

**WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

30 September 2015  
7.00 - 10.30 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Cantrill (Chair), Bick, Gehring, Gillespie, Holt, Holland, Ratcliffe, Cearns and Nethsingha

Leader of the Council: Councillor Herbert

**Officers:**

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement): Wendy Young

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Highways Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council): Evan Laughlin

**Others in Attendance:**

Police Inspector: Matt Johnson

Balfour Beatty: Mark Oldfield

Cambridge BID: Ed Quigley

Cambridge BID: Ian Sandison

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

**15/111/WCAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Reid and Hipkin.

Sergeants Misik and Wood also sent their apologies.

**15/112/WCAC Minutes**

Councillor Bick requested that the *item15/104/WCAC Replacement Bin Programme, under The Asset Manager (S&OS) and the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste response* had the additional text added (underlined).

- i. Future plans would be circulated to resident groups and Ward Councillors for their consideration and if there was no resident group's advice would be taken from Ward Councillors.

The minutes of the 8 July were then approved and signed by the Chair.

### **15/113/WCAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**

#### **15/105/WCAC: Double Yellow Lines on East Road:**

To investigate the possibility of extending the double yellow lines in the area and to enquire with the County Council's Parking Enforcement Officer if resources could be increased for patrolling in the area.

Councillor Cearns confirmed that he had submitted an application under the Local Highways Improvement Project Scheme.

#### **15/105/WCAC: Heavy goods vehicles on Huntingdon Road:**

To write to Cambridgeshire Constabulary supporting the need for action, highlighting the distress this issue has caused to residents and stressing the need of enforcement.

Councillor Cantrill confirmed that a letter would be sent to Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Hertfordshire Constabulary on this matter.

#### **15/105/WCAC Bollard on New Street**

Councillor Cearns advised that a new bollard would be installed by the City Council over the next two months. The County Council had offered to undertake the work but the City Council had declined **(CLOSED)**.

### **15/114/WCAC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations were declared.

### **15/115/WCAC Open Forum**

#### **1. Dick Baxter: Has the Beth Shalom Reform Community been given permission to put a gate in the wall facing onto Midsummer Common blocking entry into the Community Orchard?**

The Head of Property Services present at the meeting advised that the Council had not given permission to put a gate in the wall of the Synagogue garden area onto Midsummer Common or for any form of path from this gate.

The creation of a gate in the wall was not necessarily an issue the Council could take action on unless the gate was actually used. Any work on the

Common such as a footpath would need consent but until a proposal was made this could not be considered further. No such proposal had been received and no consent had been given.

City Council Officers were aware that part of the hedge had been removed to the rear of the former Yasume Club to enable the wall to be constructed. Permission was not given at the time to remove the hedge but assurances were given by the contractor that this would be reinstated. The Head of Property Services advised that this would be raised with the Synagogue by Officers to agree suitable reinstatement.

In relation to blocking the passageway, the Council did not have to give permission for it to be blocked but the Synagogue did not need the Council's permission to do this on their land.

The Synagogue had made its position with regard to the passageway very clear: it would allow access for those needing access or requesting it at all times with the exception of one day a year based on legal advice received so it did not become a public right of way.

The City Council were aware that the passageway had been closed off the week before the day of this meeting which was on the Jewish Day of Atonement. This had been a very busy day at the Synagogue and probably suited the Synagogue to choose that particular day. Council staff could have used the passageway on that day if they had needed to. If, due to anti-social behaviour, access was to be stopped, the Synagogue had advised they would be happy for community users to have access via a numerical keypad should the situation arise.

The Synagogue were aware of an application to the County Council to have a public right of way recognised. A pragmatic stance had been taken allowing access (apart from one day a year due to legal advice) pending this being determined. If the application determined a public right of way, the Synagogue would comply with the requirements.

