

NORTH AREA COMMITTEE

14 September 2017

6.35 - 9.25 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Bird (Chair), Abbott, Austin, Gawthrope, O'Reilly, Price, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Manning, Meschini and Scutt

Officers:

Head of Customer Services: Jonathan James

Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement: Wendy Young

Committee Manager: Emily Watts

Other Officers in Attendance:

Parking Policy Manager-Cambridgeshire County Council: Nicola Gardiner

Lead Technician- Cambridgeshire County Council: Gary Baldwin

Capital and Funding Manager- Cambridgeshire County Council: Paul Van de Bulk

Greenways Project Manager- Cambridgeshire County Council: Simon Manville

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**17/21/NAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Todd-Jones, Sarris and Tunnacliffe.

17/22/NAC Declarations Of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Price	17/27/NAC 17/28/NAC	Personal- He is the Chair of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Assembly

17/23/NAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/24/NAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes

The Action Sheet was noted and an updated copy could be viewed at the following link under 'Committee Action Sheet'.

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=199&MId=3352&Ver=4>

17/25/NAC Open Forum

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

- 1. Mr Yule raised the following issue:**
 - i. Was any action going to be taken over the forthcoming day time reduction in N Busway services?**

Councillor Sargeant confirmed that the City Council had no control over the operations of the Busway because it was a private company. Agreed that more control was needed over bus services in order to provide a more efficient and effective service. Stated that the Mayor of the Combined Authority had the power to franchise the bus service which would give more control over services but he had not exercised this yet.

- 2. Mr Nesbit asked:**
 - i. Could anything be done to get effective measures taken to stop the motorcycles and cars racing along Milton Road?**

Councillor Sargeant confirmed that he had been in email exchange with the Area Sargent. In order to do anything such as install a temporary speed camera the police required funding for extra resources. They had made a funding bid and were hopeful to hear back soon.

Councillor Austin raised a concern she had been receiving from residents, when calling to report racing vehicles the residents were asked to provide registration numbers. These were not possible and unrealistic to retrieve.

Councillor Price affirmed that this issue was experienced in areas all around the north of the city and moved as soon as police arrived in one area.

Councillor Manning stated that a group effort would be required to collectively report the issue and get it escalated as a priority.

Action Point: Councillor Sargeant to chase Area Sargent to see if they had secured additional resources to tackle vehicles racing. Confirmed that he would escalate the issue to more senior officers if required.

3. Lillian Rundblad on behalf of HRARA asked:

- i. Could the North Area Committee submit a Local Highway Improvement (LHI) bid requesting allocation of funds for improvements on Histon Road from the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee?**
- ii. The parking area on the junction between Histon Road and Windsor Road outside the shopping centre is often taken up with motorbikes which park all day taking up the spaces. Can provision be made to improve parking and safety and have a time limit like other short stay parking?**

Councillor Scutt said that she would discuss the issues with Lillian in the meeting break and refer back to committee

Action Point: Councillor Scutt to investigate proposing an LHI Bid/request allocations of funds for locally led highway improvements of Histon Road from the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee.

Action Point: Councillor Scutt to investigate the scope to improve parking provision and safety in the car park on Histon Road /corner of Windsor Road junction.

4. Richard Taylor raised the following issues:

- i. He had recently attended a meeting with residents of Garden Walk who wanted to raise awareness of the disruption they were being caused by the people living in supported accommodation on the same street. Could the committee keep track of the situation until it gets resolved?**
- ii. The Greater Cambridge Partnership had said that they would publish a timetable of Milton Road workshops online but this had**

not yet happened. He wanted to know which councillors would be involved and representing residents, they could then be lobbied.

- iii. Asked whether Councillor Meschini would be accepting the Area Champion role that she had been offered given that she had previously protested about the increase in Councillor Allowances?**

Councillor Richards confirmed that she had attended the resident's association meeting at Garden Walk. Sanctuary Housing confirmed that they would take measures to alleviate the disruption. Staff would be working at night which was not previously the case. Local residents would also be given a phone number to contact if they were being disrupted. Moving the site of the supported living facility had also been considered. Councillor Richards would be monitoring the situation closely so would be able to feed back.

Councillor Meschini confirmed that she had been offered a role in the new Community Partnership Committee. Although she was not happy with the allowance involved she felt that she had no choice but to accept it. The role was an opportunity to champion many issues. The job description was still vague so she was waiting for more information.

