

AN URGENT REVIEW OF LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY ENTRANCES AND PARKING POLICIES IS NEEDED

Residents' groups in Loughborough call on Charnwood Borough Council to review urgently, the car parking, parking policies and entrances at Loughborough University.

Presented by residents from the South-side of the University campus

Ian Webb	30 Spinney Hill Drive
Nicholas Ball	9 Spinney Hill Drive
Pauline Barritt	37 Mountfields Drive
Anne and Rob Kingston	33 Spinney Hill Drive
Geoff Modlen	30 Mountfields Drive

With additional support from residents in Derwent Drive, Ashleigh Drive, and Holywell Drive.

Supported by the following Loughborough Residents' Groups.

Hilda Puttick & Russ Bowman:	Storer Road/Ashby Road Residents' Group.
Steve Cuff:	Nanpantan Residents' Network.
Neil McCaughan & Mick Hoone:	Garendon Road Residents.
Theta Taylor:	Brookfield Avenue Residents' Association.

June 2009

The people of Loughborough are proud of the University and its achievements and we wish it well in the future. All that the residents of Loughborough are seeking to achieve in this document is to help the University become a good neighbour.

Preamble

Loughborough University is the largest institution of its kind that is located in such a small market town. No other university is having such an impact on its neighbours. Because of this unique situation, it is an important duty of the Council to ensure that the University's policies, including parking policies, allow the town to function properly. The University is unlikely to volunteer to do this on its own account; it requires the Council to do this on behalf of the local community.

1.0 The Problem

1.1 Loughborough is a small dynamic market town. There are increasing signs that the town cannot cope with the volume of traffic that wants to enter or cross the town to access its industrial estates, shopping centres and schools. The town is beginning to struggle with the normal needs of its permanent residents and the through traffic of nationally important trunk roads.

It is very noticeable how much better traffic flows in Loughborough during student vacations.

1.2 The rapid expansion of the University and its relatively recent need to house half its students in the town has led to an increase in parking and traffic problems. No strategic planning has been made for this change of function for the town. The Council has placed no restriction on the University's expansion and/or on the number of students bringing cars to Loughborough. Clearly, continued expansion of the University, without restriction on student cars, cannot continue without damage to the town.

At some point the Council must address this problem.

We call on the Borough Council, and/or the County Council, to limit the number of cars being brought by students to Loughborough and to liaise with the University to ensure that only students with essential needs be allowed cars.

1.3 The University must immediately introduce a policy of registering all staff and student cars brought to the town so that the scale of car ownership can be determined, planned for and, if necessary, planning constraints imposed. Such a policy of requiring all staff and students to register their vehicles will also ensure that parking transgressors could be quickly identified by university security [see Footnote A]. This is not the case at the moment. There is no record of staff and student vehicles parking off the campus, or more importantly, parking on residential roads next to the University.

Footnote A

Recently, the suggestion contained in the residents' 2002 report (see Appendix 2) that the University add a clause to its internal Traffic Regulations has been acted upon. Those students who park outside the campus, on roads covered by the Council endorsed exclusion order, are now subject to academic discipline. However, the University has no internal record of all student or staff car registrations, so this regulation is almost impossible to enforce.

2.0 Loughborough West-Side Parking Study

2.1 The current review of parking on the West side of Loughborough, that is being conducted by the Leicestershire County Council Highways Department, is not addressing the root cause of parking problems on the roads next to the University. There is no inherent parking problem on these roads. They are not close to the town centre or other facilities that attract casual parking. The only problem is uncontrolled university parking and the University should be required by the Council to adopt policies that eliminate this problem.

2.2 Some of the area involved in the LCC Highways Department review of parking is covered by a Road Traffic Exclusion Order, obtained in the year 2002 and confirmed by the County Council in 2004. This order prevents staff, students and visitors to the University parking on the residential roads next to the University. However the order is difficult to enforce, as infringements of the order have to be dealt with formally by the police rather than by traffic wardens. As noted above, a register of university cars would enable the University to deal, possibly informally, with such parking offenders reported by residents and thus fulfil its commitment made in its internal Traffic Regulations that those students who park outside the campus, on roads covered by an exclusion order, should be subject to academic discipline.

