

**TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS, CAMBRIDGE**  
**CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

**To:** Cambridge joint Area Committee

**Meeting Date:** 24<sup>th</sup> July 2018

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

**Electoral division(s):** County:- Trumpington and Sawston & Shelford  
City:- Trumpington

**Forward Plan ref:** n/a **Key decision:** No

**Purpose:** To determine objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in Trumpington, Cambridge

**Recommendation:** a) Implement the restrictions in Trumpington Meadows as published.  
b) Inform the objectors of the decision.

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contacts:</i></b>	
Name:	Richard Lumley	Name:	Councillor Kevin Blencowe
Post:	Assistant Director, Highways	Post:	Chair
Email:	<a href="mailto:richard.lumley@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">richard.lumley@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:kevin.blencowe@gmail.com">kevin.blencowe@gmail.com</a>

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1** The Trumpington Meadows development is located on the south-western edge of Cambridge, approximately 2½ miles from the city centre and adjacent to the park & ride site. The majority of the development site is within Cambridge City, but part of it is located within South Cambridgeshire District Council's administrative area. Trumpington Meadows forms part of the Cambridge Southern Fringe development area.
- 1.2** There is a pressing need to tackle congestion and improve air quality in the city. Hence, the planning vision for Trumpington Meadows was that multiple car ownership be discouraged to reduce the dominance of vehicular traffic with the intention of lowering vehicle emissions and encouraging a safer and less cluttered street scene. With this in mind, most dwellings are limited to one off-street parking space each. To avoid an overspill of parking onto the road network, it was deemed necessary to introduce some form of on-street parking control. Hence, the planning consent included a requirement to prohibit on-street parking for residents, but to provide facilities for visitor parking.
- 1.3** Trumpington Meadows is relatively remote from the city centre, but it is close to Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Trumpington park & ride site. Hence, there is a possibility of non-residents parking in the development to avoid car parking charges and on-street restrictions. This has probably reduced since the removal of the £1 parking charge at the park & ride sites, but Trumpington operates at near capacity on most working days. In addition, the Council has an ongoing commitment to better manage parking in Cambridge's residential streets. As more parking restrictions are introduced in residential areas closer to the centre of Cambridge this will gradually increase the possibility of non-resident parking migrating to areas further out of the city. It is not uncommon for city centre workers to park in residential areas on the fringes of Cambridge and use a cycle for the final part of their journey to work.
- 1.4** Residents of Trumpington Meadows have several travel options available as an alternative to using private cars, such as park & ride and the busway, which provides easily accessible transport to the city centre and railway station. Local amenities, such as food stores, the local centre and country park are easily accessible by foot or cycle. The County and City Councils and Greater Cambridge Partnership have a long term strategy to offer more sustainable transport solutions to those who live and work in Cambridge.
- 1.5** Part of the Trumpington Meadows site is complete and the developer is ready for the County Council to adopt the roads as public highway under a section 38 agreement. At present a private firm is enforcing the no parking requirement, which applies at all times and on all days. The current arrangements cannot continue after adoption, so there is a need to introduce formal on-street restrictions that the Council's civil enforcement officers can enforce.
- 1.6** The published proposal is to prohibit parking on all roads due for adoption from 8am to 6pm on all days, except for the constructed parking bays which would be restricted to visitor permit holders only during those times. There would be no on-street restrictions in operation outside of those hours. These times allow residents to park on-street overnight, at which time the numbers of larger vehicles requiring access will be lower. Also, there is likely to be little or no enforcement of any restrictions between 6pm and 8am. It is logical to apply the

same operational hours to the visitor permit spaces or drivers will park on the road itself in preference to paying for a permit to park in the visitor spaces.

## **2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO) PROCESS**

- 2.1** The TRO procedure is a statutory process that requires the highway authority to advertise, in the local press and on-street, a public notice stating the proposal and the reasons for it. The advert invites the public to formally support or object to the proposals in writing within a minimum twenty one 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 TRO was advertised in the Cambridge News on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017 and the statutory consultation period was due to run until 15<sup>th</sup> December 2017, although this was extended to 5<sup>th</sup> January 2018 to give residents more time to respond.
- 2.3** A total of 77 written representations have been received, of which 55 objected to the proposal or are strongly opposed to some elements of it. These have been summarised in the table in Appendix 4 and the officer responses to the objections are also given in the table. A total of 9 respondents offered general, but qualified, support for the principle of introducing parking controls.
- 2.4** The most common issues raised by those submitting representations were as follows:-
- The cost of visitor permits is too high and the number that can be applied for is too restrictive.
  - Parking controls are not needed as there are no real issues to resolve, the site is away from the city centre and there is no evidence of non-resident parking.
  - The absence of parking restrictions overnight will lead to roads being blocked, including to emergency vehicles. Some roads should have double yellow lines prohibiting parking at all times.
  - The proposals will create significant problems for those households with more than one vehicle.
  - There was inadequate public consultation.

