

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

7 April 2016
7.00 - 10.15 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Baigent, Benstead, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, Roberts, Robertson, Sinnott, C. Smart, Smith (Vice-Chair), Moghadas, Walsh and Whitehead

Area Committee Members: County Councillors, Moghadas, Walsh and Whitehead

Officers:

Community Funding & Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement: Wendy Young

Project Manager – Development Unit: John Richards

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Sports & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/1/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Owers and County Councillor Kavanagh.

16/2/EAC Declarations Of Interest

No declarations were made.

16/3/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 28 January 2016 were approved as a correct record.

16/4/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

Open Forum 29/10/16 Cllr Roberts to arrange for Officers to call Ms Cranmer to discuss scientific readings for Tenison Road.

Scientific readings provided to Ms Cranmer, issue closed.

Open Forum 28/1/16 Cllr Johnson to follow up issue raised by resident at Maltings Close.

A full response was provided to the resident and the County Council also provided a detailed response to the questions that were asked at the Area Committee meeting.

Open Forum 28/1/16 Cllr Roberts to discuss issue with bins on pavements with Mrs Cranmer.

Jo Dicks was due to meet with Mrs Cranmer on site to discuss this issue.

Open Forum 28/1/16 Cllr Herbert to look into community noticeboards to display information about Councillors and Environmental Improvement projects.

Coleridge Councillors put an Environmental Improvement Programme bid in for boards at the last Committee but the bid wasn't successful. Councillors will continue to seek alternative funding.

Open Forum 28/1/16 Cllr Roberts to look into Coleridge Recreational Ground, query regarding toilets being closed.

Matter was being investigated and would be reported back with the toilet review at the end of the summer.

Open Forum 28/1/16 Cllr Walsh to arrange briefing note on Traffic Regulation Order

Cllr Walsh confirmed that a briefing note had been added to the East Area Committee agenda webpage and was available for Councillors to view. Referred to a question and answer note that had been prepared by Richard Wood on the parking issue.

16/5/EAC Open Forum

- 1. Ms Cranmer asked the Committee to support the proposal that bollards be installed at Mill Road / Tenison Road junction. The County Council removed the bollards as they were too expensive to replace following vehicle damage. She commented that when the traffic calming measures went to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee there were 16 bollards by the northern access road. This was an extremely dangerous road and a slightly raised platform was not good enough. Requested that bollards were put in place and if this was not possible that railings were put in place. She also requested a reduction in taxi licences.**

Councillor Walsh stated that whilst approval may have been given by the Joint Area Committee, the County Council was in a different financial position now. He requested the Committee's support to lobby for bollards.

Councillor Benstead stated that there were two types of taxi vehicle, hackney carriages and private hire vehicles. The Council regulated the number of hackney carriage vehicles, which were currently limited to 323 vehicle licences and new plates could only be issued in exceptional circumstances. The Council could not by law limit the number of private hire vehicles.

Councillor Robertson commented that the issue about Tenison Road had been raised at the recent taxi forum.

- 2. Sandra Stamp raised an issue about the amount of traffic that was parking in Romsey Terrace and queried if the same approach could be taken to that in Victoria Road to ensure only visitor access.**

Councillor Moghadas stated that she had put in a request to the Head of Highways at the County Council previously regarding access for residents only. He had arranged for the signage to be renewed but confirmed that she would raise the issue again and try to arrange a meeting with him.

Councillor Whitehead confirmed that for residents to get a parking scheme a survey had to be undertaken and there needed to be a sufficient number of residents that were willing to purchase a permit from the County Council.

Councillor Sinnott commented that the sign at Victoria Road had been erected by residents.

- 3. Roy Stamp raised an issue to do with a planning application and Romsey Terrace. He stated that objections had been submitted and**

a Development Control Forum (DCF) arranged but this did not go ahead because the applicant had submitted an appeal, this was disappointing as residents were denied their chance to speak. Requested support from Councillors to request a formal hearing for the appeal as there was certain criteria that had to be satisfied before this could be permitted.

Councillor Smart commented that if the Committee provided support this could help with the request for a formal hearing. Residents in Romsey were worried that this application would set a precedent.

Councillor Blencowe stated that the Council still had to provide the recommendation that it would have given as part of the application process.

Action: Cllr Blencowe to speak with the Planning Manager to request that representations were made by the Council that the planning appeal was conducted by way of a formal hearing.

