

**(CCC) TRO PR0703 'Public Notice' and 'Statement of Reasons'**

documents/correspondence/records/minutes/decisions between 2012 and 2021, that describe how Planning's 'clamping' became County's 4 rules in PR0703.

Please also explain why Planning approved a 'transitional arrangement' where the outcome of a statutory TRO consultation is pre-empted as though a successful TRO is inevitable.

The agreement of details of these planning conditions were carried out under powers delegated to officers by the Joint Development Control Committee back in 2012. So did this same Committee approve these 4 new features in 2021?

Did County (Highways) design these 4 rules and did they submit said design to Planning (just like Barratt submitted to Planning the clamping design in 2012)?

If so, did the same Committee approve the 4 new rules 2021 as acceptable deviations from the original 'clamping' design from 2012?

Or, was it Planning who designed and self-approved the 4 rules?

Please withhold any personal data, and leave the job titles and departments in.

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 provide that, in the case of a delegated decision, the decisionmaker must produce a written record of any decision which affects the rights of an individual. These 4 rules cause substantial prejudice against all residents' rights to use the highway: The highway being an area of land which the public have the right to use, passing and repassing without let or hindrance.

Please produce all written records from the decision-maker that led to the creation of the 4 rules.

**Response**

Please share all documents/correspondence/records/minutes/decisions between 2012 and 2021, that describe how Planning's 'clamping' became County's 4 rules in PR0703.

A - We don't recognise the suggestion "planning's 'clamping' became County's four rules".

Please also explain why Planning approved a 'transitional arrangement' where the outcome of a statutory TRO consultation is pre-empted as though a successful TRO is inevitable.

A- From the earliest stages of the master planning work on Southern Fringe going back to 2005/06, the intention was always to have parking restrictions for place -

FOI Ref

Response sent

**9674**

**08 Oct 2021**

making reasons. The vision for Southern Fringe was to adopt a reduced level of parking provision across all the developments given accessibility of sites to good public transport links including Guided Bus and Park and Ride as well as bus service connections/good walking cycling routes into Cambridge. Plus to have streets that were free from parking clutter -learning from Orchard Park and Cambourne which were experiencing issues with parking congestion on streets.

All the marketing information from Countryside and Barratts used to refer to this as a core principle -so as not to attract residents who were multiple car focused households.

Also to prevent Addenbrookes workers from parking on the SF residential streets - which would happen without the parking restrictions in place.

None of this serves to indicate that the outcome of a statutory TRO process was inevitable, but does show the context of what was anticipated at the time the development was being designed.

The agreement of details of these planning conditions were carried out under powers delegated to officers by the Joint Development Control Committee back in 2012. So did this same Committee approve these 4 new features in 2021?

A - No details of the proposed TRO have been presented to the Joint Development Control Committee. The powers associated with the making of a TRO rest with Cambridgeshire County Council.

Did County (Highways) design these 4 rules and did they submit said design to Planning (just like Barratt submitted to Planning the clamping design in 2012)? A –

No details of the proposed TRO have been presented to planning officers. The powers associated with the making of a TRO rest with Cambridgeshire County Council

If so, did the same Committee approve the 4 new rules 2021 as acceptable deviations from the original 'clamping' design from 2012?

A-See answer to previous question

Or, was it Planning who designed and self-approved the 4 rules?  
Please withhold any personal data, and leave the job titles and departments in.

A -See answer to previous question.

Further queries on this matter should be directed to [foi@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:foi@cambridge.gov.uk)