## **3. CONCLUSIONS AND OPTIONS**

- 3.1** It is clear that there are a variety of opinions on the published proposals, including some outright opposition to any form of on-street parking control. There appear to be several options available to take this forward and the officers' recommendation is option A:-

<b>No.</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Implications</b>
A	Implement the scheme as published, i.e. a Restricted Zone imposing a general prohibition of waiting from 8am to 6pm on	There is some local opposition to the published proposals on the grounds identified in paragraph 2.4 above. The parking controls are designed to restrain multiple car ownership and the associated

	all days with visitor permit holders parking in designated bays. There would be no formal parking restrictions outside of those times.	rise in traffic movements, which is a fundamental principle of the Southern Fringe developments. The restrictions represent a balance between tackling non-resident parking during the day time, but still allow residents and others to park from 6pm to 8am. It is acknowledged that this may lead to some indiscriminate parking practises overnight.
B	Implement the scheme as published, but increase the operational hours either into the evening or to cover all days and all times.	It is clear that some residents object to the principle of introducing parking controls in Trumpington Meadows, so any proposal that would result in a more restrictive parking regime is likely to be met with strong opposition from some people. Conversely, some residents have asked for the scheme to operate on a 24/7 basis and/or for parking to be prohibited at all time on certain roads. Enforcement outside of the working day is likely to be minimal, so there could be widespread abuse of any restrictions that are in force at other times. This proposal would require an additional consultation exercise.
C	Consider some form of resident permit parking scheme, possibly prohibiting parking at all times or some lesser period on most roads, with permit holder only parking in the designated bays.	This would go against the general principle of limiting residential parking capacity. The number of on-street parking bays provided was designed to allow a limited number of spaces for visitors only. This would be inadequate to satisfy the needs of residents, who having purchased a permit would expect to be able to find parking within Trumpington Meadows. It is likely that the majority of spaces would be taken by residents, leaving little space for visitors. This proposal would require an additional consultation exercise.
D	Do not implement any parking restrictions at this time.	At present the roads are privately owned, notices inform drivers of the restrictions and enforcement is carried out by a private firm. Hence, there are currently few parking issues in the area. When the roads are adopted, the current arrangements will end and a legally enforceable Order will need to be in place to enable the Council to enforce any restrictions. If no restrictions are introduced this could lead to the roads being used as free parking by non-residents. Furthermore, residents themselves will be able to park anywhere on the adopted roads, which will be contrary to the planning principles of minimising car ownership and having a less cluttered street scene. If the parking creates an obstruction post-adoption, which is likely, the Council could subsequently have to

		introduce some form of parking control at the tax-payers expense.
--	--	---

### **3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

#### **3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

#### **3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

#### **3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

### **4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

#### **4.1 Resource Implications**

None. The parking restriction scheme is developer-funded.

#### **4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

There are no significant implications for this category.

#### **4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications**

The statutory process relating to the introduction of the required Traffic Regulation Order has been followed.

#### **4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications**

There are no significant implications for this category.

#### **4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications**

The statutory consultees have been engaged, including County and District Councillors, Police and other emergency services. Notices were placed in the local press and were also displayed on the road where it is proposed to implement the restrictions. The proposal was available to view in the reception area of Shire Hall.

#### **4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement**

Relevant Councillors engaged with residents at an early stage, prior to the publication of statutory notices, and were given the opportunity to comment as part of the statutory process. No adverse comments were received.

#### **4.7 Public Health Implications**

There are no significant implications for this category.