The Head of Property Services concluded that the Council had also undertaken work to improve access to the Common. A new vehicular access had been created off Newmarket Road with a new bespoke fabricated gate and off road parking leading to this. It had also improved the access from the north with new steps leading up from the lower part of the Common.

**2. John Lawton: Could the Head of Property Services explain if there was public access to the Community Orchard why a sign had been installed at both ends of the passage stating 'Private No Right of Way.'**

The Head of Property Services advised that the Synagogue had maintained that they would not recognise this as a public right of way until determined by the County Council. Access would not be denied apart from one day a year. The Head of Property Services reiterated this was not common land.

Councillor Gillespie stated that he supported the resident's frustration and advised that the application to recognise this as common land and a public right of way had been submitted but would take approximately eighteen months to be determined.

Councillor Cantrill suggested that a meeting should be organised with Officers and residents to discuss the matter further **(ACTION)**.

**3. Mr Dick Baxter: What is the Council doing to stop cars parking all day outside the pub and restaurant on Midsummer Common? Has the Council gathered enough evidence over 15 years to raise a prosecution file and why has no formal action been taken. Should prosecution be determined by the Legal Department or City Councillors?**

Councillor Cantrill requested that a separate meeting be planned with residents, Ward Councillors and Officers to determine what action could be taken. This matter had been highlighted many times over the years. Advice would have been given by the Legal Department to Councillors who made the decision and it would be prudent to invite the relevant Legal Advisor to such a meeting **(ACTION)**.

Councillor Bick stated his frustration on this matter which had taken up a large amount of Councillor's time. Former Councillor Reiner had worked with the Legal Department to determine the legal action that could be taken. Enforcement was required otherwise this work would be a wasted effort.

**4. Bev Nicholson: The approach from the college side to Queen's Road crossing, close to the min roundabout could get very muddy. After there has been rain, there was usually a puddle there. Was there any possibility of some improvement to this, perhaps there is a creative way in which this can be improved?**

Councillor Cantrill read out the following statement from City Council's Project Leader for Streets and Open Spaces:

'The City Council believes that there is a low point on the edge of the worn grass verge/asphalted area, where water congregates. The County Council's Highways services are aware of it, but it is not an urgent priority for them given their resourcing pressures.

The County Council operates an annual programme of Local Highways Improvements for which this type of work would seem to be ideally suited. Unfortunately, though, applications have just closed for the latest round. The other possibility might be the City Council's Environmental Improvement Programme, although the future focus of this is likely to be on non-core highways responsibilities and functions. Another option might be through an approach to the College, given that the primary crossing movements here pass through college grounds on at least one side of the road'.

Evan Laughlin (County Council) who was present at the meeting asked if Ms Nicolson could put forward the question through the County's Contact Centre in order for Officers to explore this further. The County Council did inspect the road monthly and given the location near a crossing point may help to get something done.

**5. Alison Dick: Given that Madingley Rise is the worst congested entry point to the City, in preparation for the public consultation has an independent survey been undertaken to help understand who uses this road at peak times and their ultimate destination. This would and should assist in prioritising the City Deal funding?**

Councillor Bick stated that he did not know the answer to the question but would be happy to find out and respond direct.

**6. Penny Heath: Could the Committee advise who writes the questions to the public consultation such the A428/A1303 Madingley Road Corridor Scheme Options / Cambourne to Cambridge Bus Proposals and were they scrutinised by elected members before being made public?**

Councillor Nethsingha advised that Councillors had not been involved in the writing of the consultation due to the time scale. With regards to the mentioned questionnaires the public should respond as freely as they are able. It was important that residents did not just respond to the questions but gave open ended responses where ever they could.

**7. Penny Heath: Would the same planning / material considerations be given to the City Deal if they are building in a conservation area as there would be with any other planning application?**

Councillor Cearns replied that the proposal was that planning would be delegated to the Joint Development Control Committee who would follow the same planning governance when considering these applications.

