

**SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE**

13 October 2014  
7.00 - 9.55 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Meftah (Chair), Ashton, Avery, Blackhurst, Dryden, McPherson, Moore, Pippas

**Area Committee Members:** County Councillors Crawford and Taylor

Councillor Pippas left after the vote on item 14/60/SAC

**Officers:**

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield  
Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly  
Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Team Leader - Cycling Projects, County Council: Mike Davies  
Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally  
Police Sergeant: Chris Horton

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**14/52/SAC Appointment of Chair**

The Committee Manager took the Chair whilst the South Area Committee elected a Chair.

Following the resignation of former city councillor Sue Birtles, the position of chair of the South Area Committee became vacant.

The Area Committee was asked if it wished to appoint a Chair or to wait until its next meeting on 8 December, which would be after the by-election in Queen Edith's on 13 November.

Councillor Dryden proposed, and Councillor McPherson seconded, the nomination of Councillor Meftah as Chair. They suggested electing a Vice Chair 8 December.

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions)** that Councillor Meftah be Chair for the remainder of the municipal year.

Councillor Meftah assumed the Chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

The Committee Manager advised the committee the election of a Chair could be put on the 8 December meeting agenda at the request of a Councillor after the by-election in Queen Edith's on 13 November when South Area Committee (SAC) was back to its full membership of nine members.

Post meeting note: The deadline for requesting this as an agenda item is close Wednesday 26 November 2014.

#### **14/53/SAC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Ashwood.

#### **14/54/SAC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Ashton	14/61/SAC	Personal: Chairman of the Cherry Hinton Resident's Association.
Councillor Avery	14/61/SAC	Personal: Lives on the Accordia Estate.
Councillors Dryden and McPherson	14/61/SAC	Personal: Member of the Cherry Hinton Resident's Association.
Councillor Moore	14/61/SAC	Personal: Member of Friends of Nightingale Rec.

#### **14/55/SAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 18 August 2014 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

#### **14/56/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes**

**14/48/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Ashton has written to Netherhall School to ask how South Area Committee and the community can support the school to improve following a recent inspection.**

**Councillor Birtles to follow this up as no response has been received from Netherhall School.”**

Councillor Birtles has previously written to Netherhall and not received a reply.

**14/49/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Blackhurst to query the progress of pedestrian and cycle access to the busway as this is not in place from the Kaleidoscope site as specified in the planning application. Response to be feedback to South Area Committee and member of public who raised the query.”**

Councillor Blackhurst said action was imminent on the Kaleidoscope site.

**14/49/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillors Crawford and Taylor to look into feasibility and funding for upgrading County Council Shape Your Place webpages.”**

The issue has been resolved.

**14/49/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Ashton to liaise with Councillor McPherson and member of public who raised the issue of closing Church End and Rosemary Lane to traffic.**

**Councillor Crawford to raise a Local Highway Improvement request upon receipt of petition text.”**

Councillor Ashton met with County Council representatives. Petitioner to give further details in the Open Forum section of the meeting (14/57/SAC).

Councillor Crawford has received acknowledgement of her Local Highway Improvement request from county officers.

Councillor Taylor said the County Council had received 38 Local Highway Improvement requests. The Joint Area Committee would vote on these at its next meeting.

**14/57/SAC Open Forum**

- 1. Mr Carpen said he had liaised with Netherhall School and they were keen to engage with the wider community. The Head Teacher was aware there was an outstanding action to respond to SAC. Mr Carpen asked if the Chair could liaise with the Head Teacher or Chair of Governors to investigate ways of working together.**
  
- 2. Mr Watson updated SAC on the Church End Traffic: Resident's Survey results.**
  - **This survey was prompted by his experience of observing a large volume of traffic using Church End and Rosemary Lane to bypass the traffic lights at the Cherry Hinton High Street junction with Coldhams Lane. Earlier this year, he distributed 71 leaflets to the residents of Church End and Rosemary Lane and set up an e-petition to see how many of his neighbours were also concerned about the volume and speed of traffic. Forty one residents signed the petition.**
  - **Residents of Church End, Rosemary Lane and side roads felt strongly that there was too much traffic through Church End and it was travelling too fast. They also believe that something should be done as a matter of urgency. They feel the best solution would be to make Church End and Rosemary Lane a no through road. Although, they are concerned that this solution would cause them too much inconvenience and are unprepared to commit to this.**
  - **Mr Watson proposed that the council looked at his findings and offered some combination of solutions; then consult with the neighbourhood over their implementation and installation.**

SAC thanked Mr Watson for his efforts to date. The traffic issue had been reviewed in Church End circa 2013 and in Cherry Hinton circa 2002. Residents had expressed the same opinions then: They wanted action taken, but not to be inconvenienced by any actions. Rising bollards and the city 20 MPH project were suggested as options to consider.