2.3 The Highways Department is conducting discussions with residents on parking controls, such as preference parking, and hopes to come to a conclusion in the near future. However, they are seeking to ameliorate the problem rather than remove the cause. If the Highways Department's preferred scheme is implemented it will be at great financial cost to both residents and the Council - in other words, all the cost will fall on local Council Tax payers and be a drain on limited local council finances. The review area covers over a thousand houses and homeowners and it is proposed that those needing to make use of on-road parking will have to buy resident and visitor permits. The direct cost of the Highways Department in both labour and materials, to implement the scheme, will cost tens of thousands of pounds.

For a preference-parking scheme to work, with one hour parking for student parking, there would have to be a substantial increase in warden provision from Charnwood Borough Council, we don't believe that adequate warden support can be provided. Providing up to 800 additional parking places next to the University is likely to mean even more students bring cars to Loughborough. It also raises the spectre of students repeatedly moving their cars during the day to hunt down vacant parking bays.

We ask that the Council take action with the University to stop problem parking rather than wasting large amounts of money on the proposed West Loughborough parking scheme.

3.0 Review of Parking Problems

3.1 The Borough Council should note the very long history [see Appendix I] of parking and traffic problems caused by Loughborough University's policy of allowing students to bring their cars to Loughborough. At the same time it should note that other, larger towns, that have had a similar problem, have pressed their Universities to ban student cars completely e.g. Oxford, Cambridge and Durham where students are banned from having a car within 6 miles of the University on pain of losing their student registration status. Other towns have, through a combination of encouragement and the planning process, [e.g. 1997 Traffic Reduction Act] arranged for their universities to ban student cars from the campus and strongly discourage students from bringing cars to the town e.g. Aberdeen, Aston, Bath,

Bristol, Cardiff, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Hatfield, Hull, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham, Reading, Strathclyde, Warwick and York.

3.2 Loughborough University has a policy of protecting its own campus from parking despite having ample room to accommodate all student cars. The University authorities have decided that they do not want their site diminished by cars. For instance, the University does not allow parking on university roads, although this policy means that many students park their cars on residential roads next to the University, even though such roads may be narrower and carry more traffic than those on the campus.

3.3 The neighbouring roads serve as a very convenient overspill car park for the University but at great distress to local residents; particularly those living near residential entrances to the campus. The University is allowing this problem, which is a kind of pollution, to despoil their neighbours' roads. The planning authority should insist that the University houses its own student's cars on the campus or, the University should introduce policies that restrict students from bringing cars to the town.

Allowing the University to use neighbouring roads as car parks for staff and students' cars is not acceptable to the people of Loughborough.

3.4 The University is expanding rapidly whilst building upon many car parks. The David Collett Hall extension, Aeronautical and Automotive Engineering new building, and the Manufacturing Engineering new building were all built on car parks without replacement car parks being built. The new multi-storey car park that is being built next to the Civil Engineering entrance on Ashby Road is being built on an earlier car park so that its 600 parking spaces are only a net gain of 400 spaces (approximately). And, as the large new student accommodation blocks were also built on the largest student car park, car park 7, there will actually be a net reduction in parking spaces available from 2009 even though the University continues to expand.

Developments at the western end of Ashby Road for the new Sports Park and Science Park are likely to bring another 3000 staff to the campus. With planning policies restricting car parking spaces we have no confidence that sufficient parking spaces will be created at this development. [National policy is a maximum of 1 car park space for two staff in Higher Education*]

4.0 University Entrances

4.1 At the moment the University uses the residential roads on its South side for both parking and for access to the campus. Spinney Hill Drive and Ashleigh Drive were built entirely as residential roads. There was no intention that these roads should be through-routes to a University that has nearly 18,000 students and over 3000 staff. Allowing residential roads for university access means that residents have to suffer speeding cars, the use of their roads as 'rat runs' and all the pollution and danger that follow from such use. Now that the University has staffed entrances at its main entrances off Ashby Road and Epinal Way, together with a further entrance off Ashby Road, the minor entrances in Ashleigh Drive and Spinney Hill Drive should be closed.

