

**WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

29 September 2016  
7.05 - 10.20 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Cantrill (Chair), Holt (Vice-Chair), Bick, Gillespie, Holland Ratcliffe

**Area Committee Member:** County Councillor Cearns

**Area Committee Members:** City and County Councillors Hipkin and Nethsinga

**Other Councillors in Attendance:** D. Baigent

**Officers:**

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep

New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown

Principal Planner (City): John Evans

Senior Engineer: John Richards

Enforcement Officer: Nick Kester

Enforcement Officer: Jamie Lambert

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Local Liaison Forum Chair: Helen Bradbury

Greater Cambridge City Deal Director: Tanya Sheridan

Greater Cambridge City Deal Lead on City Access: Hilary Holden

Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Manager: David Allatt

Balfour Beatty Representative

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

**16/38/WAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Gehring.

**16/39/WAC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**16/40/WAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**16/41/WAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>LEAD OFFICER/MEMBER</b>	<b>TIMESCALE</b>	<b>PROGRESS</b>
<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>Councillor Holland asked for follow up on her query (P13): Identify who was responsible for the maintenance of red pillar boxes eg in Newnham.</p>	<p>Councillor Holland</p> <p>Head of Property Services (as WCAC Lead Officer)</p> <p>Senior Engineer (in case EIP relevant)</p>	<p>Feedback at next WCAC 29/09/16</p>	<p>The red pillar boxes are the responsibility of the Royal Mail. One in question is on Storey's Way. There are others across the city that are badly in need of paint.</p> <p>Councillor Holland specifically wanted work undertaken on pillar boxes in Newnham, Market and Castle Wards.</p>
<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>Councillor Holland asked for follow up on her query (P19): Warwick Road / Windsor Road passageway. Now seeking drawings to pursue pavement</p>	<p>Councillor Holland</p>		<p>Issue goes back over 18 months.</p> <p>Councillor Holland was informed a demarcation line could not be implemented on the</p>

issue.			pavement to separate cyclists and pedestrians.
<u>Open Forum</u> Chair to invite Balfour Beatty representatives to next WCAC to raise issues and concerns regarding lighting.	Councillor Cantrill Committee Manager	29/09/16	Contacts invited.
<u>Open Forum</u> Chair to invite representatives to next WCAC to discuss streetscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (City Council) Leader, Executive Councillor for Planning Policy &amp; Transport, Head of Planning.</li> <li>• County Council representatives.</li> <li>• Officers: Green space, heritage.</li> <li>• Chair of Cambridge Past, Present &amp; Future.</li> <li>• Cambridge BID.</li> </ul>	Councillor Cantrill Head of Property Services (as WCAC Lead Officer) Committee Manager	29/09/16	Contacts invited.
<u>Environmental Report</u> Officer to clarify timescale for painting Christ Pieces railings.	Operations Manager - Cleansing Operations Manager - Community		The painting of the railings has commenced and is being undertaken in partnership with Community

	Engagement & Enforcement	<p>Payback, there are plans to progress the work during the next couple of months.</p> <p>Councillor Cearns wanted to put on record his thanks for work undertaken through community payback.</p>
--	--------------------------	---

### 16/42/WAC Open Forum

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

1. **A member of the public asked when streetscape would be discussed at West Central Area Committee.**

Councillor Cantrill said it had not been possible to include this item on the busy September agenda, so he hoped to do so at the December meeting.

**Action Point: Chair to invite representatives to next WCAC to discuss streetscape:**

- (City Council) Leader, Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport, ~~Head of Planning~~ (post no longer exists) Director of Planning and Economic Development.
  - County Council representatives.
  - Officers: Green space, heritage.
  - Chair of Cambridge Past, Present & Future.
  - Cambridge BID.
2. **A member of the public asked what enforcement action was being taken against illegal touts.**

Councillor Holland said that a public space protection order had been implemented and the Environmental Crime Team could take enforcement action. Touts offered walking tours to get around the punt touting ban. The City Council was trying to challenge this behaviour. The issue was touting, not what they offered.

Councillors Cantrill and Gillespie said that Officers were wearing body cameras to help prosecute touts, and touts were wearing body cameras to make counter claims.

The Head of Property Services said that 2 reports had gone to committee in July 2016 regarding the public space protection order and punt station. The City Council had to follow the legal process in order to address residents' concerns.