## Appendix 1 – Location of Trumpington Meadows



## Appendix 2 – Proposed Restrictions





**Appendix 4 – Summary of Objections and Representations on Trumpington Meadows Proposals, including Officer Responses**

No.	Summary of Objection/ Representation ranked by number of times mentioned (includes concerns raised in 3 or more representations)	Officer Response
1	<p><u>General Issues</u></p> <p>a) The current bus service to/from Trumpington Meadows is poor, so is not a suitable alternative mode of transport (This issue was raised in 9 responses)</p> <p>b) The boundary between Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire (shown on the drawing in Appendix 2) needs to be amended so that the whole development is within the city boundary to avoid any confusion (This issue was raised in 6 responses)</p> <p>c) The proposal will affect the market value of properties (This issue was raised in 4 responses)</p> <p>d) Will disproportionately affect less wealthy families due to permit costs (This issue was raised in 3 responses)</p> <p>e) All residents were advised of these proposals at the time of purchase, so should not have come as a surprise (This issue</p>	<p>The County Council has limited influence over bus services and market pressures will dictate. There are very regular services from 7am to 6.30pm from the Trumpington park &amp; ride site. It is hoped that improved transport options will ultimately become available through the Greater Cambridge Partnership initiative.</p> <p>This boundary issue does not affect the introduction of on-street parking restrictions which would apply equally to roads whichever Council area they are located within. However, the County Council will need to expand the Special Parking Area to enable civil parking enforcement to take place in South Cambridgeshire as well as in the city. This requires an application to central government, which will be made. If this cannot be achieved enforcement of any restrictions in SCDC's area will be a police matter.</p> <p>The principle of limiting off-street parking provision and on-street controls is expected to become increasingly common in Cambridge and other towns and cities. This allows for denser housing, tackles congestion and reduces the impact of private cars on the environment. It is difficult to determine what effect this approach might have on house prices as some people will support it.</p> <p>Alternative and cheaper parking is available for visitors in the area, notably at the park &amp; ride site. Parking will be permit-free for blue badge holders and those requiring medical support can apply for free permits.</p> <p>There was a requirement for the developer and their agents to inform potential buyers of the planned on-street parking restrictions. The fact that some residents have mentioned this, confirms</p>



	was raised in 3 responses)	that this did occur in some cases.
2	<p><u>Visitor Permit Concerns</u></p> <p>a) The cost of visitors permits is too high (This issue was raised in 35 responses)</p> <p>b) The number of permits that a household can apply for is too low (This issue was raised in 16 responses)</p> <p>c) The Council should provide one or two permits per household for a nominal fee or free of charge (This issue was raised in 12 responses)</p> <p>d) Visitor permit arrangements are too complex (This issue was raised in 6 responses)</p> <p>e) Barratt Homes did not mention permit costs at time of home purchase (This issue was raised</p>	<p>The cost of residential permits was reviewed by the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2018. Visitor permits previously cost the equivalent of £1.60 per day and it was decided to increase these to £2.40 per day. The comments received are based on the advertised figure of £3.00 because at the time of publication of this proposal revised permit costs had not been agreed.</p> <p>Each person in a household could previously have applied for an unlimited number of visitor permits, but there was evidence to suggest that this was abused. The current policy is that each person (not household) can apply for up to 20 permits per annum, equating to 100 separate visits. This could create a problem if households received daily visitors. However, other parking is available in the area, such as at the park &amp; ride site. The proposed restrictions would apply from 8am-6pm, so evening/overnight visitors wishing to park outside of those times would not need a permit.</p> <p>Any permitting arrangements introduced in Trumpington Meadows would need to match those that operate in other parts of Cambridge, as any difference could be confusing and might be seen as unequitable. Other visitor permit systems are used by other Councils, including ones that provide a single permit that can be used on multiple occasions by any visitor. However, this is particularly prone to abuse. The vast majority of local authorities charge for resident and visitor permits to reflect the fact that permit holders effectively have priority parking over other drivers.</p> <p>It is relatively simple for a resident to obtain a batch of visitor permits and make them available to their visitors. In most cases, people will apply online. Safeguards have to be built in to avoid non-residents fraudulently applying for permits, so applicants must provide proof of residency.</p> <p>There was a requirement to explain to potential home buyers that on-street restrictions were proposed, but it would have been impractical to</p>

	in 3 responses)	explain the full details as these would not have been known at the time.
3	<p><u>Proposed Restrictions</u></p> <p>a) Parking will be unrestricted overnight, so drivers will park anywhere thus blocking roads to emergency vehicles and others (This issue was raised in 21 responses)</p> <p>b) The restrictions will cause severe problems to those residents who own more than one vehicle (This issue was raised in 21 responses)</p> <p>c) The proposed scheme is away from the city centre and is not needed as there are no real parking problems in the area (This issue was raised in 21 responses)</p> <p>d) There should be a residents' permit parking scheme and/or residents should be able to obtain a permit for visitor bays (This issue was raised in 8 responses)</p> <p>e) There should be double yellow lines on the main roads, narrow side roads and other critical</p>	<p>Any on-street restrictions could be in force 24/7 but that is seen as overly restrictive. Difficulties associated with non-resident parking usually occur during the working day, so any restrictions need to apply at those times and there is less justification for them overnight. Furthermore, there would be little or no enforcement of any restrictions overnight, so there may well be abuse of them. Regardless of any formal parking restrictions, all drivers have a wider responsibility to ensure that they do not obstruct the highway.</p> <p>The vision for Trumpington Meadows was that there would be limited off-street parking provided and the roads would be restricted to stop them being used as a de-facto car park. The estate design reflects this vision. Consideration could be given to providing car club bays in the area, which is particularly useful as a second car solution. Home buyers should have been fully aware of the restriction on parking in the development, but it is possible that this was not relayed to all, such as tenants renting in the area.</p> <p>There are few issues at present as parking is being managed by the developer who is using a private enforcement company. When the roads are adopted the Council will need to take over enforcement and the correct Traffic Regulation Order will need to be in place. In addition, it is inevitable that parking pressures will increase as a result of further residential development and the Biomedical Campus and the implementation of parking controls elsewhere in Cambridge.</p> <p>This would be contrary to the overall planning principle to minimise the level of on-street parking. The estate layout dictates that there would be insufficient parking space to accommodate parking by residents.</p> <p>This would require them to be physically marked on the road, which is contrary to the principle of having a relatively uncluttered street scene. The</p>