**8. Richard Price: The City Council's website states that air quality in the City was routinely monitored and identified certain areas affected by high levels of nitrogen dioxide. Is this the only component of vehicle exhausts which are measured? The City Council's website refers to the Air Quality Action Plan and the Local Transport Plan 2006-11 which will be updated in 2014. Has this been done or will be it reviewed and did the County Council as the Highway Authority have any input? Was it not time to introduce a congestion charge and electric buses into the City?**

Councillor Cearns replied that the County Council did have a role and now the portfolio of public health was back under the County Council's control he would speak to the relevant Officers to investigate how the County Council was involved in that plan.

Councillor Bick advised there was a need for a wider traffic management approach within the City which required partnership working with multiple agencies including both the City and County Councils. This was another aspect of the City Deal which would consider a variety of different methods of traffic control in the City. These options had been highlighted in the local press and there was a need for the City Deal authorities to determine what mix of those options they deployed. It was hoped that this would be done in a transparent manner and believed that congestion charges should be one of these options.

Councillor Cantrill explained that a City Centre Access Study was currently being undertaken by external consultants who would put forward potential proposals that would go out to public consultation.

Councillor Gillespie advised that the City Council's Air Quality team were focusing on the taxi fleet as a priority to reduce air pollution. County Council were responsible for public transport and looking at ways at reducing admissions.

Ed Quigley from Cambridge Bid explained that the Bid Team would be looking at a project to reduce the amount of commercial vehicles entering into the City. It was hoped that the new scheme would be piloted the following year.

The following questions were put forward but due to the time limit were not answered but would be actioned.

**8. Mr Rosenstiel: The widening of the footpaths on Midsummer Common was open for public consultation but no information could be found on the City Council's website.**

**9. Susan Stobbs: The Auckland Road allotments adjacent to Midsummer Common were established on Common Land which the Council forgot to register properly under the Commons Registration Act 1965. I understand that it is not possible to rectify this error at the moment, but I would like to ask for reassurance that:**

- i. The County will undertake to register this land as Common land as soon as it is possible to do so.**
- ii. In the meantime the City council will give an assurance in writing that they will not seek to sell this land for development while it is wrongly designated as not being part of our Commons heritage.**

Councillor Cantrill requested that the matter of Auckland Road allotments be given to Officers to respond and be brought back to Committee as a future agenda item if necessary **(Action)**.

### **15/116/WCAC Policing & Safer Neighbourhoods - WAC 30 Sept 2015**

The Committee received a report from Inspector Wood regarding Policing and Safer neighbourhood trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the West Central Area Committee of the 07 January 2015 on the priorities that had been set. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details).

#### Comments from members of the public:

- i. Since the 20mph enforcement came into the effect in August 2010 on Maid's Causeway it would appear that no enforcement has been carried out. Could the Committee make this a Police priority?

- ii. Requested that cycling should be retained as a priority. There were a small minority of cyclists who continued to ride dangerously and examples of these cyclists need to be made.
- iii. Asked if the Police were aware that a large portion of the paths on Parkside were of dual use as the Police report had highlighted an issue with cyclists on Parkside.
- iv. Would like to bring to the Police attention the numerous vehicle drivers who jumped red lights particularly on Newmarket Road / Elizabeth Road roundabout. This was not just something that cyclists did.
- v. Enquired if the Police had been involved with the County's proposals to turn off street lights between midnight and 6.00am
- vi. Would like to see a Police presence in the areas where punt touts operated and enforcement undertaken as had witnessed money exchanging hands.
- vii. Requested anti-social cycling should be a priority.