- 3. Mr Bower said the traffic lights at the end of Coldham's Lane were not responsive to traffic.**

Councillor Blackhurst said busway access to the Kaleidoscope site was pending. Access to Hills Road was at an impasse due to land ownership issues, so no further progress was expected currently.

Councillor Avery said a ramp from Hills Road to the busway was being built opposite the bridge.

**4. Mr Taylor made the following points:**

- **Requested a breakdown of statistics in Police reports to Area Committees. This would help priority setting.**
- **Suggested Police reports were misleading, community resolutions were a small part of the out of court options available.**
- **Requested further information on Appeal routes eg on anti-social behaviour.**
- **Asked for clearer signage on public space protection orders so members of the public were aware of bye-laws in force.**

**5. A member of the public asked why former Councillor Birtles had resigned.**

Councillor Dryden said this was for personal reasons.

### **14/58/SAC Cherry Hinton High Street S106 Project**

The Committee received a verbal report from the County Council's Team Leader - Cycling Projects.

The report outlined:

- The County Council Cabinet agreed s106 projects in 2013.
- A public consultation was undertaken on options in October 2013. A good level of responses were received.
- The County Council then bid for, and received, Department of Transport funding. This was time limited, so Officers prioritised spending projects requiring Department of Transport funding over s106 ones.
- Work was now being undertaken on s106 projects and a consultation will be undertaken in March 2015.
- County and City Council Officers were jointly working on projects of shared interest.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Projects such as traffic lights at the Robin Hood junction had been delayed.
- ii. Residents and Councillors were extremely unhappy at the delays to s106 projects.

In response to Members' questions the Team Leader said the following:

- i. He could not guarantee the consultation would go ahead in March 2015 as delays had occurred in the past when the County Council had bid for, and received, Department of Transport funding. Officers would do their best to undertake the consultation as expected.
- ii. The consultation would focus on a number of options, not be a blank sheet like the previous one.
- iii. Undertook to share a detailed report on the 2013 consultation with SAC. Councillors had only seen the summary report.
- iv. The City 20 MPH project would complement county s106 schemes ie there would be join up not duplication of work.
- v. The Department of Transport set deadlines for spending its funding. This needed to be bid for, and spent, within time limits. S106 transport corridor contributions were not time limited, so not given the same priority for officer time.

#### **14/59/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods - South Area Committee**

The Committee received a report from Police Sergeant Horton regarding policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 23 June 2014. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details). Previous priorities and engagement activity noted in the report were:

- i. Combat the supply of drugs in the South area.
- ii. Target dwelling burglary in the Cherry Hinton and Trumpington wards.
- iii. Target ASB associated with the "Cambridge Lakes" area.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- i. Drug dealing and drug use affecting Trumpington and Queen Edith's Wards. Also associated anti-social behaviour eg dumping of needles in Queen Edith's Ward.
- ii. Links between alcohol/drugs and violent crime.
- iii. Breakdown of statistics in police area committee reports to help set priorities. The Sergeant undertook to provide these in future reports.
- iv. Work to reduce cycle crime across the city. This could be covered under the umbrella of road safety to address various issues including criminality.
- v. Home safety and crime prevention initiatives across the city, with particular focus on Queen Edith's Ward.

In response to Members' questions the Sergeant answered:

- i. Financial investigations were routinely undertaken when money was seized after drugs busts.
- ii. Burglary was not recommended as a priority. There had been a spike in figures (agenda page 19 due to historic issues that had been addressed).
- iii. The Police had not mapped if dwelling burglaries had occurred in areas without street lighting eg where it had been taken away. They would consider doing so in future.
- iv. It was a political decision by councilors where/not to have street lighting.
- v. Domestic violence was included in violent crime figures. A rise may have occurred due to increased reporting and the growth in numbers of dwelling in the city. A future breakdown of figures may help address this.
- vi. There was no quantifiable link between youth unemployment and violent crime. Repeat offending was more of an issue, the intention was to carry on with early intervention work.

Members of the public made statements and asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. **Mr Bower supported work to reduce cycle crime across the city.**
2. **Mr John asked why violent crime was not recommended as a police priority.**

Sergeant Horton said that violent crime was always treated as a serious issue. The breakdown of statistics in future would allow SAC to target particular issues/areas.