This is in line with the recommendation of the former Town Council's review of University entrances in 1970.

5.0 Possible and suggested solutions for the Council to consider

5.1 Work with the University to agree an outright ban on students having a car within the town of Loughborough, apart from students with special needs.

5.2 Require the University to keep a register of all staff and student vehicles for use by itself and the Borough Council. This would allow university security staff to identify any cars parked in contravention of university and local parking regulations. Such a register would also allow the Council to know the totality of the problem and provide opportunities to control pollution and emissions. [See 5.4]

5.3 Require the University to scrap its internal rules that ban students, who live in the town and within two miles of the University, from parking at the campus. This 'exclusion zone' was increased from 1 mile to 2 miles, two years ago. Such a policy just encourages students to park illegally on roads covered by the prohibition of university vehicles, adjacent to the University. No planning permission was sought for this policy, yet the implementation of this policy, and the subsequent changes to it, have had great impact on local people and the quality of their environment.

5.4 If necessary use Section 106 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act to require the University to stop staff and students from parking in areas not approved by the Council. Section 106 agreements can be used for many purposes. For instance, this power can be used to help control pollution and preserve air quality. The Council could limit the number of parking spaces at the campus, it could also require that 50% of cars parked at the University be Euro 5 compliant [See Footnote B]. In order for the University to meet such an obligation it would need to keep a register of staff and student vehicles accessible by the Borough Council. Such a register would also help control parking as described elsewhere. Other controls could be included, such as increasing the scope of the University Bus Service and other 'green' transport solutions.

5.5 When possible, the Borough Council should place a car ownership limit on each rented property within Loughborough. There are many instances of student houses with 4, 5 or 6 student cars. For most town streets the parking rules allow two parking permits, so at houses with no off-street parking extra vehicles have to be moved each day, they are not allowed on the campus, so they park in roads close to the University causing a nuisance to the University's neighbours. This daily migration of cars would be significantly reduced if the preference parking schemes in the centre of the town had their permit hours extended to 24-hour operation. The permanent residents in this area would welcome such a policy and this suggestion is supported by SARG. It would help to ensure that permanent residents who return home from work after 6pm have a greater chance of finding a parking space near their home. It would stop rented houses having more than two cars parked on the street.

Footnote B

B. Fuel exhausts have an impact on air quality and human health, especially in urban areas. The EU has adopted legislation to impose stricter emissions caps on cars, limiting nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM) which pose the most serious health problems. The next generation of standards (known as Euro 5) come into force in 2009.

5.6 The Council should review the University's entrances. We consider it essential that the University closes its residential entrances at Ashleigh Drive and Spinney Hill Drive. In the 1960's and 1970's [see appendix I] there were gates at all the residential entrances and they were closed evenings, weekends and Bank Holidays. The provision of the gates and the times of opening were controlled by planning permissions. The Borough Council overlooked these permissions at the time the new barrier system was introduced [See Footnote C]; no variation or new planning permission to control opening times was obtained. The barriers at Spinney Hill Drive allow cars to enter and leave the University at all hours of the day and night, 360 days a year, with attendant disturbance to local residents. The barriers installed at the Ashleigh Drive entrance created additional problems for local residents and a campaign by them led to the barriers at that entrance being supplemented by substantial road and pedestrian gates. The Ashleigh Drive entrance is now covered by a planning permission and both gates are locked outside normal office hours. However there are still significant problems with student parking and speeding cars accessing the University from Ashleigh Drive.

