

Subject	RE: Riverside & Access to Stourbridge Common
From	[REDACTED]
To	[REDACTED]
Cc	[REDACTED]
Sent	22 January 2016 12:32

All

As it has been a while since we corresponded on this I thought you would all appreciate an update on our ongoing work.

We have liaised with interests within the City Council and with the County Council and are hopefully moving towards a layout that satisfies most objectives. In essence, this will adjust the Stourbridge entrance broadly in line with the resident group aspirations, with easy swing gates on either side and a cattle grid arrangement in the middle for in and out-bound cyclists (separated). Whilst most vehicular access needs should be able to transfer to the Oyster Row entrance we believe we will need to retain the opportunity here for the occasional times when the other entrance might be unsuitable, but at this stage we think we can probably design this in such a way that it can be shared with the cycle access arrangement.

The County remain unconvinced of the need to remove all parking in the section between Stanley Rd junction and the common and as such we are proposing to retain a small level of provision here (approx. some 6 spaces) in line with our previous discussions. I appreciate this does not accord with the views of some but we are mindful of the pressure on opportunities to park on-street both in this area and the city in general, and the County's review work on this now underway (for interest, County are taking a paper to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee next Tues 26 Jan, which is available on their website should you wish to view it - <http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CommitteeMinutes/Committees/Meeting.aspx?meetingID=1103>).

I believe we were all in general agreement that it would be preferable to move ahead with a proposal that provides a much better arrangement here than currently, rather than have this issue hold the project up further. Our suggestions will introduce controls on parking that presently do not exist, limiting the parking available in this particular stretch to a third of what it is now. The bays would be laid out in such a way as to deter usage by larger vehicles, and to provide a margin of separation from cyclists accessing the common. They would be subject to the normal process of statutory consultation and advertisement, with any representations being considered and determined by local Committee. If successfully implemented, there would still be opportunity for them to be reviewed in respect of how the spaces are best allocated to users should the need and opportunity arise in the future (for example, if it were possible to introduce residents parking).

The next stage is to progress the design detail a bit more for further discussion with stakeholders, which we will push on with and report back further on in due course.

I hope this brief update helps and as ever, please do get in touch should you have any queries.

Yours,

1

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 03 December 2015 10:41

To: [REDACTED]

Cc:

Subject: FW: Last night's meeting

Dear All

Thank you for finding the time to meet on Monday evening. Residents do appreciate the effort required by councillors and officers to manage these meetings in addition to normal business. Shown below are summary notes of the meeting (thanks to [REDACTED] for pulling them together). I also attach the agenda paper which was circulated at the meeting.

As we stressed at the meeting, we do not want to lose this opportunity to improve Riverside and are very keen to keep engaged in this work. We will support council activity whenever possible.

Best regards

103

CONTEXT

- The funding context: [REDACTED] has secured £50k from County to improve and future-proof the Stourbridge Common entrance for anticipated growth in cycle numbers from Chisholm Trail, and to create disabled access. [REDACTED] has secured £14k from East Area Committee to tackle the parking problems at the Stourbridge end. [REDACTED] stated that the money may be lost in Jan/Feb unless there is an agreed plan. The access project needs to take a strategic view, and the parking proposals need to be consistent with and not jeopardise this. [REDACTED] confirmed that in his view the current entrance is 'not fit for purpose'.

ENTRANCE DESIGN

- [REDACTED]: multiple uses will make entrance design more complex. The cycling officer is keen that cycle access is not compromised.

- The initial design by residents provides two-way cycle access and two pedestrian gates, plus space for mobility scooters. It has been approved by the disability officer.
- There may be no need for the Riverside entrance to accommodate vehicles (though the resident design includes removable posts). The Oyster Row vehicle entrance is more accessible for emergency vehicles and leads to wider tracks inside the common. There is evidence that ambulance service, regatta and works vehicles already use Oyster Row rather than the Riverside gate.

- [REDACTED] confirmed that bins could be relocated to make vehicle collection easier

PARKING

- There are 8 Riverside residences without dedicated parking. It is important that these residents have somewhere to park.
- There is space for 20+ parking bays on the built side of Riverside and a further 6-7 spaces at the bottom of Stanley Road. These could serve residents and recreational visitors to the common
- Residents estimate that only 6-7 linear bays can fit on the riverfront east of Stanley Road, possibly fewer depending on where parking bays need to terminate to avoid blocking the riverfront pedestrian and cycle paths
- [REDACTED] said that there were ways to protect parking for residents from commuters eg 2 hour waiting times
- [REDACTED] mentioned that there are plans to restrict parking on Riverside further up, where the road is narrower, but the view of County at present is that the commons entrance cul de sac is not 'extraordinary', and cyclists/pedestrians could coexist with vehicles
- However, Riverside is unlike other roads where different uses co-exist:
 - it has an exceptionally high volume of cyclists, likely to grow
 - it has a very high number of recreational pedestrians who do not view it as a normal road, so walk in groups along the riverfront or down the centre of the carriageway
 - the pavement approach to the entrance is too narrow for most child buggies
 - parking cars would be manoeuvring in front of an entrance 'pinch point' where both cyclists and pedestrians are converging

NEXT STEPS

- [REDACTED] commented that the access project means that the solution must go beyond 'pure' parking considerations. Two options: (i) car-free/no parking east of Stanley Road (ii) linear parking bays on riverfront
- Residents strongly believe that the safest and best of these is option (i), which would get rid of nuisance vans, improve common access and improve amenity for all walking along the riverfront. This is also the preferred option of Cllrs [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].
- [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were urged to press County again to permit option (i), given strategic commitment to non-vehicle modes of transport and the very small number of linear bays added by option (ii)
- There would be reluctant acceptance of option (ii) as a tactical move to get rid of the vans, however, if County refuses to consider option (i), in order to keep the £14k.
- Residents would then start to push for full no-parking status in the future, along with resident parking to deal with commuter, student and displaced van parking. [REDACTED] stressed that there are already severe parking issues in the area which the Cheddars Lane student development will make worse.
- The commons entrance redesign project is independent of parking plans, and there is a draft plan to work with, but linear parking under option (ii) should not compromise new pedestrian, cycle and disabled access points

- [REDACTED] will consult informally with stakeholders including police, emergency services etc on both parking and entrance design
- There should just be one option for the TRO

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 2016.0.7227 / Virus Database: 4477/11099 - Release Date: 12/01/15