- 4. Richard Taylor raised a query regarding the proposals for the public highway at the riverside and stated that he would encourage a proper consultation on the proposals. He also asked how a balanced view could be reached as it seemed that a small number of residents who wanted parking spaces were being prioritised over other residents of Cambridge.**

Councillor Whitehead stated that improvement ideas were being formulated regarding the Stourbridge end of riverside prior to a formal consultation being undertaken. The Council had to take into account all views including residents, cyclists and pedestrians to try and come up with a solution which was acceptable to all.

- 5. Mr Bringham raised several questions regarding Romsey Town Square plan which questioned:**
 - Why the consultation did not reflect the brief that was agreed at the East Area residents' workshop in 2013 and asked if the plans could be revised to reflect the aspirations of the 2013 residents' Workshop.**
 - What the point of the 2013 residents' workshop was if it was ignored.**
 - Why the process had taken so long.**
 - Why it failed to include public art funding.**

- **Cavendish Road was not intended to be an ‘instead of this’ project.**
- **Where the joined-up working was with the County Council.**

Councillor Smith confirmed that there was a desire for something stronger than the current proposals. Would need to let the consultation run but would need a lot of follow up discussions and she was happy to work with residents on this.

Councillor Smart accepted that residents were disappointed but emphasised it was important to make sure that this was stage one in the process.

Councillor Moghadas commented that there had been a big backlog of s106 projects in 2013 and that this was on the ‘to do’ list.

Action: Requested a review of the Romsey Town Square S106 project proposals following the March/April 2016 consultation exercise.

- 6. Jean Glasberg asked Officers to identify sites for street scene improvements which included bike parking along the length of Mill Road to improve the public realm, this could include preliminary negotiations with landlords, costings and priorities so that if money was available in the future there were no delays like those experienced by the Romsey Town Square scheme.**

Councillor Baigent commented that there had already been discussion on this issue with the previous question and that a better more thought-through proposals were required.

- 7. Richard Harvey asked whether something could be done about the number of taxis that turned right onto Devonshire Road. Some of the street furniture was not correctly orientated. The County Council needed to find another way in which to enforce this. He also asked whether a mobile CCTV camera could be requested.**

Councillor Sinnott commented that she had seen 5 cars at 8:30 turn onto Devonshire Road. She had spoken with the Police and they had said that if they saw this then they would be able to take action. There were road signs present. It would not be possible for an officer to be in attendance at the site all the time.

Councillor Benstead stated that if the taxi had a City Council plate to take a picture and to send through to the Licensing Department. If pictures were sent

in of a taxi that was licensed by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) then these would be passed onto SCDC.

Councillor Blencowe commented that CCTV requests could be made on a temporary basis.

Councillor Smart commented that Ward Councillors could make requests for CCTV cameras to the Police.

Action: Cllr Sinnott confirmed that she would follow up whether a mobile CCTV camera could be installed there with the Police.

- 8. Frank Gawthrop asked when Dog Control/Exclusion Orders were going to be introduced. Green areas at Ravensworth Gardens and Mill Road were unusable and covered in dog mess.**

Councillor Roberts confirmed that looking at the issue of dog fouling; the dog wardens' hours had been doubled. There had been 12 fixed penalty notices issued for dog fouling and it was expected that this number would increase. The money collected from fines issued under the fixed penalty notices was put back into community projects to clean areas up. The number of dog bins available per ward had been increased.

The Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement stated that the Council was prohibited by law to introduce a Dog Control Order programme. Mobile CCTV cameras had been requested to try and resolve this issue. They would try to see whether dog poo bag dispensers provided on site would make any difference. Dog wardens undertook patrols. There was no evidence who was responsible, Officers had undertaken door knocks to try and find out who was responsible.

- 9. Dr Eva raised the following questions and asked what action the Committee planned to take:**
 - After many years of campaigning, the Riverside railings were recently painted. Within a few weeks they were chipped due to the action of houseboat tenants undertaking boat repair work and due to the daily chopping and hammering when wood was broken up for fuel.**
 - Air pollution. The issue of unpleasant, quite possibly toxic smoke has been a regular complaint from residents of Riverside since unlicensed mooring first started in 2006.**

- **At the East Area Committee meeting on 28th January 2016 an update was requested to a question posed in November 2012 with regard to the provision of cycle parking in East Area. The minutes from the January 2016 meeting state "Councillor Blencowe read a statement from the Cycling Officer and apologised to Dr Eva on behalf of the Committee for the lack of information that had thus far been provided." He repeated his question to the committee:**

On 29 November 2012 he proposed that within the area covered by the EAC, the Committee resolved that 'for buildings where there exists a community or civic interest the Committee will ensure that all such buildings are made cycle-friendly by providing an adequate provision of free and safe cycle stands by December 2013'.