The Coniston Crescent entrance is a statutory footpath and as such it should remain open. However the footpath is used by many schoolchildren making their way to the three secondary schools off Schofield Road. The road crossings leading to this entrance, particularly at Holywell Drive and Coniston Crescent, require more priority to be given to pedestrians. Student cars frequently obstruct these crossing points, thereby creating a danger to the children. The recent decision by the University to allow 24 hour opening of the University Library, (for which no planning permission is known) which is close to the Coniston entrance, is attracting illegal student parking both during the day and at night, with consequent disruption to those living nearby. If it were possible, the residents would support this entrance being closed at nighttime to prevent antisocial behaviour. [Residents report that the University is closing this entrance on 2 days each year, despite its footpath status!] The County Council's proposal for preference parking in this area would make matters worse as there would be no parking controls in the evening, Sunday and Bank Holidays.

The Forest Road pedestrian entrance also includes a locked entrance for use by emergency vehicles. There is a problem with badly parked cars at this entrance. Students who are parking cars on Outwoods Drive and Fairmount Drive also use this entrance. This problem would be lessened if the proposals outlined in 5.1 and 5.2 were implemented.

5.7 The University should be required, by planning constraint, to provide significantly more Pay and Display parking for casual parking. Residents have recorded a rise in part-time students using local roads as their car park of choice, other students, some on industrial or commercial placement are known to be parking on local roads, when using the University's facilities, as they are not allowed to park on campus.

5.8 Because planning permission is normally based on individual buildings and not on the cumulative growth of the campus, it is time the Council reviewed the totality of the University's impact on its immediate neighbours. The Council should pay particular attention to the University's parking policies, its entrances and its effect on the town as a whole.

Footnote C

C. Explanation obtained from the Borough Surveyor/Engineer at the time the barrier scheme was introduced. The planning department computer records for the old Town Council did not go back far enough to reveal the earlier, paper based, planning restrictions on the University entrances and they were overlooked at the time the new barriers were installed.

5.9 The Borough Council may know of other controls that can be implemented to achieve the aim of reducing traffic in the town and preventing student and staff parking on residential roads next to the campus.

6.0 Fifty-years of parking problems

6.1 Fifty-years of parking problems on the roads around the University has been caused entirely by the University's parking policies. The University, the old Town Council and the Borough Council have failed to anticipate or control this problem. The Borough Council's new leadership is asked resolve this problem once and for all. In doing so it is most important that the Borough Council anticipates the further expansion of the University together with its Sports Park and new Science Park that are currently under construction.

See Appendices 1 and 2, attached.

Appendix 1

A History of University-based parking problems

1950's

1958 The Principal of the College banned all first-year students from having cars on campus. Students then parked in surrounding roads and complaints from local residents began.

1959 The residents of Mountfields and Ashleigh Drive presented a petition to the Town Council to block off entrances to the campus and ban student cars from their roads. It was agreed that the Mountfields entrance only be closed.

1960's

1960 After more complaints, the Principal agreed to do all that he could to stop students parking in residential streets. He also agreed to install gates at the Ashleigh Drive and Spinney Hill entrances. These gates were subject to a planning condition that they would be closed from 6.30pm to 7.00am on weekdays all weekends and Bank Holidays.

1960–65 There were many complaints of indiscriminate university parking in the Holywell, Fairmount and Spinney Hill areas. There were two more petitions about university parking in this residential area.

1965 The College bought five private houses in Holywell Drive and sought temporary permission to convert their use to offices. This was permitted for 5 years. During the period 1965 - 1970 there were many complaints to the Town Clerk about indiscriminate University parking in the Holywell, Fairmount and Spinney Hill areas. There were two petitions complaining about university parking in these residential areas.

1970's

1970 The Council withdrew permission for the use of these houses on Holywell Drive as university offices on the grounds of *'nuisance to neighbours caused by indiscriminate parking by university staff, students and tradesmen.'* The Registrar then wrote to the Town Clerk offering to be "bound by the strictest of conditions if continued use of the offices be allowed". The Council agreed and imposed strict conditions; driveways to be blocked and locked, no vehicle or pedestrian access, no vehicles allowed to be parked on neighbouring roads. Etc.