**3. Other members of the public asked:**

- **Given that public space protection notices were in force, what should the public do when they spot touts still touting?**
- **What were the rules regarding the public space protection order and where could information be found?**

The Head of Property Services said the July public space protection order committee report set out how it would work. The Council had not received to date any complaints about walking tours. Councillors had voted against the punt station.

Councillor Holland said people could report concerns about touts to [Safer.Communities@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:Safer.Communities@cambridge.gov.uk)

**4. A member of the public asked that more publicity be given to 16/1441/FUL which is the Council's application for the commemorative football sculpture on Parker's Piece.**

**5. Members of the public raised concerns about late night deliveries, rat running, traffic flow and selling of items in a residential area.**

Councillor Cearns said additional signage had been put in to deter people from rat running near the Grafton Centre. Lorries were allowed to use certain routes eg Park Terrace, but this led to issues such as damage to parked cars, the owners of which received compensation.

**Action Point: WCAC to follow up residents' concerns about late night deliveries, rat running, traffic flow concerns and selling of items in a residential area: King St, Paradise St / East Rd.**

- **City: Councillor Cantrill, Ward Councillors and Enforcement Officers.**
- **County Council: Councillor Cearns, Graham Hughes, Local Highways Manager and Parking Services.**

**6. A member of the public said cyclists rode the wrong way down John Street, Market Street and Downing Street.**

Councillor Cantrill said signage was too general to have any impact. The Police briefed students on safer cycling.

**Action Point: Market Ward Councillors to follow up with Police about resident's concern that students were cycling the wrong way down John St / Market St / Downing St.**

*Post Meeting Note: Downing Street is two-way for bike users due to the contraflow lane.*

### **16/43/WAC Re-Ordering Agenda**

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.

### **16/44/WAC Street Lighting on Burrell's Walk**

The Committee received a presentation from a representative from Balfour Beatty who made the following points:

- i. 10% of street lights would be removed and not replaced due to a late amendment to the contract by the County Council.
- ii. Burrell's Walk was taken out of the heritage scheme so was subject to the 10% street light reduction.
- iii. Footpaths were now lit to the same standards as roads (ie higher than normal footpath standards).
- iv. Trees close to the Burrell's Walk street lights affected lighting levels. A meeting would be held 11 October 2016 between Balfour Beatty, City and County Council representatives to address issues.

Members of the public made the following comments in response to the presentation:

- i. They were unhappy with the lighting scheme and lighting levels.
- ii. Too many lights had been removed.
- iii. Some lighting columns were too tall (6m instead of the usual 5m).

In response to the presentation the Committee commented the high turnover of Balfour Beatty staff frustrated stakeholders' attempts to address issues.

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

1. **Mr Rosenstiel asked why 6m lighting columns were used on Christ's pieces and Pike's Walk instead of the usual 5m ones.**

The Balfour Beatty representative said this was done to meet the higher lighting class.

2. **A member of the public asked why Burrell's Walk was taken out of the heritage scheme.**

Councillor Cantrill said the wrong councillors were consulted. The City Council Leader could have requested the process be delayed whilst the correct councillors were consulted, or the process could continue and Burrell's Walk would lose the protection of being in a heritage area. The Leader chose to continue with the project and not delay by putting Burrell's Walk back into a heritage area.

3. **A member of the public asked why East and West Road columns looked different.**

The Balfour Beatty representative said the scheme had not been signed off as lighting was 1/3 of expected levels.

4. **A member of the public asked what happened to old street lights.**

The Balfour Beatty representative said they had been scrapped as they were 20 years old and in poor condition.

5. **A member of the public asked why new lighting columns on Queen's Road had been painted white.**

The Balfour Beatty representative said the colour was set by the City Council Heritage Officer, although it had been queried by Balfour Beatty.

**Action Point: Councillor Cantrill to clarify if new lighting posts on Queen's Road painted white on the advice of City Council Heritage Officer. Another colour would be preferred by residents.**

*Update from Urban Design & Conservation Manager following meeting: The lighting on Burrell's Walk was previously agreed by the County Council, City Council and Balfour Beatty to be changed for heritage style lamps, though from feedback earlier this year the height of the Windsor-style replacement lighting is considered by some members and the public to be too tall. This does not however affect the fact that Burrell's Walk remains part of both the Central and West Cambridge Conservation Areas.*

### **16/45/WAC City Deal - Proposed Peak Time Road Closures Consultation**

The Committee received a presentation from the City Deal Lead on City Access regarding proposals to reduce congestion through an 8 point plan.

