

FEEDBACK FROM CONSULTATION – KENDAL WAY VERGE AND FOOTWAY PARKING

Name	Date	Comments
RESIDENT NO	27 th March 2012	The proposal of new road signs in Kendal Way..... why????????? yes I agree that some areas of Kendal Way street parking is a slight problem, (not a major one) but I don't think this is the way forward it will only to make the parking issue much worse, as a suggestion do you think the money would be better spent on the footpaths in Kendal Way, making them less bumpy and un-even.
RESIDENT YES	27 th March 2012	Thank you for the information, which came through our door. We are delighted by the proposed controls and hope that they are approved.
RESIDENT NO	27 th March 2012	<p>I am writing to you as a resident of Kendal Way regarding the "Kendal Way Verge & Footway Parking Controls" proposal I have just received.</p> <p>I note, by the way, that it is sub-headed "A Residents' Consultation". Has there been a residents' consultation? Are there plans to have a residents' consultation? I ask because, as a resident of Kendal Way, I have not received any notification of any planned consultation over this proposal.</p> <p>Regarding the proposal itself, it states that "verge and footway parking can also cause a hazard to motorists if visibility is affected" yet "No change to the on-carriageway parking is proposed".</p> <p>If by "on-carriageway" it is implied that residents or their visitors may still park on the road provided they do not mount the kerb then surely this will actually increase the hazard to motorists by affecting visibility far more than verge or footway parking?</p> <p>The road of Kendal Way itself is not wide enough by any stretch of the imagination for residents of opposing domiciles to park safely without mounting the kerb unless they have a parking bay or a driveway.</p> <p>Which brings me, for the time being, to a final point. As a resident who has neither a parking bay suitably situated nor a "private driveway" I'd like to ask whether or not there will be plans within the proposal to "improve" resident parking on Kendal Way (ergo, for those without suitable parking facilities) or is the proposal merely to make parking more difficult for residents? You'll forgive, of course, if I state now that I would not be remotely interested in renting a Council garage that may mean travelling 2 miles in order to get to my car.</p> <p>The proposal does have its merits, however, I fail to see at present how it benefits motoring residents.</p>

APPENDIX D

<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012</p>	<p>I strongly oppose the parking controls being proposed for Kendal Way, as outlined in the consultation leaflet received today. Firstly, I see no real benefit of this scheme – except for making the verges look a bit nicer, all you will do is annoy residents who have no other place to park our cars. If we park them on the road we risk cluttering the road up and having wing mirrors knocked off by vans and such going down the narrow road.</p> <p>Secondly, I have had my car vandalised 3 times since moving to the area in mid-2011 (less than a year), meaning that if I have to park my car further down the street on the road I will not be able to see it from my house and therefore feel less safe about where it is. Finally, this scheme is economically flawed – spending money where it could be used elsewhere to boost the local economy i.e. better parking spaces at local shops, improvements to local road junctions to improve journey times for motorists, etc. Though this scheme will produce no economic benefits, though of course will satisfy the retired residents who seemingly have nothing better to do than to inconvenience their neighbours who they seem to see as some sort of ‘youth hooligans parking on the verges’ – and in doing so they have had on at least two occasions arrived at our door shouting in an aggressive manner to us about parking on the verges.</p> <p>I repeat my first statement that I strongly oppose this. If you really want to tidy up the area but keep us pleased why not pave over the verges or provide parking bays, especially around the speed bumps at either entrance to the estate – the middle ‘loop’ area get plenty of parking bays but none for us at either end?</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012</p>	<p>With ref to the proposed restriction in kendal way i would like to oppose the idea. where will the residents park..why have we all not got the block paving lay-bys like some have..if we are not allowed to park on the tarmac which were grass verges and dug up and tarmac'd over, do we park on the road and cause more problems. It would be nice if a referendum was sent to the residents who in turn could decide rather than a few who try and decide for us , as this is not a problem for those who have a large family and need the extra space, and when parproperly is not a hazard..please feel free to contact me as i have been in kendal way for 23 years and do not find parking a problem. thank you</p>
<p>RESIDENT YES</p>	<p>27th March 2012</p>	<p>Thanks for posting details of the proposed restrictions on verge and footway parking in Kendal Way. This is just to say that it looks like an excellent idea, both to improve the appearance of the street and to prevent footway and roadway obstructions.</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO Parking Bays</p>	<p>27th March 2012</p>	<p>I am writing to comment about the proposed changes to the parking regulations for Kendal Way (as detailed on the plan dated March 2012). The changes would prohibit cars from parking on the grass verges, or partially on the verge and footpath. Kendal Way is a residential street, and the majority of houses have at least one car. Although many of the houses have drives, and there is some on street parking, this is not sufficient for the total number of cars, so, particularly at the ends of the street (close to Milton Road and Green End Road), people also park on the grass verges. Prohibiting this would create a problems: either</p>

