

## Cambridge Joint Area Committee: Minutes

Date: 29 July 2024

Time: 4:00 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.

Venue: Council Chamber, Guildhall, Cambridge

Present: City Councillors: Naomi Bennett, Rosy Moore, Dinah Pounds  
Richard Robertson, and Katie Thornburrow  
County Councillors: Mike Black, Elisa Meschini, Lucy Nethsingha,  
Catherine Rae, Neil Shailer and Philippa Slatter

### 9. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dave Baigent (substituted by Councillor Pounds), Alex Beckett (substituted by Councillor Nethsingha) and Gerri Bird (substituted by Councillor Rae).

Councillor Robertson declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item 4 (Consider Objections to Proposed Residential Parking Scheme in Milton Road Area, Cambridge), as a resident of the Ascham Resident Parking Scheme.

### 10. Minutes – 12 June 2024

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 12 June 2024, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The Committee noted its action log.

### 11. Public Questions and Petitions

The Committee was informed that thirteen public questions had been accepted and that the questions would be taken at the start of the relevant agenda items. It was noted that eleven questions related to Agenda Item 4 (Consider Objections to Proposed Residential Parking Scheme in Milton Road Area, Cambridge) and two questions related to Agenda Item 6 (Consider Objections to Proposed Waiting Restrictions in Headly Street, Eagle Street and Hazell Street, Cambridge). A further three public questions had not been accepted because they were received after the deadline for submission.

## 12. Consider Objections to Proposed Residential Parking Scheme in Milton Road Area, Cambridge

The Committee received a report proposing the implementation of a Residential Parking Scheme (RPS) in the Milton Road area, which had been developed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) on behalf of the County Council. The report included feedback from various consultations held throughout the scheme's development, and it proposed a review of on-street parking in the affected area six months after implementation, in order to identify any issues and establish whether there was scope to incorporate more properties to the scheme.

Andrew Milbourn was invited to address the Committee on behalf of the Hurst Park Estate Residents Association (HPERA). Emphasising that HPERA had maintained a neutral stance on the proposals and tried to engage with the consultations throughout the scheme's development, Mr Milbourn argued that the consultation feedback had not been acted on sufficiently and highlighted that only a small majority of residents were in favour of the scheme. Suggesting that it would be beneficial to have different operating hours across the scheme, as was the case with the Benson RPS, he expressed concern about the visual impact of the scheme's signage in the area and highlighted the need for parking spaces for the shops close to the Milton Road / Arbury Road junction. Mr Milbourn also requested further information on the level of enforcement that would be carried out and sought clarification on whether resources were already in place to carry out the proposed review in six months.

Paul Harvey, a resident of Mulberry Close, was invited to address the Committee. Highlighting the significant financial impact the proposals would have on residents and the subsequent majority opposing them on Mulberry Close, Mr Harvey questioned whether a requirement to pay for parking would resolve the ongoing parking issues in the area. He suggested further evidence of commuter parking was necessary and expressed concern that it was a method for local authorities to raise funds. Mr Harvey also informed the Committee of comments submitted by a representative of Cambridge Housing Society, the owners of Ellis House on Mulberry Close, which emphasised the financial and medical precarities of its sheltered residents and questioned the need for the scheme's implementation in that particular area.

Michael Page, a resident of Hurst Park Avenue, was invited to address the Committee, and his question was read out by Andrew Milbourn. Expressing concern about how long it took the County Council to respond to two Freedom of Information requests, Mr Page argued that residents did not have enough time to prepare submissions for the meeting after the agenda had been published. Drawing attention to the consultation indicating there was a slim majority of residents in favour of the proposals, he noted that low response rate meant only 11% of residents in the area were in favour. On the other hand, he observed that 76% of written submissions were objecting the proposals, leading him to question whether there was sufficient mandate to implement the proposed scheme.

Andrew Barrett, a resident of Chantry Close, was invited to address the Committee. Highlighting residents' concerns about the cost of applying for a permit, Mr Barrett expressed concern that the proposals could exacerbate current problems of vehicles, particularly tradesman vehicles, parking on Chantry Close and blocking access for

residents and emergency vehicles. Noting that the issue had twice been raised unsuccessfully during the consultation process, he suggested that the installation of railings could help resolve the issue.

