average of 3.8 of the 8 spaces (48%) during the hours of the scheme. He noted that Morley Memorial Primary School would be closed for 27% of the time, while Rock Road Library would be closed for 56% of the time. Mr McKay proposed changing the bays to mixed use bays, which would receive the support both of residents and the School. He also observed that the proposed cost for using the pay & display bays was listed as £0.60 per hour on page 50 of the report, whereas the bays already on Blinco Grove charged £1.20 per hour.

Addressing the Committee as the local County Member for Queen Edith's, Councillor Taylor thanked officers for their response to the review, which had raised issues over enforcement of the parking controls and a need for short stay parking facilities. She noted that visitors to Morley Memorial Primary School and Rock Road Library did not qualify for a permit and needed provisions for parking, while residents considered the proposed eight pay and display bays to be excessive. Councillor Taylor proposed amending the proposals, with the pay and display bays on Blinco Grove being changed to mixed use bays.

While discussing the proposed changes, Members:

- Queried why the bays had not been suggested as mixed use at the start of the review, given that it was the clear preference for residents. Officers observed that if they were

mixed use bays, it was possible that they would all be occupied by residents and therefore visitors would still be unable to find parking spaces. It was noted that the survey conducted by residents suggested that the bays had never been fully occupied by residents but Members expressed concern over relying on data collected informally by local residents, arguing that it did not show whether there were spaces elsewhere within the scheme and was therefore incomplete.

- Suggested that the scheme could run from 10am-5pm instead of 10am-7pm, thus alleviating unnecessary problems for residents when returning from work. Officers acknowledged that such a change to the scheme would be possible as it would be making the published proposals less restrictive.
- Considered amending the proposals to include four mixed use bays and four pay and display bays, although it was acknowledged that residents and the local Member preferred changing to eight mixed use bays
- Established that three music teachers from Morley Memorial Primary School had reported arriving late to classes due to lack of parking facilities.
- Clarified that the disabled parking bay outside Rock Road Library would not be impeded by the proposed cycle parking stand which would be installed alongside.
- Noted that the proposed cycle parking stand would not serve as a replacement to the library's current cycle parking facilities, which had been moved to a different location within the library's grounds.

Councillor Taylor proposed changing the pay and display parking bay on Blinco Grove, as indicated on the drawing shown in Appendix 1 of the report, to a mixed use bay. Following discussion, the proposal was agreed unanimously.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Introduce the proposed amendments as shown on the drawing shown in Appendix 1 as published, except for the proposed pay & display parking bay in Blinco Grove, which was changed to a mixed use parking bay; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

59. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS ON CHURCH END, CHERRY HINTON

The Committee received a report which included objections received in response to the publication of proposed waiting restrictions on Church End in Cherry Hinton.

Councillor Crawford spoke as the local County Council Member for Cherry Hinton and she strongly endorsed the scheme, noting the high number of accidents and dangerous incidents that had occurred at the location. Suggesting that parked cars had been a cause of accidents, she considered that the safety concerns greatly outweighed the objections, noting that a young boy had been knocked off his bicycle. Councillor Crawford clarified that the scheme was not intended to improve traffic flow but was rather intended to slow the traffic flow down, noting that double yellow lines were mandatory alongside the

proposed gate to ensure the safety of the feature. She also noted that one objection suggested enforcement would have been sufficient, but she informed Members that the police had confirmed that it was not possible to provide sufficient enforcement and that they had recommended traffic calming measures.

The committee received written statements from Penny and David Nicholas, and Matthew Polaine (and family), the contents of which are attached as **Appendix 2** to these minutes

While discussing the report, Members expressed their agreement for the proposals, noting the importance of improving safety in the area.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Implement the proposals in Church End as originally published; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

60. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSAL TO INSTALL DOUBLE YELLOW LINES IN THE HURST PARK AVENUE AREA

The Committee received a report which included objections received in response to the publication of proposals to install double yellow lines at junctions in the Hurst Park Avenue area.

Addressing the Committee as the local City Council Member for West Chesterton, Councillor Sargeant informed Members that he had originally put forward the LHI initiative to prevent vehicles parking on junctions and blocking the crossing points for pedestrians. He noted that double yellow lines on a junction should be unnecessary, given that the Highway Code prohibited parking within 10 metres of a junction, but he acknowledged the unorthodox shape of the junctions, which perhaps made such restrictions less clear. Councillor Sargeant also informed Members that having considered calls from residents to remove the proposed double yellow lines from the Highfield Avenue / Hurst Park Avenue junction, he was inclined to accede to their request.