Members of the public made the following comments in response to the presentation:

- i. Leaflets about City Deal proposals were not consistently available across the city.
- ii. Proposals that generated revenue seemed to be favoured over those that seemed a better idea.
- iii. Expressed concern that schemes to reduce congestion (eg Peak-time Congestion Control Points (PCCPs)) would:
  - Hinder people who had genuine need to travel across the city eg carers.
  - Trap people in their own city wards.
  - Create artificial barriers between wards or communities in wards.
  - Encourage rat running as people tried to avoid PCCPs.
  - Lead to people performing illegal manoeuvres in the road to avoid PCCPs.
- iv. Signposted a petition against City Deal proposals.
- v. Supported a congestion charge and underground railway scheme.

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

- i. PCCPs may encourage a modal shift from private cars to walking, cycling and public transport.
- ii. Expressed concern over the lack of consultation on City Deal proposals and details about them.
- iii. Queried if funding from the City Deal could subsidise park&ride services to encourage a modal shift from cars.

The City Deal Director and Lead on City Access said in response to questions from members of the public:

- i. Information on proposals to reduce congestion was set out on the City Deal website.
- ii. Feedback was invited on the proposals during the 11 July to 10 October consultation period.
- iii. Proposals aimed to reduce congestion and so improve bus services and the built environment. They were not designed to generate revenue or be a forerunner for congestion charging.
- iv. The City Deal was applying for funding to get infrastructure for growth areas. It had to apply for funding in the short, medium and long term in three stages. Failure to achieve goals in one stage would stop future funding applications. An underground railway scheme would take 20 years to implement and so was not practicable.
- v. Ways to speed up bus fare payments and so decrease journey times were being looked at.
- vi. The City Deal was liaising with social care providers about siting PCCPs to achieve the goal of reducing congestion without impeding carers.
- vii. PCCPs used a number plate recognition system, rather than a physical barrier. The aim was to encourage people to exit the city on the same route they came in, not travel across to exit.
- viii. Number plate recognition had been evaluated as a more practicable option over gating as a method to control congestion.
- ix. People would receive a £50 fine for crossing PCCPs.
- x. PCCPs had been trialled in the 1990s (Cambridge) and 1960s (Groningen, Netherlands).

Councillor Baigent made the following points as a City Deal Assembly Member:

- i. Cambridge is a commercially successful city.
- ii. The City Deal proposals aimed to help people travel across the city (specifically in buses) without getting stuck in traffic.
- iii. City Deal proposals would not trap people in their own city wards by stopping them from travelling.

## **16/46/WAC Local Liaison Forum / Western Transport Corridor**

The Committee received a presentation from the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) Chair.

The presentation outlined:

- Background to the LLF.
- Bus corridor options.
- Proposals put forward to the City Deal.
- Current position in the process.

Members of the public made the following comments in response to the presentation:

- i. Expressed concern regarding the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge bus route.
- ii. Travel routes from the city fringe to city centre needed improvement.
- iii. An infrastructure study should be undertaken to review the number of bus routes and reduce these if necessary.
- iv. Existing travel congestion issues would be exacerbated.
- v. Time savings from the bus route would be cancelled out by time spent in congested traffic. A simplified bus fare system (ie taking less time to pay) would speed up journey times more effectively than a major infrastructure project.
- vi. The city needed affordable public transport.

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

- i. The LLF was a new concept to the city. People had more experience of these in rural parishes.
- ii. All bus routes travelling through residential areas would be limited to 20mph.
- iii. There were citywide concerns from residents about the impact of the proposed bus route on traffic flow and congestion.
- iv. A proposal was made at the 29 September City Deal meeting to join up the bus corridor with the northwest and southwest corridor across the motorway to manage bus access into the city.
- v. Park&ride was controlled by the County Council, who could encourage uptake by re-introducing subsidies to reduce ticket/parking costs. However bus services were run by independent companies who operated services as they saw fit. The County Council had little influence over these as it had no funding to subsidise services.
- vi. Suggested residents could attend the 13 October 2016 City Deal Board meeting and lobby to influence options considered.