APPENDIX D

		<p>people would be forced to park completely on the road, where it would be likely to cause an obstruction either to motor vehicles, or to the cycle paths which pass the existing traffic calming measures. This would also not address the restricted visibility for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians mentioned in the proposal, and may actually make it worse. Alternatively, people would have to park on neighbouring streets, which would simply move the problem, and would inconvenience the residents of other nearby roads, which would become much more congested as a result as well as Kendal Way. An alternative solution would be to remove part of the verges, and replace them with parking bays (as has already been done in some parts of Kendal Way), but this is likely to be expensive and cause considerable disruption. In my view, it would be much better to leave things as they are, and use the existing rules to address the problem of vehicles that are obstructing the road or footway. It could also be worth assessing the layout of the road and side streets, to if necessary using yellow lines to ban parking where it restricts visibility. It should also be noted that most of the small side streets/drives off Kendal Way have high hedges or fences, and join Kendal Way across the pavement. This is often busy with pedestrians and cyclists including children going to and from school. The main part of Kendal Way is surprisingly busy as it is used for access between Milton Road and the Chesterton area. Both these factors mean that it is desirable that people turning into Kendal Way from the side lanes do so very slowly and carefully. The additional restriction to visibility caused by cars parked on the verge is likely to be minimal, and may even help to ensure that drivers exiting side roads/drives go sufficiently cautiously</p> <p>Thank-you for taking the time to read my comments.</p>
<p>RESIDENT SHIRLEY GROVE NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012 (☎ PHONE)</p>	<p>Objects to the proposal as far as it relates to Shirley Grove as this close is tight and they have an agreement that dates back to the 60's to allow them to park on the footway. In 97 the Council asked all cars to be parked on the carriageway which was carried through but resulted in emergency vehicles not being able to access to close so neighbours reverted back to parking on the footway.</p>
<p>RESIDENT SHIRLEY GROVE NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012 (☎ PHONE)</p>	<p>Objects to the proposal as far as it relates to Shirley Grove as this close is tight and they have an agreement that dates back to the 60's to allow them to park on the footway. In 97 the Council asked all cars to be parked on the carriageway which was carried through but resulted in emergency vehicles not being able to access to close so neighbours reverted back to parking on the footway. Suggested that grass verges are removed elsewhere if parking on the verges is the main issue. Asked why can't parking bays be marked out half on half off the footway as used on streets such as Ross Street.</p>
<p>RESIDENT SHIRLEY GROVE NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012 (☎ PHONE)</p>	<p>Objects to the proposal as far as it relates to Shirley Grove as this close is tight and they have an agreement that dates back to the 60's to allow them to park on the footway when all the grass verges on Shirley Grove were tarmaced over as the Council had asked the neighbours if this is what they wanted so they could park on the footway. In 97 the Council asked all cars to be parked on the carriageway which was carried through but resulted in emergency vehicles not being able to access to close so neighbours reverted back to parking on the footway. Agrees with the proposals generally but not on Shirley Grove.</p>

APPENDIX D

<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012 (☎ PHONE)</p>	<p>Supports not parking on grass verges but doesn't support not parking half on the footway. There is traffic calming outside her house which would make it difficult to park completely on the road.</p>
<p>RESIDENT MILTON RD NO</p>	<p>27th March 2012</p>	<p>I would like to reiterate our conversation regarding the constant use of the footpath on Milton road by vehicles that drive significant distances on said footpath to gain access from grass verges outside their properties. This is becoming increasingly frequent and I'm sure it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident.</p> <p>I hope that the same initiative will be taken as that proposed in Kendal way as a long term solution, but in the interim, please advise on what can be done as a short term solution.</p> <p>I have seen vehicles mount the curb at 386 and drive all the way along the footpath as far as 370, forcing young Mums with pushchairs out of the way.</p> <p>The main and persistent offenders seem to be at 376, 374, 372 and 370. 376 have their own dropped curb but have so many vehicles in the drive that they permanently leave one parked on their dropped curb!!!</p>
<p>RESIDENT YES</p>	<p>29th March 2012 (☎ PHONE)</p>	<p>Supports the proposals, doesn't want to see the grass verges taken away.</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>29th March 2012</p>	<p>Many thanks for bringing the above consultation to the attention of the residents of Kendal Way. I have to say I'm a bit surprised that this is being considered now. The main people who both caused issues with parking on long sections of the pavement, and had need of as much of that pavement space as possible for buggies etc. were the parents of children attending the old Shirley School, now relocated to Nuffield Road. There was a rear access to the old school in Kendal Way, so parents would often use our road to get there. However this is no longer a problem and the number of both people parking on the pavements, and pedestrians in need of the full width of those pavements, has been significantly reduced. The number of residents and residents' vehicles on the other hand has not changed.</p> <p>Nowadays there are just a few of us who need to park partially on the pavement, and this only really at the top and bottom entrances to Kendal Way where there are no parking bays provided. Despite having driveways with parking space for one, many of us have need of more than one vehicle - for instance where there is a business vehicle, or (as in my own circumstance) where there are multiple families occupying one house.</p> <p>The pavements on Kendal Way are wide and allow more than sufficient foot or wheeled access along their lengths. Even if vehicle parking was restricted on these areas, there would still be "pinch points" for pushchair or wheelchair users etc. where the trees and grass verges narrow the walkways. If vehicles had to</p>