#### Comments from the Committee:

- i. At the last Council meeting the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places stated that the byelaw to deal with illegal punt touts was not very effective. This was because it required individuals to provide their name and address which that was required for action to be taken to Council Officers. However these details did not have to be supplied to Officers.
- ii. Noted a significant increase in burglaries as shown in the report
- iii. Enquired what the view of the Police was if the County's proposals to switch off street lights occurred and would the Police address the issue of burglaries, particularly in Castle Ward which had seen an increase.
- iv. Asked if the Driver Speed Awareness Schemes for 20mph was available in Cambridge.
- v. Highlighted a minority of taxis showed disregard to pedestrian and cyclists and asked what could be done on this issue.
- vi. Noted that punt touts who stood outside the Guildhall on a daily basis sent the wrong message to the public that this was acceptable.
- vii. Enquired what areas of the City were covered by Speed Watch volunteers.
- viii. Suggested the next set of priorities should include dealing with illegal punt touts.
- ix. Requested that a report be brought to Committee on the Public Space Protection Orders **(ACTION)**.

In response the Police Inspector and Safer Communities Section Manager made the following statements:

- i. Enforcement had been undertaken on Maid's Causeway. Student Officers would spend three months on 20mph enforcement in the City Centre including Maid's Causeway. Statistics could not be broken down unless specifically requested to do so.
  - Speed Watch volunteers had covered Huntingdon Road, Trumpington Road and Tennyson Road.
  - The difficulty of the byelaw relating to punt touts meant that the City Council would have to go to Court and prove beyond reasonable doubt that the byelaw had been broken.
  - With a Public Space Protection Order a fixed penalty notice could be issued for a breach on the balance of probability.
  - Had not been aware /seen that money was being exchanged on the street between punt touts and the public. If witnessed this could be reported to the City Council's Safer Communities Team. The more information supplied would assist in gathering evidence to the Public Space Protection Order.
  - Comments had been made by the Police to the County Council on their proposals to switch off the street lights.
  - A significant factor relating to burglaries was that residents did lock their properties. Burglaries did not just take place at night.
  - Was aware of the dual use of paths on Parkside. The issues were outside of the school and opposite the Police Station.
  - The National Driver Offender Retraining Scheme (NDORS) has been rewritten to accommodate breaking 20mph speed limits and had been made available in Cambridge
  - Encouraged residents to sign up to the Neighbourhood Alert Scheme to report issues such as inconsiderate cyclists.

Resolved (**unanimously**) to set the following priorities:

- Night time economy
- Traffic Junction Enforcement ( All road users)
- 20mph in City Centre.

## **15/117/WCAC Cambridge BID**

The Chair welcomed Ed Quigley and Ian Sandison from Cambridge (Business Improvement District) BID to present a report on the work of the Business Improvement District team.

Mr Quigley provided details on the work of Cambridge BID which had been spread over four key work streams; Pride and Promotion, Welcoming and Vibrant, Safe and Clean and Business Support.

Comments from members of the public:

- i. Asked if the BID Team could ensure that the clearing of snow was undertaken in the City Centre.
- ii. Enquired about the role of the City Ambassadors and the work that they undertook and asked if the money could be better spent.
- iii. Queried if there had been any progress on re-introducing the pea pods.

Comments from the Committee:

- i. Asked the opinion of local businesses on the value of the day coach trips that brought large volume of tourists into the City but did not necessarily spend money during their visit.
- ii. Enquired how the BID Team promoted sustainability and encouraged local businesses to become greener and aware of their social responsibility.
- iii. Enquired into the promotion of the Ethical Buying Scheme in Cambridge
- iv. Queried how the work of street cleaning differed to that of the City Council's street team.
- v. Requested that information collected by the City Ambassadors such as data on illegal punt touts was passed to Councillors as well as Officers.

In response to the comments made, Mr Quigley and Mr Sandison made the following statements:

- i. The focus is to encourage those visitors who visit the City to stay longer and contribute to the economy.
- ii. Regarding the clearing of snow the BID Team should not replace services that should be run by the local authorities as this is what business rates were paid for but the BID Cleansing Team would clear the snow if absolutely necessary and had the time to do so.
- iii. The BID Team delivered the deep cleansing that the City Council did not have the equipment or resources to do. There was a partnership working and a pilot scheme would be starting to encourage recycling, changing peoples' behaviour called 'bin it your way'.