Following discussion, the EAC agreed that where there exists a civic or community interest, EAC would strive to ensure that all such buildings were made cycle friendly by providing adequate free and safe cycle parking by December 2013.

The EAC were asked to confirm:

- 1) How many buildings of civic or community interest were identified within the EAC region?**
- 2) How many of these lacked adequate free and safe cycle parking?**
- 3) How many sites had since been fitted with adequate free and safe cycle parking?**
- 4) How many sites (if any) remained without adequate free and safe cycle parking, and (if such still exist) what plans were in place to correct the situation?"**

Councillor Blencowe read out responses which had been provided by Officers:

- The Railings were owned by the County Council and were redecorated through the Environmental Improvement Programme that the City Council operated. The boats on the Riverside were either regulated by a set of terms and conditions or were dealt with through ongoing enforcement action. The terms and conditions could be amended to cover boat repair works especially if they impacted on neighbouring properties.
- Smoke from a premises could be held to be a statutory nuisance, if the smoke came from one property and affected another (a boat would count as a property) and created an unlawful interference with the complainants use or enjoyment of their property. If (as it seemed) the

problem just effected the public highway then it was unlikely to be something the Council could tackle under normal nuisance provisions. Where complaints of this nature were made to the Council, Environmental Health were able to attend the complainants property whilst the smoke was being generated and undertake a nuisance assessment. It was confirmed to the best of Officer's knowledge the offer of a visit had not been taken up.

- The moorings were not in a smoke control area so the Clean Air Act could not be used to enforce. Local Air Quality Management legislation required that air quality standards were regularly breached at a sensitive receptor (for example a domestic premises, school or hospital) this was unlikely from such a small source.

Boaters were aware that smokeless fuel was to be used at all times. When the Council received reports of boaters who did not follow this, they were spoken to by a member of the Council's Enforcement Team to stop, and asked to replace it with smokeless fuel.

- Funding would be sought from the City Deal project for a comprehensive audit of cycle parking provision at civic buildings around the city and to provide improved cycle parking where need was identified. Work had been undertaken to identify these buildings which included community centres and polling stations.
- A recent survey of community buildings had provided some information which was being further investigated. Some, such as the River Lane Centre and Barnwell Baptist Church, had already had cycle parking installed through either the Cycle Cambridge scheme or the City and County Council Joint-funded Cycleways Minor Schemes Budget.
- The information gathered as part of the Council's community facilities review asked a general question about the availability of cycle racks at community facilities.
- Of the 75 that completed the Council's survey across the city 52 of the 67 that answered this question stated they did have cycle racks and 15 said no.
Of the 28 facilities in the east that responded to the survey 25 replied to this question, 20 stating yes and 5 stating no.

Councillor Roberts confirmed that additional paint had been bought to touch up the railings but that this work could not be completed until the issue of mooring conditions had been looked into.

Action: Cllr Roberts confirmed that he would look into the issues of mooring conditions and air pollution issue which had been raised.

Action: Baseline review of cycle provision at community facilities and application for City Deal funding to fund this.

- 10. Mr Lucas-Smith asked what was happening with the Eastern Gate proposals as there was money which could be sought from developers which was not being achieved.**

Councillor Johnson commented that £50,000 had been allocated for a feasibility study so that officers could evaluate plans that had come out of the supplementary planning document (SPD).

Following the Committee further information was sought from Glen Richardson of the Urban Design Team responsible for the formation of the Eastern Gate SPD. He commented that if what Mr Lucas-Smith was asking for was for developers to fund cycling improvements in the immediate area then the answer would be that because we do not have a specific identified scheme yet against which we could target funding it would be premature and unreasonable to ask for money at present.

- 11. Mr Bond stated that the refurbishment of the Cherry Trees Day Centre was able to go ahead by virtue of s106 agreement funding. He was conscious that the Centre did not have adequate cycle parking provision however the provision of cycle parking could inhibit access for other users of the Centre. He also provided an update on the management structure of the Cherry Trees Day Centre. He said that Age UK Cambridgeshire and Age UK Peterborough had merged to become Age UK Cambridgeshire & Peterborough. Trustees were going to be appointed in the following week. Gloria Collier had been appointed as the new Chief Executive.**

- 12. Ms Shepherd asked about secondary school provision in Abbey ward.**

Councillor Whitehead commented that there was not a lot of land in Abbey ward where a new school could be situated. The County Council had been looking at three possible sites and now a fourth had become available. These were all being considered with a view to being put out to public consultation.

