

County Council answers to questions about how proposed Residents' Parking Scheme will affect Arbury Road east.

On March 18th, the County Council published a Traffic Regulation Order. This reveals how the County's Residents' proposed Residents' Parking Scheme will affect those who live, work and travel to school along Arbury Road east.

The ARERA committee submitted more than 20 questions to the County Council asking for clarification about what it is planning to do.

Implementation of the scheme is being managed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The County's Policy and Regulation team asked the Greater Cambridge Partnership to provide the additional information requested. The GCP's project manager for the scheme has done so, leaving one question unanswered, see below.

The answers that have been given make clear that what is being done is the result, not of mistakes or oversights, but of deliberate policy decisions. These decisions will advantage some and disadvantage others. Which of these two groups will you find yourself in?

Are you personally going to be disadvantaged? Or can you see that others will be - including children going to school, pedestrians, cyclists and car owners, those shopping or working on Arbury Road east?

If so, you only have a short opportunity to make objections to, or comment on, what is being proposed.

Comments and objections have to be submitted by April 12th.

You can do this, quoting reference PR0998, online using <https://consultation.appyway.com/cambridge> or by email to Policy.andRegulation@cambridgeshire.gov.uk or by writing to Gary Baldwin at the County's Policy and Regulation Team*

* Box No. DBE, Huntingdon Highways Depot, Stanton Way, Huntingdon, PE29 6PY>

Here is the additional information provided by the County Council.

(If there are other questions to which you would like answers, please let ARERA know ASAP)

1. Yes, it is the CCC's intention to maintain double yellow lines outside the Arbury Road shops and in front of Nos. 1-7.

2. No. Pay and display spaces within the parking bays on Arbury Road **will not be provided** because **"The existing double yellow lines outside the shops would be retained. On other lengths of road, parking for residents takes priority as there is limited on-street capacity available for other uses, such as pay & display."**

3. No. It is not the CCC's intention to provide parking bays with on-street provision for electrical vehicle charging because **"Parking for residents is the main focus at this stage. If the published scheme is implemented, parking activity would be reviewed and other on-street parking allocations could be considered."**
4. Yes. It is the CCC's intention to include the shops and flats above in the Milton Road Area Residents' Parking Scheme – of which Arbury Road east is a part.
5. Yes. It is the CCC's intention to include the Far End House behind No. 1 Arbury Road and Austin Court (private road) – currently absent from the Schedule to the TRO - in the MRA parking scheme so that their occupants are eligible to apply for parking permits.
(But see also the supplementary comments provided against Answer 15 below)
6. Yes. The dotted line markings on the map published in the TRO do each signify a single parking space.
7. Yes. These markings do indicate the provision of 53 parking spaces on the south side of Arbury Road east but **"This is indicative only and assumes a standard length for vehicles, which obviously varies due to vehicle type. For that reason, each individual space would not be marked on street should the scheme go ahead."**
8. Yes. It is the CCC's intention that the properties on the north side of Arbury Road (even numbers), and in the cul de sacs adjoining it, will be excluded by where the boundary for the MRA parking scheme has been drawn.
9. Yes. The occupants of these properties will not be eligible for permits under the scheme.
10. The CCC's rationale for treating the two sides of Arbury Road east differently is that **"There is inadequate on-street parking capacity to accommodate them. The majority of properties on the north-east side have off-road parking available. Should the scheme go ahead there would be a 6 month review and revisions to the scheme could be considered at that time."**
11. There are two properties on the north side of Arbury Road east that do not have driveways or do not currently park in their front gardens.
These are ineligible for parking permits because **"They would not be able to park in resident permit holder spaces on Arbury Road or within the remainder of the Milton RPS during its operational hours. If they wish to park on-street from Monday to Friday between 9.30am and 3pm they would need to find alternative spaces in other roads."**
12. Yes. Under the proposed scheme, the occupants of Maio Road will be ineligible for parking permits because **"Maio Road is an unadopted private road."**
13. No. The CCC does not propose to prevent vehicles displaced from parking in the MRA scheme from parking in Maio Road because **"Maio Road is an unadopted private road there is no mechanism to prevent vehicles parking within."**

14. No. The CCC does not propose to provide permits for parking spaces for residents of any of the private developments - Havenfield, Marfield Court and Twickenham Court – **“These private developments have some off-road parking available. There is inadequate on-street parking capacity to accommodate them all within the Milton RPS. If all individual dwellings were eligible for resident and visitor permits, the parked cars are likely to have a significant impact on parking availability for those residents of Arbury Road and adjoining streets who have no off-road parking. Should the scheme go ahead there would be a 6 month review and revisions to the scheme could be considered at that time.”**

15. **Austin Court** a private road with provision for off-street parking but the GCP has indicated that its residents will be eligible for parking permits whereas private development off the north side of Arbury Road east will not.