Action Point: Councillor Richards to provide an update on Garden Walk

17/26/NAC Parking Scheme Update

The Committee received a verbal presentation from the Parking Policy Manager and Lead Technician from Cambridgeshire County Council on residents parking schemes.

The presentation outlined that a cross authority working group had been set up to review parking policy for Cambridgeshire. The review identified 26 areas across Cambridge as potential sites for residents parking schemes. 7 of the sites had been prioritised and 2 of these, named Victoria and Elizabeth fell into North Area. The project was still in its initial stages but if the forthcoming consultations supported the scheme then they would be progressed. Objections to the scheme would be considered by Cambridge Joint Area Committee. The County Council's aim was to implement the first round of schemes by autumn 2018.

A survey was also due to be commissioned and completed later this year to evaluate the impact of commuter parking around the Cambridge North Station site. The outcome would be shared with the local Councillors.

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

- i. They defended the work of Officers, affirming that their role was to carry out the technical work to assess safety. Highlighted that it would be the politicians who put pressure on the amount of parking spaces which may eventually be lost.
- ii. Stated that the Elizabeth scheme had been paused so that resident could explore caveats.
- iii. Stated that informal consultations with various community groups had been undertake already. It was established with the consensus of resident's that a parking scheme of some description would be beneficial.
- iv. Sought clarification of the stages to the consultation process and to confirm that they had not yet entered the formal statutory consultation stage.

Councillor Manning confirmed that he would send the dates of future parking scheme meetings to the Chair of North Area to publicise.

The Parking Policy Manager and Lead Technician said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Clarified the stages of the parking scheme process-
 1. Informal consultations, these had already been carried out. The Victoria Scheme was ready to go to public consultation stage in October 2017. The Elizabeth Scheme had been paused and was awaiting Councillor's responses regarding how they would like to proceed before it can move to the next stage.
 2. Public consultation, every household within the impacted areas wold be contacted with maps and the proposals and asked to feedback. If the feedback established support for a residents parking scheme then it could be progressed to the next stage of a statutory consultation. Feedback in opposition would be considered by Cambridge Joint Area Committee, the plans could then be amended if necessary.
 3. Statutory consultation.

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

- 1. Felt that the term ‘residents parking’ was a misnomer because the reality of the proposals so far meant that the parking for residents would be hugely restricted.**

The Parking Policy Manager affirmed that when undertaking a parking review lots of factors needed to be considered such as public safety. For example, enough space needed to be left on the street to ensure emergency vehicles had access; this limited the amount of on street parking.

- 2. The maps of the proposal areas previously circulated had been very basic, the current ones looked a lot more detailed. Had the additional level of detail been accrued from further consultation which the public were not aware of?**

Councillor Manning confirmed that significant adjustment to the Elizabeth Scheme had been made so this Scheme was on hold. Once the residents had been consulted further he would report back to committee.

ACTION POINT: Councillor Manning to report back to committee with an update on the Elizabeth parking scheme.

- 3. A member of Hurst Park Resident’s Association had undertaken their own informal consultation. Since then more detailed information from the County Council had appeared which they had not been consulted upon. What degree of flexibility was there for the plans? Additionally, had the budget for the changes already been secured?**

Councillor Scutt stated that the money was available for the purposes of the consultation. She apologised on behalf of the County Council because invitations to the informal consultation had not been sent out. Highlighted that Hurst Park Estate was within Chesterton Division, Councillor Scutt represented Arbury Division so her apology on behalf of the County Council was expressed in relation to Arbury Division and those residents for whom she had responsibility. Councillor Manning represented Chesterton and was the County Councillor for that Division when the informal consultation was being arranged and was held and hence he was responsible to/for Hurst Park Avenue residents.

The Parking Policy Manager confirmed that the detailed drawing had been created to identify the areas under focus, it formed a starting point for the public consultation but there was still scope to refine the plans. Once the initial plans for the Elizabeth Scheme had been signed off from Councillors all residents in the impacted areas would be contacted with the plans to allow them to have their say.

4. **Stated that any Residents Parking Scheme would not get rid of the problem created by commuter parking, it would just displace the problem. Measures needed to be taken to tackle long term commuter parking before any other changes were made.**

Councillor Richards highlighted the need for flexibility for the scheme. This would involve as much public involvement and willingness to contribute as possible in order to move forward together to find solutions.

17/27/NAC Transport Proposals for Histon and Milton Road

The Committee received a verbal presentation from the Capital and Funding Manager from Cambridgeshire County Council regarding proposals for Milton and Histon Road.

