

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

14 October 2010

7.00 - 10.35 pm

**Present:** Councillors Herbert (Chair), Wright (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Brown, Hart, Marchant-Daisley, Pogonowski, Saunders, Shah, Smart, Walker, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell.

County Councillors Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

**Officers Present:** Peter Carter – Principal Development Control Manager,  
Richard Preston, Cambridgeshire County Council  
Andrew Preston - Environmental Projects Manager  
Toni Birkin – Committee Manager

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****10/40/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Shah and County Councillors Bourke and Harrison.

**10/41/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Minutes Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Cllr Saunders	10/46/EAC	Personal and Prejudicial: Friend of Mill Road Cemetery
Cllr Brown	10/45/EAC	Personal: Lives in area covered by 20 mph limit

**10/42/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2010 were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment Cllr Walker was not present for the planning items.

## **10/43/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

### **Q. Georgie Deards**

Ms Deard's read a note of thanks on behalf of Gerri Bird. The Friends with Disabilities Group have won their slot back at the Cherry Hinton Village Centre, after it had been taken away. This was a campaign by the Cambridge Forum of Disabled People and Friends with Disabilities. We would like to thank the East Area Committee for their help. We start back on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

### **Cllr Walker**

There is an outstanding issue regarding the lighting in Occupation Road. Can the committee have an update?

### **Change to Agenda Order**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

### **10/44/EAC Open Forum**

**Q. Mr Greer: Many Petersfield residents, especially those with young children, are very appreciative of the Council's investment in improved play park facilities in the area. However, the reported level of drug dealing that is taking place on and in the area of at least one of these parks is causing concerns that these could become 'no go' areas for families with young children. Is any coordinated action being taken to eradicate this problem or is the fear that this could end as up as wasted investment justified?**

Answer: Cllr Walker has spoken to the local neighbourhood watch members. The City Council are working with the Police to resolve the issues. Cllr Walker will follow up with Mr Greer outside the meeting.

Other members suggested that CCTV has failed to resolve the issue and local residents have not been satisfied with Police responses, This issues will be discussed at the next meeting when the police will be present. York Street remains a Police priority.

**Q. Georgie Deards: A private contractor has been appointed to take over the maintenance of council housing. Tenants were happy with the existing arrangements and have experienced problems in the past when external contactors have been employed. Tenants were not consulted on this decision and loyal employees have lost jobs. Will the decent homes programme continue?**

Cllr Smart responded. Maintenance work can be divided in to two areas: response and voids which covers day to day unexpected maintenance and planned maintenance for larger, long term works which can be planned ahead. The day to day maintenance will remain in house. However, the Council was advised in a recent Audit Inspection that it should test the market for planned work to see if better value could be achieved. The Housing Management Board, which includes tenant representative, made the decision to go to tender in September 2009. The in house tender was unsuccessful. Staff will be transferred to the new contractor under the TUPE (Transfer Undertaking of Public Employees) and their conditions of employment and pensions will be protected. Tenants have voted on two occasions to retain the City Council as their landlord but retaining in house services was never part of the discussion.

In response to questions, Cllr Smart reassured tenants that the quality of the work will be monitored and that problems experienced with an electrical contractor in the past would not be repeated.

**Q. Andrew Bowers: Did the planned meeting with ARU (Anglia Ruskin University) regarding the problems at Tiverton House happen? Has the problem in the are resumed now that the new intake of students has arrived?**

Cllr Herbert responded. ARU are now taking responsibility for their students and are working with local councillors to persuade the landlord to address the issues. There has been one serious incident in recent weeks which occurs between 4am and 6am, after the night warden had left at 3am. The Forum area remains a police priority.

**Q. Mr Green: Will lessons learnt here be applied to student accommodation in the CB1 scheme?**

Tiverton House was sold without restrictions in order to maximise financial returns and its location n a quiet residential area was not fully considered. The CB1 accommodation is part of a much larger, planned development.

## **10/45/EAC Update on County Highways Issues in East Area: Question and Answer with Richard Preston**

The Chair welcomed Richard Preston, Head of Road Safety and Parking Services at Cambridgeshire County Council's . A number of issues for discussion and questions had been raised in advance of the meeting and it was agreed to take them in four broad groups: CB1, Road Safety, New Plans and Parking.