While discussing the proposals and objections in the report, Members:

- Noted that the planned Hurst Park Area residents parking scheme would be considered in the future and that it would include the area included in the report.
- Requested that future maps marked distances from the centre of the junction marker, in order to allow Members to ensure that markings extended for 10 metres, as required by the Highway Code.
- Considered the suggestion of remodelling the layout of the junctions, but it was noted that residents appreciated the current design and that the cost of carrying out such work would be extensive.
- Acknowledged that resident parking schemes sometimes served to bring neighbours together and develop a sense of community in the area.

- Discussed the objection raised regarding the double yellow lines proposed for Leys Road facing the junction with Leys Avenue, which it had been suggested would lead to reduced visibility for drivers at the junction due to cars parking alongside the junction instead. It was noted that the advice from officers had been to install the double yellow lines on both sides of the road, as would be the case in a residents parking scheme, in order to allow for the safe manoeuvring of vehicles.
- Observed that the County Council's Protocol on Member/Officer Relations required the local County Councillor to be invited to any meeting with a councillor from another council within their division.

Councillor Sargeant proposed removing the yellow lines on the Highfield Avenue / Hurst Park Avenue junction. Following discussion, the proposal was agreed unanimously.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Implement the proposals as advertised, except for the proposed double yellow lines on the Highfield Avenue / Hurst Park Avenue junction; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

61. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSAL TO INSTALL DOUBLE YELLOW LINES ON WADLOES ROAD

The Committee received a report on the objections received in response to the publication of proposals to install double yellow lines on Wadloes Road in front of the entrance to McDonalds in order to reduce congestion at peak times.

Mrs Sharon Secker, a resident of Wadloes Road, was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee. Mrs Secker noted the tendency of visitors to McDonalds to park on the double yellow lines currently installed on Wadloes Road without being subject to enforcement and suggested that such a practice would continue regardless, thus rendering the proposed extension ineffective. She drew attention to the multiple reasons that drew non-residents to park on the road and the problems subsequently faced by residents. Mrs Secker suggested that a yellow box junction in front of the entrance to McDonalds would be a more effective solution to the problem, while also noting that extra parking bays could be provided by removing the zig-zag lines on either side of the pedestrian crossing further up Wadloes Road. She expressed frustration at being unable to establish communication with the local County Councillor to discuss the issue.

Addressing the Committee as the local County Council Member for Abbey, Councillor Whitehead acknowledged the concerns raised by residents but argued that it was a relatively small measure that would help alleviate heavy traffic congestion. She noted that it was perfectly reasonable and legal for cars to queue to enter McDonalds and therefore it was necessary to extend the double yellow lines by the equivalent length of two cars in order to allow the passage of vehicles that were not in the queue.

While discussing the proposal and objections raised, Members:

- Noted that the LHI had been given support by the panel and also support from residents through the consultation phase. Members were informed that the original proposal for parking controls had been made by residents.

- Clarified that it was a requirement to include 8 lines of zig-zag parking restrictions on either side of a pedestrian crossing to ensure safety for those crossing the road.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Implement the proposals as advertised; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

62. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSTO INSTALL DOUBLE YELLOW LINES ON CARISBROOKE ROAD, WARWICK ROAD AND TO INSTALL A NO STOPPING ORDER OUTSIDE MAYFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Committee received a report which contained objections received in response to the publication of proposals to install double yellow lines on Carisbrooke Road, Warwick Road, along with a no stopping order outside Mayfield Primary School.

Addressing the Committee as the local City Council Member for Castle, Councillor Payne informed Members that the proposals had received overwhelming support from local residents. She expressed concern over where teachers at the Mayfield Primary would be able to park, noting that 22 of the 76 members of staff drove to work 4 days a week, but acknowledged that the scheme would not be able to ensure such provisions.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Noted that there were usually parking spaces available in the vicinity, including during peak hours.
- Expressed concern over how the controls would be enforced.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Implement the proposals as advertised; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

63. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSAL TO INSTALL DOUBLE YELLOW LINES NEAR THE JUNCTION OF MARMORA ROAD AND HOBART ROAD

The Committee received a report containing objections received in response to the proposal to install double yellow lines near the Marmora Road / Hobart Road junction.

While discussing the report, Members noted that the scheme had not been proposed to improve safety for users of the Chisholm Trail, as had been suggested in an objection.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Implement the proposals as advertised; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Chairman
25th February 2020

Item 4 – Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Benson North Area

Written Submission (1 of 3) from Teddy Brookes

I would like to outline the proposal of a scheme on Oxford Road whereby one side of the road is 9-10 residents only and then the other side is 1-2 residents only which would prevent commuters from taking up parking spaces but would allow enough fluidity in parking to allow the clinic to be minimally affected and for residents to be able to park liberally. This scheme has proved to be successful in Colchester where residents parking was consumed by overflow from the train station.

Item 4 – Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Benson North Area

Written Submission (2 of 3) from Gail Stevens

Dear Council

The Therapy Room in Oxford Road has

- Over 20 therapists
- 2 full time administrative staff
- Over 10,000 patient visits per annum.