1972 More complaints and a petition from residents because of indiscriminate parking in the Fairmount and Holywell area. The University agreed to close the Fairmount Drive entrance to vehicles and pedestrians.

1980's

Mid 1980's The University banned those students who live in town, and less than a mile away, from parking at the campus. So the students started to park on neighbouring roads again, particularly, Ashleigh, Mountfields, Spinney Hill, Coniston Crescent, Holywell Drive and Conway Crescent, Ashby Road.

Late 1980's The University continued to expand and more student accommodation was created privately in the area - Ashby Road to Station Street and from Frederick Street to Radmoor Road. The parking congestion brought about by the 'change of use' for these streets led to a lot of complaints. No planning permission was sought by the new university policy to house half its students in the town. The student population in the town grew from a few

hundred to nearly 7000 in less than ten years without planning constraint or restriction by the Council.

1990's

Early 1990's Because of the increase of student cars in the area, the first Residents' preference-parking scheme in the Frederick Street to Radmoor Road area was created. This was quickly extended into Westfield Drive because of displacement parking. A number of student houses had more than the allowed two cars, so these cars had to be moved away each day, they were not allowed to park on campus so roads next to the University suffered another surge in student parking.

Mid 1990's The Residents' Preference Parking Scheme had to be extended into the 'Golden Triangle' area. Ashby Road to Station Street. Again, some student houses had more than the permitted two cars parked on the road and during the day many cars moved to the roads next to the University, particularly New Ashby service road, Holywell Drive, Spinney Hill and Cotswold Close and Coniston Crescent. Subsequently, new developments to the North edge of this area have not been added into the controlled parking zone. Goods Yard Close and Wheeltappers Way now suffer excessive displacement parking.

Late 1990's Because of the continued increase in student parking in the Ashleigh, Mountfields, Spinney Hill, Holywell, and Coniston Drive areas residents made many complaints to the University, police and the Council.

The University South Side Residents' group was formed after two public meetings when over 100 angry residents demanded the University and the Council work together to solve the problem of university parking on roads next to the University. The residents' group proposed a residents' preference-parking scheme but the wider community rejected this.

2000's

2000-2002 The University South Side residents' group then worked to create an experimental 'Restricted Access Scheme' (Road Traffic Act 1984) that covered two areas of the town; - (1) Cotswold Close and the New Ashby Road service roads and (2) Forest Road to the University Campus from Epinal way to Kirkstone Drive. This proposal was accepted by the community and the University met the expense of signs and their installation. The residents' group tried to include Outwoods Drive in the scheme but this was turned down by a combination of the police and council objections.

2004 Leicestershire County Council confirmed the status of the Restricted Access Scheme and it was made permanent. Outwoods Drive continued to suffer greatly from displacement parking and many complaints were made.

2008 Outwoods Drive eventually received yellow lines, just at the entrance from Forest Road. Student parking continues to cause a nuisance at the Forest Road end of the Drive. Start of the County Council's review of parking on the West side of Loughborough. Petition presented from Garendon Road complaining about student parking in their area. Petition presented from the Kingfisher Way estate complaining about student parking in their area.

Appendix 2

In May 2000 the residents' group on the south side of the University prepared a report detailing the problems brought about by university parking in that area. The report was presented to the Chairman of the University Council for consideration by that body together with senior staff of the University. The report is still relevant and is included as further evidence of the strength of feeling within the community on the issue of the University not taking sufficient responsibility for parking by staff and students on residential roads next to the campus. (Note, the appendices from this document have not been included.)