### CB1

In response to questions, Mr Preston stated that the current bus stops arrangement at the railway station uses land which is not part of the public highway and therefore the County Council has no control over the future use of the land. Further consultations will continue with Ward Councillors and residents.

**Q. Frank Gawthrop: How much consideration had been given to the safety of the future student population on the CB1 site whose natural route to college will be to cycle down Tenison Road.**

There will be funding of £250,000 from the developer of the site. However, this is unlikely to meet the wish list of safety and mitigation measures requested by residents. The County Council has no extra money for this project. Alternative sources of funding are being investigated.

**Q. The current road works on Hills Road Bridge are causing more disruption than the previous work. Is there a reason for this?**

The road layout for previous work caused fewer delays, however, cyclists reported a number of safety concerns. The current work uses a safer design for cyclists.

**Q. Mr Green: The future road layout of the bridge, connections and lights, will produce a pinch point on a main route into the City. Could a more elegant arrangement be found using land from a private slip road?**

The final design has not yet been approved by the Area Joint Committee and Mr Preston will give an answer to this question at a later date.

### Road Safety

**Issues raised by members and addressed by Mr Preston:**

Ditton Lane / Newmarket Road junction. This is currently not a high priority. Alternative funding sources are being examined but are unlikely to be successful. Any work in this area would cause considerable delays.

Coldhams Lane / Newmarket Road junction. A new fresh bid for an upgraded traffic light system is currently under consideration.

Abbey Walk / Newmarket Road junction. This crossing has been upgraded but members have raised concerns about safety. Pedestrians cannot see the, safe to cross, indications once they have stepped off the pavement. Road markings still visible from the old system also confuse pedestrians into thinking they must stop in the middle of the road. An onsite meeting with the signal team is planned for the near future to see what improvements can be achieved. An extra second may be added to the beeping time. The problem may be due to the width of the road, which is wider than most signal span foot crossings. The change to crossing styles is a central government decision and it may be a case of education of the public to understand them.

McDonalds roundabout. This has been on the list for improvements for three years and residents feel it is dangerous. Alternative traffic arrangements were discussed. Improvements would be dependent on future funding sources. Any improvements would be very expensive and are not currently a priority.

Ditton Lane: The cycle lane has gaps can this be addressed? Additional housing in the area means that some crossings are not in the best location anymore. On site walkabout suggested.

Cllr Walker asked if action could be taken about dangerous parking on Mill Road. Mr Preston responded that restrictions are in place and the road is well patrolled.

Speeding in Coleridge Road was discussed. A 20mph limit for this road is not planned as this is only applied to streets with a mean average no more than of 24mph or less. Alternative speed reduction measures are unlikely due to the cost.

**Q. Lynette Gilbert: The highways department is looking for additional land to widen Newmarket Road. However, the impact on pedestrians and community cohesion of an even wider main road through this area appears to have been missing from the debate.**

Mr Preston agreed that this is a valid point that may have been overlooked.

**Q. Peter Vary: The Mill Road, East Road junction is dangerous for pedestrians as the motorists will be looking at traffic coming from the right and not at pedestrians crossing from the left. Many school children and young people use this crossing point. A proper crossing would be helpful.**

The Area Joint Committee have looked at this junction in the past. However, there is no money for improvements. This area is not priority as, while it may look dangerous, to date there have been no serious incidents or accidents.

**Q. Speedwatch: Has any progress been made?**

The initiative is delivered by the Police. It has a long history in rural areas but less is known about its success in urban areas.

### Future Plans and Parking

Cross authority working is on-going to review the transport strategy. A congestion charge has not been ruled out.

Members asked if the probation service would be able to provide labour to paint the railings along the river at Riverside. This was not thought possible.

Mill Road is due to have new street lights and consultation is on-going about the introduction of a 20mph limit which would include some side streets. There is a potential for some street-scape work to improve the area subject to funding availability.

A review of the outer ring road is on-going. This will include a review of parking issues and improvements have already been achieved in the Milton Road area.