Supplementary information subsequently provided directly by the Policy and Regulation Team, ***“The drawing shows a scheme boundary line indicating the extent of the scheme and encompasses properties that would be eligible for permits. In respect of Arbury Road those properties on the south-west side are clearly within the proposed scheme, but those on the north-east side are not. Even if a road is privately owned, it is still possible to make the properties eligible to apply for a permit to park in public roads that are within the RPS zone.”***

16. A new stretch of cycle lane is shown on the map to run from outside No. 106 just to where Arbury Road east narrows outside No. 88.

No. The new stretch of cycle lane to be provided will not take the same form as the existing one provided under Phase 2 of the GCP’s previous work on Arbury Road west because: **“It was highlighted through consultation and discussions with Members to improve cycle infrastructure where possible within the implementation of the RPS. Incorporating larger scale cycle improvements is outside the scope of the programme.”**

17. This new stretch cycle lane will be part of what CCC has designated a ‘priority cycle route’.

But No. The new stretch will not be joined up with the cycle lane installed under Phase 2 of the GCP’s improvements to Arbury Road west because: **“It was highlighted through consultation and discussions with Members to improve cycle infrastructure where possible within the implementation of the RPS. Incorporating larger scale cycle improvements is outside the scope of the programme.”**

18. The CCC was asked: What does the CCC expected cyclists using this new designated cycle path to do when they reach the end of it:

a) ride on the pavement

or

b) ride on Arbury Road east along its most congested stretch down to the Milton Road junction?

The CCC did not answer this question.

Instead, it reported the GCP as saying that: **"Although some additional cycle lanes are proposed, the programme is primarily an RPS and not a cycle improvement scheme. There are however cut through options to Leys Avenue for cyclists."**

19. The CCC was asked to explain *Why they think its selected option is acceptable on this 'designated priority cycle route'?* It answered: **"Although some additional cycle lanes are proposed the programme is primarily an RPS and not a cycle improvement scheme."**

20. The CCC was asked *Why isn't the introduction of a residents' parking scheme on Arbury Road east being used to improve both cyclist and pedestrian safety by providing a designated cycle lane on both sides of the street or, at least, a two-way (4m) path on the north side of it?* It answered **"Although some additional cycle lanes are proposed the programme is primarily an RPS and not a cycle improvement scheme. There is insufficient road or footway width to accommodate continuous cycle lanes on both sides of the road."**

(Whilst this answer is factually correct at present. But this is only the case if Arbury Road east doesn't have a modal filter or isn't made one way – both interventions that may be considered when the Road Hierarchy Review undertaken by the GCP is implemented. But this has been postponed until after 2030.)

21. No. The CCC does not propose to use the parking scheme to introduce a modal filter because **" The potential for a modal filter to be installed on Arbury Road is, at this time, not a confirmed feature and subject to further review and consultation. There has however been an interest for the introduction of Residents Parking within this area for some time. We are aware of potential proposals for this area in the future and, given that the proposed RPS would not conflict with these possible future measures, it was felt that in the interest of the residents within the area that the RPS consultation should proceed. Both proposals have a meaningful impact on reducing congestion within the city and make a strong move towards modal shift. The proposed RPS would also ensure much needed prioritised parking for residents as part of this process. "**

22. No. The CCC is not willing to acknowledge ARERA and HPERA's rationale for locating the modal filter to the north-western side of Leys Road junction to avoid rat running because it is **"N/A. The potential for a modal filter to be installed on Arbury Road is, at this time, not a confirmed feature and subject to further review and consultation. There has however been an interest for the introduction of Residents Parking within this area for some time. We are aware of potential proposals for this area in the future and, given that the proposed RPS would not conflict with these possible future measures, it was felt that in the interest of the residents within the area that the RPS consultation should proceed. Both proposals have a meaningful impact on reducing congestion within the city and make a strong move towards modal shift. The proposed RPS would also ensure much needed prioritised parking for residents as part of this process."**

23. Yes. The CCC is willing to adjust the location of the parking space currently shown outside No 15 to accommodate the proposed new zebra crossing if this is funded by the CCC's Local Highway Improvement Programme (currently under consideration).