Anthony Weale was invited to address the Committee. Citing the success of parking restrictions in London with shorter operating hours, Mr Weale suggested that reducing the operating hours of the proposed scheme would lessen the impact on residents without undermining the scheme's objectives. He also highlighted that a significant majority of residents in the Arbury Road and Hurst Park Avenue area had objected to the scheme.

Linn Purr was invited to address the Committee on behalf of the residents of Havenfield, a retirement home on Arbury Road that was not included in the proposed scheme. Expressing concern about the significant impacts on residents, as well as their visitors and carers, of having no nearby parking available as a result of the proposals, Ms Purr highlighted that many residents had age-related disabilities that did not qualify them for blue badges, while exclusion from the scheme meant that their carers would not be able to apply for medical visitor parking permits. Arguing that the proposals contravened the councils' policies and equality legislation, she suggested that either Havenfield or the whole north side of Arbury should be included within the boundaries of the scheme. Ms Purr questioned the report's assertion that such an expansion of the scheme would exceed its capacity and negate its purpose, suggesting that the impact would be minimal, while also expressing concern that a review in six months would also not lead to such an expansion.

Alan Hart, a resident of Herbert Street, was invited to address the Committee. Expressing concern about the impacts of the proposal to remove parking on one side of Herbert Street, as well as Springfield Road, Mr Hart highlighted that residents would lose the ability to charge electric vehicles outside their property and would be required to walk further to their cars, which would be difficult for disabled people and vulnerable people, particularly when it was dark. He suggested that an exception could be made to the required width of roads, as was the case in Benson Street, arguing that the Department for Transport (DfT) had confirmed there was not a statutory requirement to make such a change, while the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire and Rescue Service had agreed that changes to the street layout could be made without removing the whole side of parking.

Dr Jocelyne Scutt, former County Councillor for West Chesterton and Arbury, and former City Councillor for West Chesterton, was invited to address the Committee. Acknowledging that certain areas within the proposed scheme had been requesting the implementation of parking measures for many years, Dr Scutt drew attention to a commitment from the GCP to ensure there was sufficient parking available to residents as a result of spaces being removed as part of its project to improve Milton Road. Suggesting that local councillors and residents were unaware that the north side of Arbury Road would be excluded from the scheme before the TRO was advertised, she argued that Havenfield should be treated as an exception, due to the age and level of disabilities and medical requirements of its residents. Dr Scutt expressed concern that the proposed review would not take place, and that the north side of Arbury Road could also be excluded from other neighbouring RPSs.

Ann Galpin, a resident of Mulberry Close, was invited to address the Committee on behalf of Mulberry Close Residents' Society (MCRS). Expressing concern about the accessibility and presentation of the consultation process and agenda papers, Ms Galpin suggested that the proposals had not taken due to consideration from the consultation's feedback, despite continuous engagement from residents, which had therefore eroded trust and confidence in the consultation process. She paid tribute to some local councillors for supporting residents throughout the process but expressed concern that MCRS had not been invited to a consultation meeting, while other meetings had been cancelled. Arguing that Mulberry Close should not be included in the scheme, Ms Galpin drew attention to the difficulty for people with some disabilities in obtaining blue badges, while also suggesting that the whole approach of the scheme failed to acknowledge the social model of informal care support, which would result in residents' carers being unable to obtain medical visitor parking permits because of the informal nature of support provided.

Martin Lucas-Smith was invited to address the Committee. Expressing his support for the proposals in removing commuter parking, Mr Lucas-Smith nonetheless suggested that the scheme should go further and remove all parking along Arbury Road, except for some spaces alongside the shops, observing that there were no parking spaces on other main through roads in Cambridge apart from specially created parking bays. He highlighted the danger for pedestrians and cyclists of vehicles being forced to avoid parked cars, and argued that residents living on such a road should not expect to be able to park on the road, particularly when they had private land in front of their property could be used for parking instead. Mr Lucas-Smith also noted that the TRO process did not seek the submission of positive support for proposals, arguing that this meant the outcome of the consultation should not be considered a demonstration of the level of support for or against the proposals.