APPENDIX D

		<p>park out on the road they would be more prone to damage, especially by the anti-social drivers who regularly roar up and down our street. I very much doubt they will change their driving style if the road were made narrower – certainly the 'sleeping policemen' don't seem to deter them! As a cyclist, I would be worried about having to weave in and out around parked cars, not having a clear view of the road and possible oncoming traffic ahead</p> <p>of me as I was doing so. I would also worry about young children crossing the road for the same reasons.</p> <p>In short, while I can see some benefit to restricting parking on the grass verges - especially during periods of wet weather - I can't see much benefit at all in restricting parking on the pavements of Kendal Way. If you absolutely must restrict this practice, I would hope that you would provide those of us who live in the top and bottom straight sections of the road with recessed parking bays rather than expecting us to park out on the road.</p> <p>Please take this email as my rejection of the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>29th March 2012</p>	<p>With reference to document on parking in Kendal Way. We always park close to bushes so there is room for wheelchairs, prams etc. to pass. I am disabled, have blue badge and cannot walk far. We do not park all the time only when I need picking up dropping off etc. I also feel we shall have cars parked on road each side of Kendal Way which will make it difficult for emergency vehicles to get to houses.</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>1st April 2012</p>	<p>We strongly opposed this proposal for the reasons outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Cars that turn left into Kendal Way from Green End Road often turn in quickly. Under these proposals, if they then met a parked car in the road, this is more dangerous than if they met a car parked half on/off. Hence an accident is more likely. * Under the new proposals, to park our car on our drive I would have to pull onto the opposite side of the carriageway into on coming traffic and then reverse back. I currently don't have to pull onto the opposite side of the carriage way because our neighbour parks half on/off (which won't be allowed and hence he will park in the road). Parking on our drive is very difficult anyway as I have to reverse across an area where children play (they climb the tree) and people are walking. Hence, I have many places to watch when parking and making my starting point the wrong side of the carriageway increases the danger. I would not want to miss seeing the child running round the corner from the sweet shop because I was looking at the cars I was facing on the road, but I will be less likely to spot them, as I will have even more things to observe

APPENDIX D

		<p>when reversing under your proposal. * When I walk along Kendal Way I do not see evidence that parking on the pavement or half on/off impedes passage as the pavements are wide and people park sensibly.</p> <p>Please do reconsider this proposal. At the very least, you could place the signs so that only the circular section of Kendal Way has these controls, thus leaving the straight sections off Milton and Green End Road unaffected. It is the straight sections where accidents are most likely to occur as a result of this change. The pavement is wide enough in the straight section immediately off Green End Road to allow on pavement and half on/off parking.</p> <p>Please do keep us informed as to how this progresses.</p>
<p>RESIDENT SHIRLEY GROVE NO</p>	<p>1st April 2012</p>	<p>I think its a total waste of money and time to proceed with such drastic measures. It would certainly create problems for visiting family or friends as parking would not be available and so would cut social ties. We don't have a problem in Shirley Grove as we give and take and share parking and respect each other. Myself and neighbours whom I have spoken with, all feel things should be kept as they are. Money would be better spent on providing care for children, the elderly and mental health.</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>5th April 2012</p>	<p>I am writing to comment on your proposals for parking controls on Kendal Way. As I'm sure you've noticed almost all the houses on Kendal Way have some sort of allocated parking space, whether it be on a drive in front of the individual houses or on the parking bays on the side of the road, or in some cases, both. Unfortunately for me and my partner we have neither of these allocated spaces.</p> <p>For these reasons I strongly disagree with your proposals, that is unless you could guarantee that we will get a drop-kerb and gates or an allocated parking space outside our house.</p>
<p>RESIDENT NO</p>	<p>9th April 2012</p>	<p>I am writing in connection with the proposed parking restrictions on Kendal Way, I have a number of points to raise so here goes:</p> <p>- I am a resident on Kendal Way, I do not drive but do walk along the footpath on numerous times during the day, many of these being with a double buggy and walking children either side as I am a childminder. I have to say that I have very rarely had an issue passing residents parked vehicles, the obstacles that I mainly encounter causing me to have to take the children and buggy onto the road are when works vans (usually council related) are parked on the footpaths, TOTALLY blocking the path with or without their doors open, or on a Friday when the bins are emptied and the COUNCIL workers leave the bins all over the place!</p>