- 13. Ms Rice asked about the condition of Carter Bridge and whether there were any plans to renovate it as it had deteriorated over the last 2 years.**

Councillor Roberts confirmed that the bridge was owned by Network Rail but that the City Council cleaned it. The number of times that the bridge was cleaned had been increased to 3 times a week and there was a particular sweeper that was used to clean it. People should not smoke on the bridge but they still did and this created rubbish. Consideration had been given to putting a slim-line bin in the middle of the bridge. No smoking and dog fouling signs had been erected. The exterior of the bridge was not in a good condition as it had not been cleaned since it was built. The exterior would need scaffolding to be erected so that it could be cleaned as the electricity lines created a problem in cleaning the bridge.

Councillor Smart commented that the street lights were the responsibility of the County Council and that one third of the lights did not work and some were dirty.

Action: Cllr Roberts to check with Don Blair whether the Council was cleaning the Carter Bridge at the correct rate.

14. A representative from the Body Works Dance Studio stated that it was unlikely that they would be able to move into the Howard Mallet building and asked for advice how to go forward.

Councillor Blencowe commented that the current change of use application from community use to educational use was likely to go to May /June Planning Committee. Members of the public had the ability to make public comment on the planning application.

Councillor Robertson stated that he was aware that the owners of the site had reneged on the agreement that they had with Body Works. He had asked that the application went to Planning Committee. The public needed to make representations on the application.

Councillor Sinnott commented that the site had been designated in the local plan as a community use.

16/6/EAC Environmental Data Reports - EAC

The Committee received a report from the Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement.

The report outlined an overview of City Council Refuse and Environment and Streets and Open Spaces service activity relating to the geographical area served by the East Area Committee. The report identified the reactive and proactive service actions undertaken in the previous quarter, including the requested priority targets, and reported back on the recommended issues and associated actions. It also included key officer contacts for the reporting of waste and refuse and public realm issues.

The following were suggestions for Members on what action could be considered for priority within the East Area for the quarter of March to May 2016:

Continuing Priorities:

1. Enforcement Patrols to tackle fly tipping at Riverside, Ashbury Close, Ditton Fields and St Matthews Street area.
2. Early morning, daytime and weekend patrols for dog fouling at the following locations:
 - St Thomas's Square and Road
 - Ravensworth Gardens play areas
 - Thorpe Way play area
 - St Bedes Crescent
 - Coleridge Recreation Ground
3. Enforcement investigation and action to deal with littering problems Newmarket Road from Tesco and around the areas of Wickes and Staples.
4. Enforcement patrols to undertake enforcement action against abandoned, untaxed and nuisance vehicles in the East Area.

New suggested priority:

5. Illegal camping barbeque and green space patrols at Stourbridge Common.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. Commented that the Riverside walkabout was a success.
- ii. Questioned whether the railings on Mill Road Railway Bridge could be painted by the community payback team, if so then funding would need to be found to pay for the paint.
- iii. Expressed thanks for bins on Wycliffe Road.
- iv. Questioned how much waste was going into landfill.

- v. Asked whether Priority 3 could be extended to include the other side of the road up to B&Q.
- vi. Commented that the graffiti was back in the Elizabeth Way underpass.

Action: Wendy Young to arrange for dog poo bag dispenser at Ravensworth Gardens. Also to investigate whether Network Rail's railing could be painted.

Following discussion, Members **unanimously resolved** to approve the priorities for action above subject to the inclusion in Priority 3 to include the B&Q area on the opposite side of the road.

16/7/EAC 2015/16 S106 Priority-Setting: Follow-up Report

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager. The report set out the options for a couple of local outdoor sports projects. These proposals would enable the Area Committee to make use of its devolved s106 funds (which included time limited s106 contributions from Coleridge Ward) whilst leaving money for outdoor sports in the next s106 priority setting round.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. Expressed support for outdoor fitness equipment, however stated that Officers needed to be mindful of the type of materials that were used for the equipment so that it blended in with the context of the area.
- ii. Welcomed the upgrade of the pavilion but commented that some football teams found it difficult to be able to find a site to play locally.
- iii. Questioned whether S106 funding from outdoor sports was available for a MUGA (multi-use games area) at the East Barnwell Community Centre.