The Perne Road crossing was due to be considered at AJC shortly and can then proceed subject to funding.

The repeater signs for the 20mph signs were discussed as some members felt they were not frequent enough.

Parking at Rustat Road was discussed. The road is used by rail commuters who park all day. The use of yellow lines was dismissed as the parking is not a

safety issues. A residents parking zone could be considered and a site visit was suggested.

Redundant yellow lines, which are adding to local parking pressures in the Tennison Road area, were discussed. Mr Preston suggested an audit to see why the lines were no longer needed. However, there is no funding to carry out any improvement work.

Members were concerned that when St Matthews Gardens is adopted and clamping is no longer permitted, parking problems will escalate. Working with the residents to resolve the problem was agreed to be the best way forward.

**Q. Mr Bower: What is happening about the Cherry Hinton Road cycle lane?**

This work will be going ahead shortly following an audit agreed as necessary due to the number of side streets crossing the cycle lane route.

**10/46/EAC Community Development and Leisure Grants**

The committee received a report from the Grants Manager of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation regarding Community Development Grants.

Cllr Saunders, having declared a prejudicial interest, vacated the room for the discussion regarding Mill Road Cemetery.

The committee considered the projects separately and resolved to agreed the recommendations detailed below by the following:

**Resolved by a vote of 9 to 0** to agreed Friends of Mill Road Cemetery grant.  
**Resolved by a vote of 10 to 0 (unanimously)** to agree Cherrytrees Over 50s grant.

Community Development current applications.				Available: £10,465	
CCF ID	Group	Project	Requested £	Recommended from Area Committee Grants £	Offer from other CCF funds £

WEB13102	Friends of Mill Road Cemetery	a contribution to revenue costs, the purchase of gardening materials (spring bulbs, bird boxes etc) and a shed for storage.	411	411	0
2559	Cherrytrees Over 50s	to pay for a Christmas trip and a show.	900	900	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,311</b>	<b>1,311</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Remaining</b>			<b>9,154</b>	<b>9,154</b>	

### 10/47/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The committee received a report from the Environmental Projects Officer regarding the Environmental improvements Programme.

#### I. Perne Road Pedestrian Crossing.

Following consultation, minor amendments have been made to the proposal. The proposals have received widespread support for local residents and schools.

The committee **resolved by a vote of 10 to 0 (unanimously)** to approve the scheme for implementation at an estimated cost of £65,000

#### II. Romsey Planting

The committee **resolved by a vote of 10 to 0 (unanimously)** to approve the scheme for implementation at an estimated cost of £22,000.

#### III. Cherry Hinton Road Shop Forecourts

Members were anxious to see results from this project as I had been under consideration for a very long time. The officer was praised for finally resolving the problems that had delayed the project.

The committee **resolved by a vote of 10 to 0 (unanimously)** to approve implementation with no further consultation at an estimated cost of £70,000



#### **IV. Rayson Way, Fairsford Place & Stone Street**

This item had generated considerable public interest and concern and the committee decided to take the items individually.

##### Rayson Way

Cllr Hart submitted a petition, signed by 115 residents of the Rayson Way area opposing the introduction of waiting restriction. Residents' of Rayson Way suggested the problems were caused by Football fans parking in an area where there is very limited parking. There is no off road parking for residents of first floor properties.

Members were concerned that this project was not what residents wanted and that a lot of time and money had been wasted. A site visit along with the Highways Authority was suggested to see if a solution more in keeping with local need was possible.

The committee **resolved by 10 votes to 0 (unanimously)** to agree to abandon the proposal to introduce "no waiting" restrictions on Rayson Way based on the strong negative response from residents received thus far.

##### Fairsford Place

Residents were concerned that the proposal went beyond what was required and was increase rather than resolve the problems. They raised the following points:

1. Parking near the entrance to the road causes a problem in terms of safety.
2. A covenant attached to the properties allows one car per household to be parked in the owners garage. However, residents either do not do this or have more than one car.
3. Residents who want to use their garages are often unable to do so because of parked cars.
4. Some residents have successfully resolved the problem with their own no parking signs
5. Residents will provide large planters to limit the opportunity for parking on the junction. This will be discussed with officer to ensure safety.