It supports people in the local community with a wide range of conditions from low back pain to anxiety and depression.

As parking restrictions increase in Cambridge these facilities for the community are being squeezed out of the city making them less and less accessible to residents.

I joined the Therapy Room in 2015 having left the Cambridge Chiropractic Centre on Hamilton Road which closed after 30 years of business following the impact of resident parking restrictions.

Based on my previous experience of the drastic effect of residents parking schemes on patient visits I would urge you to ensure that there is adequate parking provision for the Therapy Room patients. If not I fear the clinic cannot survive.

Item 4 – Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Benson North Area

Written Submission (3 of 3) from Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE)

To: Steve Cox and members of the CJAC committee

From: The Committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE)

Re: CJAC Committee meeting on 22 October 2019: Item 4 Benson North Residents' Parking

Appendix: Copy of our Comments, submitted on 22 August 2019 in connection with the Statutory Consultation.

Comments for members of the CJAC committee

1. Position of parking areas in Windsor Road

We agree that there should be double yellow lines on at least one side of Windsor Road, for the whole its length, and on both sides in a few places. However, we are concerned about the proposed number of changes of the side of road for the double yellow lines, and consequently the locations where parking is permitted.

We are aware that a number of different views have been advanced, some with a more solid evidence-base than others. We still maintain that the major considerations should be:

- (i) safety pedestrians and cyclists ; and
- (ii) access to all properties by large motor vehicles, particularly those dealing with emergencies and rubbish collection.

In order to satisfy these considerations, we still maintain that the proposed plan needs to be changed in the manner outlined in our previous comments (see below). We therefore ask the committee to re-consider the location of parking areas in Windsor Road.

If the committee is not minded to do that, we request that the plans should be reviewed after a year, and that any necessary changes should be implemented without charge to residents, since they would be part of the implementation charges of the whole scheme for Benson North, which the Council has agreed to meet.

2. Parking permit area

We request consideration of the possibility of a parking permit area in the cul-de-sac region of Windsor Road.

We would appreciate confirmation of receipt of this mail. Thank you.

20 October 2019

Appendix on next page:

Appendix

Copy of our comments submitted on 22 August 2019 for the Statutory Consultation

These comments replace ours of 20th August, which contained a typographical error. Please destroy the previous version.

The committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE) welcomes the introduction of Residents' parking in Benson North.

We have the following concerns:

1. Windsor Road between Oxford Rd and Histon Road

The committee objects to the reduction in the chicane effect of the proposed parking layout compared with the present arrangements. Traffic is relatively heavy in this part of the road and there can be inappropriately fast driving.

2. Windsor Road between Oxford Rd and the boundary with Darwin Green

The committee objects to the multiple changes of the side of the road where parking will be allowed in this cul-de-sac part of the road. We are aware of various views about the best layout. Some are backed by more evidence than others. We place highest priority on access for large vehicles (eg. emergency vehicles and refuse lorries), and safety for cyclists. We also note that there is less traffic in this part of the road, and that the possibility of speeding is reduced the closer one gets to the dead end of the cul-de-sac. Some large vehicles are unable to turn at the end of the road and have to reverse in one direction. Repeated changes of side of the parking therefore create difficulties for large vehicles, and may also be less safe for cyclists. The committee proposes that the number of changes of the side of the road on which parking is allowed should be minimised. This applies more strongly the closer one is to the cul-de-sac end of the road.

3. The committee requests discussion of permit parking in the cul-de-sac.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

The Committee of Windsor Road Residents' Association (WIRE)

22.08.2019

(Letter separate – scanned)

Item 4 – Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Waiting Restrictions on Church End, Cherry Hinton

Written Submission (1 of 2) from Penny and David Nicholas

We have been advised by Sandra Crawford to write to you regarding the one objection to the scheme that can apparently scupper the whole scheme. My self and several of my close neighbours have been in conversation and they all agree the scheme to install the gate & provide the yellow lines proposed in the scheme should go ahead. We think this would work, but if it proves otherwise, nothing is irreversible. Having witnessed the aftermath of the accidents that have occurred at the junction of Neath Farm Court and the private junction opposite, it is only a matter of time before there is a fatality. How would the objector feel if (when) this happens? Surely saving a life is a small price to pay for a little inconvenience.

Written Submission (2 of 2) from Matthew Polaine (and family)

We have been informed by our local councillor that you have received objections to the proposed highway works on Church End, and only one agreement.

I find this astonishing given at least 12 households who have expressed their support to the councillors we have been in contact with for many years, over this very problem; excessive speed and volume of drivers on Church End, resulting in many damaged vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists forced into impact avoidance.

Please take this email as confirmation that four local constituents APPROVE of this highway works that include contra flow restrictions with an island, and extension of double yellows in the vicinity.