- iv. The projects delivered by the BID Team were set by the local businesses and the organisation was separate to the City Council which was not funded by public funds.
- v. The role of the City Ambassador was created as local businesses had said that they would like to see a 'Visitor Welcome Service'. The Ambassador provided excellent customer services and undertook work for the businesses in the City.
- vi. Cambridge BID aimed to promote good business practice in an open and transparent way and was recently accredited as a living wage employee. Currently working on recycling projects and reducing the volume of delivery vehicles into the City to promote a healthier environment.
- vii. Waiting for costing regarding the installation of Pea Pods and would be prepared to the part fund this scheme.
- viii. Planning to meet with the Student Hub to discuss the Ethical Guide to Buying in Cambridge.

### **15/118/WCAC Environmental Data Reports - WAC**

The Committee received a report from the Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) regarding environmental data which provided an overview of City Council Refuse and Environment and Streets and Open Spaces service activity relating to the geographical area served by the West/Central Area Committee.

#### Comments from members of the public:

- i. Asked if the paths on Coe Fen and Midsummer Common could be cleaned after the cattle had left.
- ii. Enquired if planning notices could be taken down when they were out of date.
- iii. Queried what kind of permission was required to put up oversized posters or banners on railings.
- iv. Thanked the Council for installing two bins on King Street outside the takeaway premises and stated it was surprising that it was not the owner's responsibility.

#### Comments from the Committee

- i. Would like to highlight how effective the cleaning of the runnels had been and would like to keep the project running.
- ii. There were two recycling centres in Market Ward with one in Adam and Eve Street which was also experiencing issues

- iii. Asked what was possibility there was for partnership working with the University for such events as the May Ball and if the Council worked with the May Ball Committees, if not whether this could be looked into
- iv. Expressed surprised that some of the work undertaken during a ward blitz was not carried out on a regular basis.
- v. Queried what lessons had been learnt from the ward blitzes and what could be done more of, particularly in Market ward.
- vi. There was still an issue with pink bags not being collected and left out for days at a time.
- vii. Enquired if the City Council could clear the weeds from the kerbs that grew up from the road.
- viii. Requested that the clearing of leaves in Newnham be added to the ward blitz.

In response the Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) made the following statements:

- i. Could not answer if the paths were specifically cleaned after the cattle had left but would speak with the relevant Officers.
- ii. Acknowledged there had been a particular issue with fly tipping, particularly at Adam and Eve Street. It was an error in the report not to have included Adam and Eve Street in Market Ward.
- iii. Ward blitzes allowed areas of the City that had not been previously focused on, such as the cleaning of the bike racks by the City Rangers. Ward blitzes were then analysed to determine what lessons could be learnt.
- iv. City Rangers would be intrusted to take down out of date signage.
- v. Posters that were advertising non-commercial organisations did not require planning permission but permission from the landowner such as highways or churches.
- vi. Banners that were not authorised were taken straight down.
- vii. Could not answer the question regarding the May Balls but would speak with the relevant Officers and bring back further information to a future meeting.
- viii. Aware of the problem with the pink bags and would speak with the Operation Managers on this matter.
- ix. New regulations had come into force which enabled the Council additional powers to serve a notice to those proprietors who were causing harm to the environment.
- x. A sweeper would be sent out to clear the weeds and soil from the paths. If access was blocked the paths would have to be cleaned manually which took times. The probation team had also undertaken work.

- i. The clearing of the leaves in Newnham would be included as part of the ward blitz in November.

Evan Laughlin from the County Council confirmed that the County Council carried weed kill treatments three times a year undertaken by the City Council.

The Committee:

Resolved (Unanimously) to agree the following priorities, including the additional priority (No 7).