APPENDIX D

- There are not adequate parking spaces for all residents along Kendal Way, and those who do not have driveways or parking bays are left with no alternative but to park partly on the footpath - and as a pedestrian I do not feel that they are parking inconsiderately. If they parked totally on the road it would definitely cause an obstruction, especially for the idiots who drive round and round the street at top speed (usually on an evening), however, I guess it would not be them whose vehicle would be damaged! Also, in view of the crime rate in the area, and the number of dubious characters that loiter on the street I would not recommend any resident park their vehicle anywhere out of view of their own home either.

- I notice that the parking restrictions do not cover the 'set-back' areas at the Milton Road end of the street where there is often double parking causing full obstructions on the road.

- It is interesting to see that there are County Council Enforcement Officers who have the time to patrol Kendal Way in order to enforce the proposed restrictions, yet no-one can find the time to patrol the front and back of Shirley School at drop-off and pick-up times where inconsiderate parents constantly park totally on the footpath, and impede views on what can be a busy road. Surely the safety of the children attending the school should be a greater concern than Kendal Way, which is hardly a busy road at any time of day?

- As for improving the appearance of Kendal Way, maybe reducing the amount of dog excrement on the footpaths, and encouraging residents to keep their front gardens tidy would help more.

- I personally feel that this proposal has been put together to address issues with a couple of residents on the street who often have more than one vehicle parked outside their homes, perhaps the council should have the guts to stand up to these residents and deal with these issues individually rather than inconvenience a larger number of residents who do nothing wrong, they just want to park their cars near their home and without adequate parking facilities they have to use the footpath but do so in a way that is in fact considerate to other footpath and road users.

- It would be interesting when the results of this residents consultation is published whether the residents agreeing to it already have safe and adequate parking for their vehicles, as I suspect this will be the case. This should be taken into account when considering the results.

- I would also like to ask how allowing parking on-carriageway will cause less obstructions and hazards than restricting parking partly on the footpaths? Will this leave enough room for a 3.8m wide fire engine to pass safely if vehicles are parked at alternate sides of the roads.

I look forward to the published results in due course, but assume that the council will not be spending too much of the council tax money on issues that are far less important than the children's safety outside of

APPENDIX D

		Shirley School.
RESIDENT MILTON RD NO	9 th April 2012	<p>I am concerned that what you are planning to do will mean more cars parked on the verges and pedestrian / cycle paths of Milton and Green End Road.</p> <p>As no prohibitive signs of the sort shown in your brochure currently exist in Milton and Green End Roads, I assume that what you propose means that anyone unable to park in Kendal Way can now park on the verge in front of my and my neighbours house and down the entire length of Milton and Green End Roads.</p> <p>If this is correct, are you not just transferring the problem into Milton and Green End Road? We already have a problem with drivers entering the pavement from Kendal Way and driving down it to park on the verge. (As an aside, there are some houses in Milton Road without drop curb exits whose residents drive out of their property by making a dog-leg manoeuvre to exit by a neighbours drop curb or in my case the pedestrian drop curb.</p> <p>I can furnish you with photos of the problems this congestion causes to pedestrians and mothers with prams forced to share the Milton Road pavement with cyclists. Further, cars parked on Milton Road verges and or partly on the road and footpath restrict the vision of residents attempting to leave their property and gain access to the increasingly busy Milton Road. Several accidents have resulted because of this.</p> <p>In Gilbert Road where you have instituted a cycle path and a similar ban on verge parking, a growing number of front gardens are now being paved over. This is not exactly an environmentally friendly development as it reduces the nesting and feeding habitat of birds, etc., etc., etc., production of oxygen and hastens the end of the world through global warming - if you believe Cambridge scientists! Surely the development of front gardens into car park is something that will now happen in Kendall Way as well? It is not a green development.</p> <p>Given the exorbitant cost of installing drop kerbs, is this proposal of yours not just a roundabout way of raising revenues through their installation? If no, will the City Council work with residents it is foisting this "proposal" on and who see no alternative to their parking requirements other than to pave over their front garden. Can the City Council not offer such residents a decent discount on the installation of a drop curve?</p>
RESIDENT NO	11 th April 2012 (☎ PHONE)	<p>Ringling on behalf of her brother who lives on Kendal Way and has learning difficulties, has concerns over the proposal as she visits her brother on a regular basis and due to the road she could not park completely on the road and would have to park further down the road which she isn't happy about.</p>
RESIDENT	15 th April	With reference to the parking controls proposed for Kendal Way, I welcome the measures in principle, but