- vii. The County Council had applied to Central Government for funding to purchase electric/hybrid buses, but had been turned down.
- viii. The devolution deal could lead to greater funding and control over buses. Cambridge City Council could learn from Cardiff Council who operated a bus service.

### **16/47/WAC West Cambridge Development Site - University of Cambridge**

The Committee received an update presentation from the Principal Planner on the West Cambridge Master Plan.

In response to the presentation members of the public expressed concern about design, employment provision, visual impact, amenities and transport matters.

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

- i. Transport issues needed addressing.
- ii. Relevance of outstanding S106 commitments from the extant 1999 permission.
- iii. Strategy for car parking through the key phases needed to be fully understood.
- iv. The lack of a mix of uses across the site was disappointing. The absence of further residential accommodation appeared to be a missed opportunity to reduce the transport impact of the proposal.

The Principal Planner said the following in response to questions from Councillors and members of the public:

- i. Visual impact from the site edges, including Madingley Road was a key issue for consideration. Connections between the two sites across Madingley Road was very important.
- ii. The Landscape and Visual impact assessment submitted with the application included analysis of impact from longer viewpoints from the south and west, including the higher chalk hills beyond the M11.
- iii. Travel management was needed to control demand for private motor vehicle trips. The emerging transport strategy set out the strategy for car parking on the site, travel planning measures, together with the emerging access strategy and strategy to improve highway safety.
- iv. Some obligations from the 1999 planning permission had not been delivered. These would be fully considered as part of the revised masterplan proposal.

- v. Further residential use was not part of the University's strategy for developing the site. Emerging local plan policy 18 does not mandate the provision of further residential use at West Cambridge.
- vi. The application is likely to be reported to Committee in spring 2017.

### **16/48/WAC Environmental Reports - WAC**

The Committee received a report from the Enforcement Officer

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 West Area Committee. The report identifies the reactive and proactive service actions undertaken in the previous year, including the requested priority targets and reports back on the recommended issues and associated actions to be targeted in the following period. It also includes 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 West Area for the period of September to November 2016.

#### Continuing priorities<sup>1</sup>

<b>Number</b>	<b>Priority details</b>
1	<p>Enforcement and City Ranger patrols in the City Centre to address issues of illegally deposited trade waste and littering.</p> <p>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.</p>
2	<p>Joint working patrols to address the issues of fly tipping at <i>Adam and Eve Street</i> recycling points.</p> <p>Justification: Fly tipping at Adam and Eve Street recycling centre continues to be a problem for 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.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Amendments to continuing priorities are shown in italics

New suggested priorities

Number	Priority details
3	<p>Pressure wash and cleanse of the public recycling points at Castle Park, Park Street, Adam and Eve Street and Lammas Land.</p> <p>Justification: Recycling points can become dirty and clogged with litter, and detritus, deep cleansing of them can encourage people to recycle and dispose of rubbish more responsibly.</p>

Councillor Holland noted a typographical error on P45 of the Officer's report. Carisbrooke Road (near Histon Road junction) should be listed as Castle Ward rather than Newnham.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. High levels of litter in the city but only 2 penalty notices issued.
- ii. Fly tipping in the Adam & Eve area.
- iii. Collection of bins in the Silver Street and Queen's Green area.

**Action Point: Enforcement Officer / Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) to clarify with Waste Team if figures are increasing in agenda P39 / addendum Waste and Recycling Data.**

Following discussion, Members **unanimously resolved** to approve priorities for action as listed above.

### **16/49/WAC Environmental Improvement Programme Second Round**

The Committee received a report from the Senior Engineer regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP). The report requested that the Committee determined which of the proposed new second round EIP applications should be allocated funding as part of the 2016-17 Environmental Improvement Programme, from those listed in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

In response to Members' questions the Senior Engineer answered:

- i. £10,000 - £20,000 of funding was available for projects to bid for.
- ii. Section 5 of the Officer's report set out projects that were not yet ready to come forward.

Councillor Cantrill suggested Area Committee Councillors liaise after the meeting on how best to encourage projects to come forward and apply for funding rather than lose it. Although it was not desirable to use EIP funding to replace trees, this was the only way currently as other funding had run out.

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

- 2.1 Allocate £2,000 of remaining EIP budget for 2016-17 to the list of proposed projects in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- 2.2 Approve those projects for implementation, subject to the schemes being deliverable, obtaining consents necessary, positive consultation where required and final approval by Ward Councillors.

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm

**CHAIR**