1. Enforcement and City Ranger patrols in the City Centre to address issues of illegally deposited trade waste and littering.  
Justification: Littering and illegal deposited waste if left un-investigated can cause ongoing issues and encourage antisocial behaviour. This priority has been included as a continuation to balance the high standard of trade waste management and litter patrols already existing in the West/Central area and to continue to build upon this work further.
2. Early morning, daytime and weekend dog warden patrols for dog fouling on Grantchester Street, Lammas Land and surrounding areas.  
Justification: Dog fouling continues to be identified by the Dog Warden and a number of individuals spoken to have not been aware of dog control orders; this recommendation remains in order to balance education and enforcement. Further reports have been received that has identified an increase of dog fouling on the routes to and from the local school.
3. Proactive small scale graffiti and flyposting removal by City Rangers across the West/Central area.  
Justification: Work already conducted by the City Rangers has been positive and enhanced the areas where cleared. This recommendation is to continue this work as a priority for all the rangers covering the West/Central areas.
4. Regular litter picks and enforcement monitoring in New Square, Drummer Street, Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street  
Justification: Foot traffic in these areas continues to be high, particularly at the beginning of the new university term and continued focus on these areas is recommended.

5. Ownership and cleansing of Garrett Hostel Lane ditches  
Justification: Work to identify the ownership of Garrett Hostel Lane ditches is ongoing. Work on maintaining the cleanliness of the ditches is ongoing and remains a focus for the Operations team.
- 6 Jesus Green ditch cleansing – looking at frequency of activity  
Justification: Work has already been undertaken in this area since July / August time, however in order to measure the success of this activity it is necessary to examine the effectiveness of weekly cleansing over a lengthy period of time and the period October to December would allow that.
- 7 Joint working patrols to address the issues of fly tipping at public recycling points.  
Justification: Fly tipping at Lammas Land and Castle Park recycling centre account for an increase in the fly tipping figures across the West area. Enforcement and ranger work to focus on these areas will balance education and enforcement to deter this problem.

### **15/119/WCAC Street Lighting within the City of Cambridge**

The Chair welcomed Mark Oldfield from Balfour Beatty to present a report on the next phase of the lighting programme within the historic core of the City.

Mr Oldfield explained that he had been looking at an improvement plan on how this could be implemented and how installation could be improved. The first was to reduce the length of time to one week for each installation. Secondly, only one 'gang' with a dedicated supervisor would be allocated to undertake the work and thirdly it was important to liaise with as many stakeholders as possible. This was to ensure minimum disruption when the work would be undertaken.

A customer vehicle would be close to the work to discuss any issues if they occurred or any previous issues that had not been concluded and to discuss the programme of works.

#### Comments from members of the public:

- i. Asked if a timetable of works could be made available to the public.
- ii. Enquired if Tree Officers were contacted before any works were undertaken.

- iii. Queried if wall mounted lights would be replaced by new lighting columns in the City Centre.
- iv. Noted that there was equipment left all over the City that needed to be collected and referenced the barriers on Christ Pieces.
- v. Highlighted that one of the 10metre columns on Jesus Lane had been replaced with an 8 metre column.
- vi. Enquired when the work would be carried out in North Terrace as was advised that this would be undertaken in the first week of May.
- vii. Lights on the footpath on Midsummer Common are going to be replaced with silver columns and it was requested that they should be replaced with black columns.
- viii. Maids Causeway was full of grade II listed buildings with old gas style lamps and these should not be replaced with silver columns. There had been no consultation with residents associations or community groups as part of the heritage street light replacement process. Residents may have been able to finance some of the lighting but were not given the option.
- ix. Asked when work would be completed on 'Reality Checkpoint' at Parker's Piece.

#### Comments from the Committee:

- i. A number of complaints had been received from residents in the Newnham ward regarding the lack of response from Balfour Beatty to communication they had sent.
- ii. A number of complaints from residents were with regards to how the streets had been left unusable as they were cluttered with equipment.