Report on Off-Campus Traffic and Parking Generated by Loughborough University Students and Staff

Problems and Solutions

Prepared by representatives of the residents in the following roads adjacent to the University:

-

Ashleigh Drive
Charley Drive
Coniston Crescent
Derwent Drive

Holywell Drive
Mountfields Drive
Spinney Hill Drive

1. **Introduction**

For many years, the parking of University vehicles on residential roads around the University has been a serious nuisance. During the past few years the parking of such vehicles by students on roads adjacent to the University has increased to a point where it is now causing, in addition to very considerable inconvenience, a constant driving hazard to local residents and in some cases severe distress. The situation has turned good class residential areas of the town into what now can only be described as saturated long and short stay car parks and, it is to say the least, quite disgraceful. At the end of this report there are attached photographic evidence showing the intensive car parking on residential roads close to the University during term time and their equivalent state out of term. (Appendix 3) Note. Not attached with this document

Many residents have had great difficulty in getting their cars in and out of driveways and in many cases visitors have been unable to park. More seriously, and these are cases which cause the severe distress, ambulances have been unable to reach the homes of patients. This has resulted in a number of instances of patients being carried considerable distances from the house to an ambulance. In yet another case, a patient has had to forego day care on a number of occasions. Some cars are driven with excessive speed along roads flanked with parked vehicles and at least one accident has occurred, fortunately not a serious one, at a road junction in which parked vehicles apparently were a contributory factor.

Appendix 2 (cont)

These problems are clearly brought about because not all students are allowed to park their cars on campus or, in a minority of cases, because they prefer not to pay the charge imposed by the University for such parking. It is perfectly clear that the University does not have sufficient parking spaces on campus, a figure of just over 2,000 spaces for a population in excess of 14,000.

Pressure from local residents and local councillors brought about a public meeting on 18th March 1999, which lasted some two and half hours at which many concerns, including those of the above, were raised. This resulted in a liaison group being formed that has met only twice and from which, to date, very little positive action has resulted.

In our discussions with members of the University, it seems that they believe that the police and/or the local council should deal with these problems. It is clear from the latter's' representatives on the committee that they only have limited powers, which in no way are capable of resolving these problems. Their powers can only deal with instances of illegal and dangerous parking and obstructions, which are isolated instances compared with the widespread problem of massive indiscriminate parking.

It is self evident that the causes of these problems stem from the University, as they do not exist during vacation periods. We strongly believe that it is incumbent upon the University to take action to eliminate these problems. Such action would also have the additional positive effect of improving the currently low level of the relationships between the University and the townspeople.

In the following sections we put forward proposals for actions which could be taken by the University, and which are clearly within it's control, to deal with the concerns of the townspeople.

2. University Entrances

As early as May 1959, lack of parking space resulted in a petition to the local council for entrances from Mountfields Drive and Ashleigh Drive to be closed. (See the attached Appendix 1 that provides abstracts from council minutes charting the history of the parking problem). Subsequently the Mountfields Drive entrance was closed.

A similar action in 1972 resulted in the closure of the Fairmount Drive entrance.

Furthermore in September 1970 (see Appendix 1), the local council Planning Committee proposed that future entrances be restricted to the entrances already built on Ashby Road and the new entrance of the road which is now known as Epinal Way.

Up until that time, there was no reasonable south-north road link on the town-side of the campus. This now exists and we see no real reason why local residents in highly residential areas should be subjected to either the parking and its associated nuisance or the traffic these entrances generate.

Furthermore, the east-west access is strengthened by the fairly recent addition of the new entrance adjacent to the Gas Board Research Facilities. With the University's good internal road system, the entrances as defined 2.3, in our view are able to cope with the traffic. The only reason for keeping the residential entrances seems to be one of convenience.

Appendix 2 (Cont.)

We propose that the University close all of its entrances on the South side of the campus. Clearly the University has this right, as notices appeared that state that there is no Public Right Of Way or that the entrance is a Permissive Right of Way, which the University can withdraw. This will eliminate the parking and traffic problems experienced in this highly residential area. It would appear the local council is also anxious to safeguard the amenity of the area.