Residents generally felt that they could resolve the problems for themselves. A site visit could be arranged at a later date if needed.

Cllr Marchant–Daisley proposed the addition of a second recommendation to read:

To invite the Highways Authority to consult on the alternative of limited restrictions (yellow lines) on the corners at the entry to the street only, and if the Authority refuses to do so, to request that officers provide a written explanation of the reason for the refusal.

Some members expressed concerned about the tone of the amendment and felt that it was unduly aggressive.

The committee **resolved**:

1. To agree to abandon the proposal to introduce “no waiting” restrictions on Fairsford Place based on the strong negative response from residents received thus far by **10 votes to 0 (unanimously)**.
2. To invite the Highways Authority to consult on the alternative of limited restrictions (yellow lines) on the corners at the entry to the street only, and if the Authority refuses to do so, to request that officers provide a written explanation of the reason for the refusal **by 8 votes to 2**.

### Stone Street

The committee **resolved**:

3. To agree to abandon the proposal to introduce “no waiting” restrictions on Stone Street based on the strong negative response from residents received thus far by **10 votes to 0 (unanimously)**.
4. To invite the Highways Authority to consult on the alternative of limited restrictions (yellow lines) on the corners at the entry to the street only, and if the Authority refuses to do so, to request that officers provide a written explanation of the reason for the refusal **by 8 votes to 2**.

### **10/48/EAC Improve Your Neighbourhood**

The committee received a report for the Recreation Officer regarding the Improve Your Neighbourhood scheme. The committee requested a briefing note giving them more information about the projects.

The committee **resolved by a vote of 7 to 0 with 3 abstentions** to agree the following recommendations.

#### **EAST Area Project Recommendations.**

1	New equipment for play area - River Lane.
2	Playground improvements - Abbey pool playground. Needs more modern equipment and improved condition to encourage more use and better treatment of the playground and will thus be safer to use.

#### **CITYWIDE Project Recommendations.**

1	Joint facility upgrade Kelsey Kerridge & Parkside Pools - Conversion of part of top floor (unused open air area) of existing multistorey car park to provide additional changing room facilities at Kelsey Kerridge and multi use "Dry Land" training facility for Cambridge Dive Development Centre for use by dive squads and also for wider community for trampolining, gymnastic conditioning, general exercise use.
2	Sand beach volleyball court - in a public park.
3	Installation of Parkour outdoor sites - In response to Police reported incidences of youth jumping and climbing over properties in the City and the general lack of targeted over 16 youth provision. The sites would allow a 'safe' place to practice free running. Sites can be supervised or free-to-access depending upon design requirements and there would be a code of practice and qualification structure introduced for any formal provision.
4	Tree planting scheme - Jesus Green and Midsummer Common.
5	Cambridge climbing centre.

### 10/49/EAC Planning Applications

**10a** 10/0763/FUL 38 Thorley Road, Cambridge

The committee received an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling.

The committee received representations in support of the application from Mrs Hardingham the applicant who raised the following points:

- Growing family with elderly dependents needs extra space.
- Extension will be no bigger than the conservatory that has been removed,
- Proposal more sympathetic to original building than other in the area.
- Would not reduce light to neighbour any more than the existing hedge.

### Resolved (by 7 to 2)

1. To reject of officers recommendation to refuse the application and 2. to approve the application for the following reasons (subject to the standard condition CO1A relating to commencement)

## REASONS FOR APPROVAL

1. Having heard the introduction of the officer and the explanation of the proposal by the applicant, the Committee discussed the proposal and came to the view that it was acceptable. This was because given the aspect and the height and design of the proposal, and the presence of the hedge on the common boundary, the extension would not have an undue impact on the outlook from the adjacent property, 36 Thorley Road, nor create an unreasonable sense of enclosure. For these reasons the proposal was not considered to be in conflict with policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations.

For further detail and to discuss the application with the officer who attended the Committee meeting, Peter Carter 01223 457155 or [peter.carter@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:peter.carter@cambridge.gov.uk) .

The meeting ended at 10.35 pm

**CHAIR**