#### In response to the comments made Mr Oldfield made the following statements:

- iii. Lightingcambridgeshire.com will have a live timetable of works.
- iv. Signage would be left on barriers to explain why the equipment had been left.
- v. Would check the method statements for work to be undertaken around the trees in the City and would talk to the relevant organisations.
- vi. Wall units would remain wall mounted in the City Centre.
- vii. Would instruct the sub-contractors to remove barriers and any other equipment that had been left.
- viii. The smaller column on Jesus Lane was temporary and would be replaced.
- ix. Noted the issues that had been raised by Councillors which was why the approach had changed to the work undertaken in the City Centre.

- x. A timetable would be published on where the customer vehicle would be placed.
- xi. Confirmed would chase when the work would be carried out on North Terrace.
- xii. Explore the option of black columns on Maids Causeway.

### **15/120/WCAC Street Lighting – County Council Proposals**

The Committee received a report from the Safer Communities Manager, as introduced by the Leader of the City Council, Councillor Herbert.

The report outlined that following major budgetary reviews, the County Council proposed to dim street lighting and to turn off lights in a number of areas across the County overnight, with midnight to 6am the current proposed hours.

As the proposals would have a significant impact in Cambridge City, the City Council have raised a number of concerns with the County Council around the safety of the public, if the planned lighting goes through as currently proposed.

Councillor Herbert advised that he felt that there was no justification for the lights to be switched off and asked the Committee and public for feedback on this matter.

#### Comments from members of the public:

- i. Queried what energy savings would be made.
- ii. Enquired what regulations allowed street lights to be dimmed or switched off.
- iii. New streets lights had been placed in the City and now it was planned to switch them off. Why did they have to be replaced in the first instance?
- iv. Asked if individual streets could pay to implement lights as a result of safety concerns due to lack of lighting.
- v. Noted that there was too much light pollution in some areas of the City.
- vi. Suggested that areas that were well lit by 'business lighting' should be switched off only.

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

- i. Asked Councillors to inform the County Council that this proposal should not be approved.
- ii. Enormous difference between the lights being dimmed and switched off.

- iii. Feedback received from many Parish Councillors was that they were happy to have the lights switched off. However Cambridge as a City with a night time economy was different.
- iv. Could have an impact on congestion in the City with shift workers choosing to take the car instead of biking to and from work.
- v. Expressed safety concerns due to a lack of light as more of Cambridge University moved to the west of the City, the labs on this side of the City were used throughout the day and night.
- vi. The switching off the lights would create a gender imbalance
- vii. The proposal to switch off the street lights would increase stress levels in the City and have a major negative impact on women. There could also be a possible rise in hate crime.
- viii. It would have been beneficial to have an Officer from the County Council present but there had not been enough notice given.
- ix. The County Council were not obliged to light all roads.
- x. The County Council was under funded. If money could not be saved in this area, savings would have to be made elsewhere.
- xi. Queried if the City Council would be willing to contribute to the lights costs in the City.
- xii. Lights were justified in order to get more efficiency savings.
- xiii. Third party financial contributions towards lights were invited from parish councils in rural areas (to pay for their own street lights), but this scheme was not being implemented in the City.
- xiv. An on-line consultation regarding lighting was planned in the next few months. In the meantime, members of the public could make representations to the County Council Highways Committee.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)** to note the Strategy and Resources Committee Report on the County Council lighting proposal and to comment on any areas of concern that they would like taken up with the County in the planned negotiations.

### **15/121/WCAC Public Notices From the Chair**

Councillor Cantrill advised that the public consultation for the A428/A1303 Madingley Road Corridor Scheme Options would begin on 12 October 2015.

**15/122/WCAC Record of Attendance**

- i. 29 members of the public
- ii. 9 Councillors
- iii. 4 Cambridge City Officers
- iv. 1 Cambridgeshire County Officer
- v. 1 Balfour Beatty Representative
- vi. 2 Cambridge BID Representatives
- ii. 1 Member of Cambridgeshire Constabulary

The meeting ended at 10.30 pm

**CHAIR**