The Sports & Recreation Manager made the following comment:

- i. The outdoor sports equipment for Abbey was intended to offer more resistance and "boot camp" based workouts for people and would not be constructed of wooden materials as this material was more suitable for trim trails.

The Urban Growth Project Manager also commented that:

- ii. The Area Committee's previous allocation of S106 funding for East Barnwell community centre had been for the community centre, not for a multi-use games area. Devolved S106 outdoor sports funding was still available for local sports projects, albeit that it was running down. The

Area Committee would be able to consider any eligible future proposal for a multi-games area at the community centre, alongside other proposals for funding.

The Committee

Resolved unanimously to:

- i. Allocate up to £70,000 of its devolved outdoor sports s106 contributions for improvements to the pavilion at Coleridge Recreation Ground, subject to approval of the business case.
- ii. Allocate £40,000 of its devolved outdoor sports s106 contributions for outdoor fitness training equipment next to the Astro turf pitch by Abbey Pool, subject to the approval of the business case.

16/8/EAC EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The Committee received a report from the Project Manager – Development Unit regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP). The report requested that the Committee determined which EIP schemes were allocated funding as part of the 2016-17 programme as set out in appendix A of the Officer's report.

The Project Manager – Development Unit referred to the amendment sheet which had been circulated to members and published on the Council's website which updated typographical errors within the report.

The Committee asked the following questions regarding the report:

- i. For project E1 it was requested that the funding be increased by £1000 so that it could include a community noticeboard and map of the Chisholm Trail.
- ii. It was commented that for the project for Romsey they would like to see the car parking spaces removed and replaced with cycle parking.

Mr Wakefield made the following comments:

- i. He referred to Anglia Ruskin University which had done some simple landscaping around their new building.
- ii. Requested that project E7 was prioritised so that the new building could be linked in with the rest of the area.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)** to approve the following schemes: E1 with additional £1000 funding, E2, E7 (as revised on

the amendments sheet), E8, E9, E12, to combine E13 &14 with a budget of £5000 and E3 would be a reserve project in the event that there was any unspent funding.

16/9/EAC Strategic Review of Community Provision

The Committee received a report from Jackie Hanson, the Community Funding & Development Manager regarding the work being undertaken as part of the strategic review of community provision.

The Committee were also provided with a list of community facilities identified to date across the city that were invited to complete a survey and a map of those that had responded to the facility audit.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. The map of community facilities which had been provided highlighted the areas which had the most deprivation and did not have community facilities; thought would need to be given to this information.
- ii. The map of community facilities was useful as it highlighted where a need was and if it was being met.
- iii. Encouraged people to take part in the consultation.
- iv. Questioned whether the facilities which had received funding were providing facilities to the whole of the community.

The Community Funding & Development Manager commented that:

- i. During the consultation more community facilities were being identified and would be included in the review.
- ii. Community facilities would be encouraged to take part in the consultation.
- iii. There were agreements in place with facilities who had received s106 agreement funding to monitor the use of the facility. Mystery shopping checks were also undertaken so that the Council could check that the facility was meeting the agreed use.
- iv. The facilities had been plotted by type on the plan, this did not necessarily show the number of facilities in the ward or the capacity of the facility in the ward.

The Committee

Resolved unanimously to:

- i. Note the work of the review and initial findings of the city-wide community facilities audit.
- ii. Promote the 'call for evidence' stage of the review and encourage stakeholders to feed in their experience and evidence as detailed in sections 5 and 6 of the Officer's report.

16/10/EAC Area Committee Community Grants 2016-17

The Committee received a report from Jackie Hanson, the Community Funding & Development Manager which detailed applications received for 2016-17 funding for projects in the East Area.

The Committee questioned the allocation of funding to Mill Road Bridges.

The Community Funding & Development Manager confirmed that it was anticipated that the Mill Road Bridges organisation would become less dependent on East Area Committee funding.

The Committee

Resolved unanimously to:

- i. Approve the awards detailed in appendix 1 of the Officer's report and summarised in paragraph 2.2 of the Officer's report.

16/11/EAC East Area Committee Dates 2016/17

The following dates were agreed:

- 7 July 2016
- 13 October 2016
- 12 January 2017
- 6 April 2017

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

CHAIR