3. Car Parking on Campus

Once again there is ample evidence of lack of car parking spaces as is shown in the abstracts of local council minutes (see Appendix 1.) The minutes of May 1959 show that the Principal of the then college “had banned first year students from bringing vehicles onto campus”. In 1971, in requesting planning permission for a large car park, the reason given was to “ensure that adequate off street parking is available”

Soon afterwards the University seems to have reversed its thoughts for, in 1976 (see Appendix 1) it obtained permission to reduce the number of car parking spaces originally approved for the Students’ Union Building area from 200 to 75. Subsequently, facilities and buildings have been considerably extended.

In conversations with students who have parked their cars on our streets, many say that they would happily park on campus if permission were granted. As mentioned in the introduction, the car parking spaces available, around 2,000, seems woefully inadequate to serve a population of some 14,000 staff and students. Also the figure of 2,000 is currently being reduced by the construction of new buildings on areas of existing car parks. There will be additional requirements for staff only car parking to cater for staff employed in the new buildings, which is likely to displace even more students and so worsening the situation markedly.

We believe that the University should provide the parking spaces necessary to satisfy the demands from students and staff. Currently it does not allow students to park on its own internal roads. Why should not the same courtesy be extended to the local residents?

There would appear to be adequate areas within the University for additional car parking. At the West end of the campus there appears to be a space for further surface car parking. It would also seem possible to construct a multi-storey car park on the present Ashby Road car park.

In addition, our observations show that the existing car parks are not utilised to their full advantage and, in at least one instance, seem to be capable of being marked out more effectively i.e., could provide more car parking spaces.

We believe that the University should provide more car parking spaces and this in addition to closing of entrances through residential areas.

4. Control of Off Campus Parking

At the present time, the University has no definitive means of exercising control over students whose parking is causing the nuisance and distress outlined previously. It seems clear from conversations with students that there will be some who would not wish to pay to park on the campus.

Furthermore, it is our understanding that the University wishes to embrace the “environmentally friendly” approach to all relevant matters including transport. In this light, Appendix 2 (Cont.)

We would envisage that it might wish to persuade students not to use cars in and around the University and town.

To deal with both of the above issues, the University does have powers, through its Vice Chancellor, to discipline students for activities that take place beyond the actual boundaries of the University. Such powers have been invoked elsewhere to control students’ use of vehicles in areas surrounding a University. Appendix 2 is a copy of a disciplinary regulation, which has been in force at Cambridge University for many years. It will be noted that students need permission from the University to bring a vehicle within 10 miles of Great St. Mary’s Church, Cambridge.

Clearly, such a large exclusion zone is inappropriate for Loughborough. At the present moment, no student residing within 1 mile of the University is allowed to have a parking place on campus. Presumably within such a zone the University believes it is reasonable to expect students to either walk or cycle to the campus- particularly in view of both the environmentally friendly image the University wishes to promote and the sports image it has.

It is proposed that a regulation such as that used by Cambridge University, but using the University’s 1-mile zone, be incorporated into Loughborough University’s disciplinary code and traffic regulations. Furthermore, it should also prohibit student vehicles from parking within this zone in other than designated public parking areas.

In practical terms, as is done elsewhere, students will be required to register any vehicle which they may wish to use within the University or its precincts as defined in such a regulation in 4.5 above. This could quite easily be done with the addition of an item on the normal registration forms. The owner of the vehicle resulting in a complaint by residents to the University could then be traced and suitably dealt with.

5. Conclusions

University off campus parking generates much aggravation, inconvenience and, in some cases, severe distress to local Loughborough residents. The University has a responsibility and also the means to resolve these problems.

Remove traffic and parking from the residential areas adjacent to present entrances on the south-side of the campus, by following a local council proposal and closing fully, i.e. to pedestrians and vehicles, all entrances which generate these problems.

Provide sufficient on campus parking to accommodate all staff and students.

Have a disciplinary and/or traffic regulation which controls the bringing of vehicles to Loughborough University and its precincts as described in paragraphs 4.4 to 4.6.