Sergeant Horton requested a change to the recommendations. He proposed adding road safety to priority 3:

- Address cycling offences with the return of students and darker evenings (will compliment effort against cycle crime **and road safety**).

The amendment was **agreed nem con**.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

- i. Continue work against Class A dealers.
- ii. Address cycle crime in response to citywide spike.

- iii. Address cycling offences with the return of students and darker evenings (will compliment effort against cycle crime and road safety).
- iv. Dwelling burglary

### **14/60/SAC Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014**

The Committee received a report from the Safer Communities Section Manager. A report on the introduction of the new Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 was taken to Strategy and Resources Committee on 29 September 2014. The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation at 2.1.4 in the report to “take the report to Area Committees and request that they review if any areas merit consideration for Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs)”.

In response to Members’ questions the Safer Communities Section Manager said the following:

- i. The legislation allowed the community to request action if they were not satisfied with how their Anti-social Behaviour complaints were being dealt with. Area Committees could recommend areas for consideration which they feel may merit from the introduction of PSPOs Consultation would take place with the Police and Police and Crime Commissioner on any proposed PSPOs.
- ii. The law gave victims a say in offender’s punishment through restorative justice. This was found to be an effective measure against low level crime.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)**:

- i. To note the new measures being introduced to address anti-social behaviour, as detailed in the full Strategy and Resources report attached to the Officer’s report.
- ii. Identified areas meriting consideration for Public Space Protection Orders:
  - Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground.

### **14/61/SAC SAC S106 Devolved Decision-Making: Taking Stock and Moving Forward**

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager.

The report outlined a report is due to be considered by the council’s Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 16 October, which proposes

arrangements for the next rounds of S106 priority-setting. A short presentation was made to the SAC in order to highlight what these recommended changes (if approved) would mean for the South Area.

SAC was not asked to make any priority-setting decisions on 13 October. This was an opportunity to brief councillors on the proposed new arrangements and to provide an update on the progress of S106-funded projects previously prioritised by SAC.

The Urban Growth Project Manager brought the report up to date by saying:

- i. The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places would be happy to meet SAC Members individually or in groups if they have issues. Alternatively, she would be prepared to come to a future SAC meeting if that would be helpful.
- ii. Guidance would be published in future on the developer contributions webpage ([www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106)).
- iii. A S106 priority-setting report would be brought to a future SAC in early 2015 and would include an update on devolved S106 funding available by contribution type.

A member of the public asked a question as set out below.

**1. Mr John asked if s106 funding was ring fenced to particular wards.**

Funding was devolved to area committees, not specific wards.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)** to note:

- i. The proposed arrangements for the third and fourth priority-setting rounds in 2014/15 and 2015/16.
- ii. The progress being made on S106-funded projects that have been prioritised by the South Area Committee in 2012/13 and 2013/14.

**14/62/SAC Citywide 20mph Project - Phase 3 Consultation**

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager. He also circulated the late Appendix D document.

The report outlined the overall programme for the proposed City-Wide Cambridge 20mph Project. It also brought the project to SAC in order to request feedback and input to the consultation plans for Phase 3 of the project (the South & West/Central Area).

In response to Members' questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager said the following:

- i. The traffic survey data was accurate.
- ii. The 20 MPH project would only apply to category C roads. It may encroach a little into South Cambridgeshire in order to be practicable.
- iii. By rolling out the project across the city, it would have a greater impact than smaller scale projects. There was a high level of support ie 70%.
- iv. Terrisham Drift (as referred to in the Officer's report) is also known as Hinton Road. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager undertook to cross-reference details with Ordinance Survey data.
- v. Every single registered Cambridge address (personal and business) would get a copy of the questionnaire by post. It was also available on-line.
- vi. Police were part of the project board from day one. Enforcement would be undertaken as per 30 MPH areas.
- vii. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager was working with the County Council Major Projects Team so that City Council projects would complement County Council work.

A member of the public asked a question as set out below.

**1. Mr Bower asked for questionnaire process details.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded:

- He would ensure questions were identical in the postal and on-line versions of the questionnaire.
- The 20 MPH project was being phased as it was too large to undertake in one go.
- The impact of the north phase would be evaluated in 2-3 years. The Council will review general speeding issue learning points.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)** to:

- i. Note the project programme, and previous approvals from Environment Scrutiny Committee, and to note the proposed consultation area, consultation method, and content for Phase 3.
- ii. Provide comments and recommendations to the Executive Councillor for Planning, Policy and Transport (Councillor Kevin Blencowe) on the proposed consultation arrangements. Particularly with regard to which roads/sections of roads are specifically identified within Question 3 of the Officer's report.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm

**CHAIR**