In response to the public questions, officers:

- Suggested that implementing different operating hours across the scheme could confuse drivers, while increasing challenges on the scheme's boundaries and causing drivers to park in different streets during different time periods, making it hard to predict and manage the impact of the scheme. It was also observed that consultation responses had called both for longer and shorter operating hours, and the proposed operating hours were considered to be a reasonable balance between the two, although the six-month review would be able to assess whether this was the case or whether changes should be considered. While shorter operating hours were more appropriate in one area of the city, they would not be appropriate in others, due to the differing parking patterns and pressures in each area.
- Clarified that although a small amount of flexibility was possible, the County Council followed DfT guidance on signage, and it was emphasised that unclear, inadequate or inconsistent signage was likely to result in challenges and an increase in the level of accidental non-compliance.
- Confirmed that free medical visitor parking permits were available for all residents living within a RPS area. It was also clarified that the fees paid for resident permits were to cover the cost of managing the scheme and traffic demand, rather than

seeking to raise funds for local authorities, and it was confirmed that the GCP had agreed to fund the design and implementation costs of the proposed scheme.

- Clarified that following a two-week period of warning notices to provide non-residents sufficient opportunity to change their parking behaviour, there would be an initial heightened level of enforcement of the scheme, which was likely to reduce as it became less necessary.
- Acknowledged the challenges faced by private land-owners of vehicles parking on unadopted roads, emphasising that the County Council could not carry out enforcement in such cases, although it was suggested that the implementation of an RPS in the surrounding area would decrease the likelihood of non-residents vehicles looking to park in the area in the first place, thereby helping to alleviate the situation on affected unadopted roads.
- Noted that the proposal to remove parking bays on the south side of Arbury Road was dismissed on the basis of feedback from the consultation and clarified that throughout the design and consultation process the north side of Arbury Road had never been included in the scheme, despite requests from various residents for its whole or partial inclusion.
- Acknowledged concerns about the impacts of removing a whole side of parking along roads such as Herbert Street but observed that commuter parking also resulted in the same impacts, and noted that such considerations were set out in the Equality Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 8 of the report. It was also highlighted that the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service agreed that changes were needed to the layout of certain streets within the scheme, including Herbert Street, and had indicated support for the proposals.
- Acknowledged the concerns of Havenfield residents and provided assurance that the decision to exclude the north side of Arbury Road had only been made after extensive analysis and consultation. An initial six-month period would allow a detailed review to be carried out to inform an assessment on whether the scheme had the capacity for a boundary expansion. It was clarified that the review process would not require residents of Havenfield or any other properties to provide evidence of when they were unable to obtain a parking space in the nearby vicinity, and that separate monitoring of the scheme and parking surveys would be undertaken.
- Acknowledged that support for proposals was not sought as part of the consultation stage, and therefore the figures included for objection and support were not indicative of the wider level of support for or against the scheme. It was also observed that the County Council used to require 50% support for a scheme to be considered for implication, but this was no longer the case for schemes within Cambridge City and those being delivered by the GCP, with other factors also taken into consideration, such as emergency vehicle access.
- Observed that travel patterns and parking patterns had evolved during and after the Covid-19 pandemic, although it was clarified that data indicated the general level of travel had returned to its original level, albeit with weekday movement now more

concentrated between Tuesdays and Thursdays. It was emphasised that monitoring of such data would continue to be collated, and that expected levels of housing and employment growth in the region were likely to exacerbate current travel and parking issues unless they were addressed.

- Emphasised that RPSs were initiated in line with conversations with local councillors and local liaison forums, and that the GCP had identified the Milton Road area as a priority area for a number of reasons. It was also noted that it was common practice for all related material to a scheme to be published together, to ensure that all relevant documents were considered as a whole.

Councillor Richard Swift, a City Councillor for the West Chesterton ward, was invited to address the Committee. Acknowledging there was a problem with commuter parking in the area that needed to be resolved, Councillor Swift nonetheless expressed concern about how the scheme had been developed and how consultations had been carried out, suggesting there was disagreement and confusion over whether the north side of Arbury Road had previously been considered for inclusion in the scheme. Noting that neighbouring residents had always been willing to accommodate the additional parking demands of Havenfield residents and their visitors due to the property's insufficient capacity, but would no longer be able to provide such community support, he expressed concern that underlying commitments from the GCP to ensure there would be sufficient parking capacity for residents affected by the Milton Road developments would not be fulfilled, and that Havenfield should be considered for inclusion in the scheme.