	<p>areas (This issue was raised in 6 responses)</p> <p>f) Insufficient visitor parking places have been provided (This issue was raised in 6 responses)</p> <p>g) The proposed operational hours (8am-6pm) are too long and should be shortened, e.g. Monday to Friday only and/or shorter times (This issue was raised in 6 responses)</p> <p>h) Drivers will park in residents' own off-street allocated spaces to avoid permit costs and/or if no other parking is available (This issue was raised in 4 responses)</p> <p>i) Why is Trumpington Meadows being subjected to these restrictions and not other nearby residential areas? (This issue was raised in 4 responses)</p> <p>j) Some parking spaces, such as in Bead Road, were not marked on the drawing, but should be for visitor use only (This issue was raised in 4 responses)</p>	<p>proposed single yellow lines would prohibit parking during the working day when most larger vehicle will need access. Double yellow lines would be seen as overly restrictive in a residential area.</p> <p>The road layout has been agreed as part of the planning application and approval. The roads have now been built, so there is no opportunity to change the estate layout.</p> <p>The hours could be shortened, but this would allow residents to park in the visitor bays earlier in the day, thereby denying space for visitors. There is the potential for parking issues at the weekend due to retail businesses operating seven days per week. In contrast, a small number of residents asked for the operational times to be increased to stop resident use of the visitor bays in the evening.</p> <p>There is little the Council can do to control parking in private areas. It will be for residents to secure their own spaces if problems develop.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is directly related to the residential development and associated planning consent. There is a requirement to introduce parking restrictions prior to the Council adopting the roads. The Council is planning to pursue residential parking schemes in various parts of Cambridge, including in the general Trumpington area, primarily to tackle non-resident parking, congestion and improve air quality.</p> <p>Some bays located on the highway were erroneously omitted from the drawing. All of the constructed parking bays that are located within the adopted highway would be designated for visitor permit holders' use.</p>
4	<p><u>Consultation and publicity</u></p> <p>a) There was inadequate consultation and residents should have received details individually (This issue was raised in 23 responses)</p>	<p>The proposals were published in the Cambridge News, on the Council's website and notices were posted on street. Relevant local Councillors of the County Council, City Council and SCDC were all consulted. Resident groups were also given the opportunity to have their say. At the time of purchase, all home buyers had been alerted to the</p>

		<p>planning requirement to introduce on-street parking restrictions when the roads are adopted. Hence, a door-to-door letter drop was not undertaken.</p> <p>The drawing was provided by the developer's consultant. There were several errors, some of which were corrected midway through the public notice period. Any remaining mistakes will be resolved if and when the legal Order is made. It is felt that the drawing still adequately indicated the area covered by the proposal.</p> <p>There were no plans to hold a consultation event to coincide with the publication of these proposals. It was coincidental that a residents' meeting was held during the public notice period for the parking restrictions.</p> <p>There are specific reasons defined in Regulations for introducing Traffic Regulation Orders, which sometimes do not appear appropriate. In any event the public notice adequately set out what was being proposed and other information, such as permit costs.</p>
	<p>b) There were street naming anomalies on the drawing used for consultation purposes (This issue was raised in 15 responses)</p> <p>c) There was no representative present at the residents' meeting that was held during the public notice period (This issue was raised in 8 responses)</p> <p>d) Some of the documentation, specifically the reasons for the restrictions, was misleading and inadequate (This issue was raised in 7 responses)</p>	

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Officer Clearance</b>
<b>Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
<b>Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by Finance?</b>	Yes or No Name of Financial Officer: n/a
<b>Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?</b>	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Hannah Edwards
<b>Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?</b>	No comment Name of Officer: Sarah Silk/Joanne Shilton
<b>Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
<b>Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health</b>	Yes Name of Officer: Stuart Keeble

### **SOURCE DOCUMENTS GUIDANCE**

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Objections and other written representations (redacted)</b> <b>Draft Traffic Regulation Order</b>	Vantage House, Washingley Road, Huntingdon PE29 6SR