APPENDIX D

<p>NO</p>	<p>2012</p>	<p>have serious concerns how they will be enforced in practice. Most violations occur in the evening and at night by both residents and visitors alike, when active parking enforcement will not be present. This will defeat the objective of the controls. Do you envisage a solution?</p> <p>Secondly, Kendal Way is relatively narrow and on-carriageway parking, if in significant numbers, will seriously obstruct legitimate large vehicles such as rescue services and more frequently, refuse collection services. These vehicles will be forced to mount the verges with detrimental consequences in wet weather. Many car owners may feel that they too should drive onto the footpath or verge in order to circumvent a parked van or large car. Again the objectives of the controls are defeated. The verges do not look any better.</p> <p>In recent years the number of cars owned by residents has increased substantially with some households having two or more vehicles. The pressure on available parking spaces is ever increasing. This comes to bursting point when friends and relatives decide to visit the area. Violations will happen and do happen. Maybe the introduction of residential parking permits could help to regulate, but not eliminate, the influx of non-residential vehicles.</p> <p>Finally, I would appreciate a clear definition of footpath or footway as it applies to Kendal Way. Some years ago a number of grass verges were removed and replaced by parking bays. Others were removed and simply tarmaced over, creating a wide "footpath", which because of its width, is frequently used for parking with no real obstruction to pedestrians.</p> <p>Under the new proposals will the tarmaced areas be reinstated to grass verges, when there is no ambiguity (preferable), or will these areas become prohibited and clearly marked?</p> <p>If possible, I would welcome some comment on how you see this difficult situation resolved in a realistic and just manner.</p>
<p>RESIDENT SHIRLEY GROVE NO</p>	<p>15th April 2012</p>	<p>I am writing to you in regard to the 'Kendal Way Verge & Footways Parking Controls' consultation leaflet I have received.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection specifically to the proposal for to verge and pavement parking restrictions on Shirley Grove.</p> <p>I am in favour of verge & pavement parking restrictions on Kendal Way and also on the stretch of road leading into Shirley Grove which I feel is narrow and would benefit the residents of Shirley Grove if controls on vehicle parking was introduced on this stretch leading into Shirley Grove..</p> <p>I however do object to parking controls being introduced to the areas in front of the properties of the residents on Shirley Grove.</p>

APPENDIX D

My reasons for objecting to restricting parking for Shirley Grove residents in front of their properties are as follows:

1) The consultation and proposal for parking control is for Kendal Way. Technically, Shirley Grove is not Kendal Way. Shirley Grove should be assessed on a separate basis to Kendal Way.

2) Shirley Grove does not have any grass verges so parking off-road does not damage any grass verges.

3) My understanding is that in the past (1960's) the council consulted the residents of Shirley Grove to remove the grass verges at the time and the benefit proposed to the residents was that the residents would be able to then park on the footway in front of their properties. My understanding is that the residents accepted this proposal for removal of grass verges for the benefit of parking on the footway in front of their property.

4) The only people who park in front of the houses on Shirley Grove are the residents only, all residents are mindful and considerate of each other, we have a close community feel and we self regulate our parking so that it does not negatively affect any other residents on the Grove. Residents always park off the carriage way.

5) The parking of residents on footways does not restrict pedestrian access as the middle part of the road is always free and this is the route that residents use to exits/enter their properties on foot. This is possible given the nature of this road as it a cul-de-sac and the road area is always free of vehicles. Please note I do support restrictions on parking on the footways leading into the grove, the area which is not in front of residents properties.

6) Shirley Grove is not a through road, it's a cul-de-sac , there is no obstruction of the highway. All residents park off the road on the pavement in front of their properties and so do not obstruct vehicles using the 'road' area in the grove for manoeuvring.