While discussing the report, individual Members:

- Emphasised the importance of resolving the issues resulting from commuters parking in residential areas, as well as for residents who lost parking spaces as a result of the Milton Road development, although it was suggested the situation was not comparable to London due to the proximity to the city centre and nearby areas of employment. Members requested further information on the kind of parking pressures that were causing issues in the area, which the proposed scheme would seek to overcome, and it was clarified that surveys carried out in 2022 identified differing stresses across different areas, although the greatest pressures were identified on weekdays, and in the Chesterton Triangle area.
- Highlighted the extensive amount of work that had been carried out in the development of the proposals and consultation on the scheme, noting that particular attention had been given to respond to the feedback wherever possible.
- Clarified that carers and other medical visitors for residents in Havenfield would not be eligible for medical visitor parking permits, as it was not within the boundaries of the proposed scheme. Members were informed that the County Council's Resident Parking Scheme Policy, in which such eligibilities were established, was currently under review.
- Suggested that the layout of the parking facilities at Havenfield could be reviewed to increase capacity, although it was acknowledged that this would still be unlikely to be sufficient to cope with the property's demand. Members queried whether the GCP had experience in advising or supporting organisations on developing their

infrastructure, and it was agreed to provide Havenfield with such advice. **Action required**

- Suggested that if a further consultation on the inclusion to the scheme of the north side of Arbury Road was to take place now, it was more likely to be rejected due to concern about the capacity of the scheme to incorporate the extra demand. If such a consultation was carried out after the scheme had been implemented and capacity had become clear, it was suggested that the proposal could receive more support. It was also argued that implementing the proposed scheme and then reviewing it after six months to assess whether the boundaries could be expanded would be the quickest option, given that undertaking a further consultation on the inclusion of the north side of Arbury Road would delay the process by a number of months anyway. Members noted that implementation at the current time would coincide with the completion of the Milton Road development works.
- Clarified that changes to the proposed scheme could not be made without further consultation of affected areas within the scheme, which would take a few months due to the summer holidays and a backlog of other consultations due to the recent general election.
- Acknowledged that removing a whole side of parking on roads such as George Street would be inconvenient for some residents but emphasised that the narrow width of the road was unsuitable for parking on both sides. It was also noted that the consultation received 71% support for the proposals from residents on Herbert Road.
- Drew attention to the fact that residents would not be able to charge electric vehicles from their own supply if their vehicles were not parked in front of their own house, with commercial rates being charged at a significantly higher cost, and it was noted that the County Council was investigating how on-road vehicle charging issues could be overcome on a wider basis.
- Confirmed that additional resources had been put aside for potential changes following the review, although it was not anticipated that the nature of such changes, such as signage and road markings, would result in significant expenditure.
- Drew attention to the experiences of residents before and after the implementation of the Newnham RPS, which had also involved the removal of parking on whole sides of streets. It was noted that residents had expressed similar concerns about the loss of spaces before the scheme was implemented, but it was highlighted that once the scheme had been implemented, the commuter parking issue had been alleviated and residents found that there was an excess of parking space available.
- Suggested that the six-month review could also consider the addition of 90-minute parking spaces in the vicinity of Havenfield, rather than expanding the scheme's boundary, as they could provide the necessary capacity that its residents and visitors required.
- Expressed concern that the wider approach of the scheme did not address the inherent problems with the carer industry, such as excessively short visit times,

frequent staff turnover and a tendency for providers to not provide formal medical care to reduce insurance costs. Members expressed concern that such difficulties would be exacerbated by carers being unable to park close to Havenfield, or being required to frequently apply for new permits, which many would not be eligible for in the first place.

- Noted concerns raised by members of the public about accessibility of the consultation, agenda papers, and wider permit scheme, and suggested that such matters should be considered by both councils and the GCP.
- Agreed that an exclusive email address should be set up to receive comments about the scheme following its implementation and in the build-up to a review after six months. **Action required**
- Clarified that public questions were not published or circulated to Members in advance of the meeting because members of the public were not required to submit the full text of their questions or comments in advance.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Recommend that the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability, in consultation with the Local Members, approve the introduction of the Milton Road Area Residential Parking Scheme, as published; and
- b) Approve a review of on-street parking in the affected area six months after the Residential Parking Scheme commences operation.

### 13. Vinery Road One-way Experimental Traffic Regulation Order

The Committee received a report proposing that an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order involving the reversal of a one-way system on Vinery Road be made permanent.

Councillor Neil Shailer, the County Councillor for the Romsey division, was invited to address the Committee. Highlighting that he was not aware of any strong objections to the scheme, despite some initial objections that had been raised to some of its particular aspects early on in the scheme, Councillor Shailer welcomed its success in achieving its objectives. He noted there were some persistent, minor parking infractions within the scheme, and it was confirmed that some additional changes were proceeding through the TRO process to address this.

While discussing the report, individual Members drew attention to the potential loss of the local Post Office service, which currently operated in a store on Vinery Road that was for sale, and it was suggested that the impacts of the scheme contributed to the decision for the potential sale. While Members acknowledged the service to the local community and paid tribute to how it improved over recent years, it was emphasised that it related more to the modal filter aspect of the scheme, which had been discussed in detail at a meeting of the County Council's Highways and Transport Committee on 5 December 2024.



It was resolved unanimously to:

Recommend that the Executive Director of Place and Sustainability, in consultation with the Local Member, approves that the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order on Vinery Road, as set out in the report, be made permanent.

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

The Committee received a report on proposed waiting restrictions in Headly Street, Eagle Street and Hazell Street, which included feedback on the proposed restrictions.

Martin Lucas-Smith was invited to address the Committee. Arguing that the proposals merely represented the implementation of decisions that had already been made by the City Council during the planning process for nearby developments, Mr Lucas-Smith drew attention to persistent issues of parked vehicles obstructing pavements, cycle routes and crossing points, which he suggested was due to the road's design not intended to accommodate parking in the first place. Expressing concern that the inclusion of four short-term spaces within the scheme could be expanded in the future, he expressed frustration at the slow progress of the scheme and queried when implementation would take place, if the TRO was approved. Members were informed that the short-term spaces had been approved in the original planning permission, apart from one additional space that had been requested by the community centre. It was also noted that although most of the works had already been completed, finer parts of road marking had not been completed due to cars always been parked on the road.

Alan Smith was invited to address the Committee. Drawing attention to the low use of the underground car park that had been built to provide off-street parking for houses in the area, Mr Smith highlighted regular issues faced by people with disabilities as a result of inappropriate parking on the streets and pavements. Seeking clarification on whether TROs could be implemented and enforced on unadopted roads, he also expressed frustration at the length of the process and queried when the separate redevelopment of the Headly Street / Milton Road junction would take place. It was confirmed that a TRO could be implemented and enforced on an unadopted road, as long as the required road markings were in place and there was agreement between the landowner and the enforcement agency. It was also noted that work had been carried out on the Headly Street / Milton Road junction, with a narrowing of the road and the adjustment of a railing on the bridge parapet, with no further highways improvements scheduled.

Councillor Richard Howitt, the County Councillor for the Petersfield division, was invited to address the Committee. Indicating his support for the comments made by Mr Lucas-Smith and Mr Smith, Councillor Howitt highlighted the length of time taken to overcome the parking issues in the area and suggested that lessons should be learned to avoid new developments being the cause of similar avoidable disruption to residents in the future. He nonetheless paid tribute to the City Council and local City Councillors for their longstanding support in resolving the issues. While frustration over the length of the process was acknowledged, it was noted that planning processes and TRO processes were separate legal requirements that had to be treated accordingly.

Councillor Richard Robertson, a City Councillor for the Petersfield ward, was invited to address the Committee. Emphasising the difficult and lengthy process to adopt a road, alongside the complexity of implementing a TRO on an unadopted road, Councillor Robertson highlighted that restricted on-road parking had always been intended and included in the planning permission for surrounding developments, with residents informed of this in advance. Acknowledging the low use of the underground car park, he informed the Committee that the City Council was considering a charge reduction to incentivise greater use.

While discussing the report, individual Members:

- Welcomed the proposals and expressed concern about the situation in the area, noting that residents often found non-residents waiting in cars to occupy their spaces when leaving their properties.
- Suggested that £20 per week for a space in the underground car park, while cheaper than nearby alternatives, was not affordable for everyone, particularly given that it did not guarantee users with a certain space or provide a high level of security.
- Queried whether additional short-term spaces, for example to accommodate 90-minute visits by medical carers, could be added to the scheme. Members were informed that an extension to the number or the proposed time limits would require a mini-consultation and cause further delay to the implementation of the scheme, and it was suggested that a review at a later date could consider such issues.

It was resolved unanimously 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.

## 15. Cambridge Joint Area Committee Agenda Plan

The Committee noted its agenda plan.

Chair  
18 September 2024