The presentation provided an update on both schemes. The Executive Board had approved the concept design for Milton Road, they were now at the preferred option design phase. The Histon Road scheme would be delivered behind Milton Road, a resolution would be going to the Executive Board soon for agreement to move the scheme forward. A number of workshops were due to be held over the next few months to discuss topics such as bus stop design and location, crossings and trees/ landscaping.

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

- i. Queried whether the dates of the workshop would be publicised online?
- ii. Asked if the Cam Sight representatives could be invited to the next Milton Road workshop to discuss the bus stop design?

The Capital and Funding Managers aid the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Confirmed that he would ensure the workshop dates would be published online.
- ii. Confirmed that another workshop to discuss bus stops on Milton Road had not been planned, however he agreed that it was important for Cam Sight to be involved in the design of the bus stops.

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

1. What changes would be made to the parking situation on Milton Road? How many spaces would be lost?

The Capital and Funding Manager confirmed that a parking survey would need to be undertaken to assess the impact. The same would also be undertaken for Histon Road.

2. Suggested including signs and some kind of noise indicators on the crossings to make it easier for blind or partially sighted people to cross the road.

17/28/NAC Cycle Greenways Project

The Committee received a verbal presentation from the Greenways Project Manager, regarding the Cambridge Greenways Project.

The presentation outlined the 12 proposed routes. The project was designed to connect the villages surrounding Cambridge through a cohesive network for pedestrians, cyclists and equine riders. The project was currently going through its pre consultation stage; this involved holding meetings in various locations to gain public input and feedback. Once completed, the designs would be drawn up and a public consultation on the preferred options would be undertaken.

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

- i. Sought clarification regarding how the Waterbeach route would connect to Milton Road?
- ii. Queried why the routes/paths would not be completely segregated from roads?
- iii. Stated that it may be difficult for cyclists and pedestrians to both use the routes together, this could be dangerous. Asked whether the routes would be lit up?

The Greenways Project Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Waterbeach connection would travel via Cambridge North Station to Milton Road and on to the Chisholm Trail.

- ii. The route would encompass small roads, making entirely separate routes/ paths would be incredibly costly.
- iii. Confirmed that the paths would be wide and could potentially include white separation lines to stop collisions between cyclists and pedestrians. Lighting would be costly to have along all the routes so it would be strategically placed in areas where it was most beneficial.

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

1. **Raised concern regarding the Waterbeach route, it should be west of the railway otherwise part of it would go through a floodplain and would be unusable in the winter.**

The Greenways Project Manager confirmed that they wanted the routes to be as direct as possible and welcomed all suggestions for improvements.

2. **Stated that a line in the center of the path wouldn't be effective because not everyone adheres to them. It was difficult to get a balance but still having some pedestrian only paths would be nice and less risky.**

The Greenways Project Manager highlighted that the whole aim of the scheme was to reduce vehicle congestion so the key focus was on cycle provision. Suggestions for alternative solutions would be useful though.

17/29/NAC Environmental Report - NAC

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

The report provided an overview of City Council Refuse and Environment and Streets and Open Spaces service activity relating to the geographical area served by the North Area Committee. The report identified 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 included key officer contacts for the reporting of waste and refuse and public realm issues.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. Commented on the impressive reduction in fly tipping in Kings Hedges.

- ii. Referred to the increase in wheels being dumped in Arbury Court, asked whether the bike shop situated close to the location had been contacted in relation to this?
- iii. Stated that the 2 additional bins on the corner of Northampton Street installed as part of a trial had been really beneficial and wanted them to stay permanently.
- iv. Asked whether it was possible for the City Council to do anything about the removal of the advertising banners which hung from the Student Castle on Milton Road?

Members of the public raised the following issues:

- i. Stated that there were not enough refuse bins in relation to the number of flats on Cockerel Road.
- ii. Raised concern that at recycling points the bins were often overflowing. Could they be emptied more frequently or could solar Big Belly bins be installed so that they are emptied when needed?

In response to Members' questions the Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement said the following:

- i. Confirmed that she would check if the bike shop had been contacted with regard to the fly tipping of tyres in the area.
- ii. Would consider the bins on Northampton Street being installed permanently once the trial was over.
- iii. Stated that she could not comment on the bins on Cockerel Road or the capacity of the Waste Service to make more collections. Confirmed that she would pass the message on to the correct team.
- iv. Confirmed that she would ask the Recycling Team to check the frequency of collections.
- v. Stated that the advertising banners at Student Caste would be an issue for the Planning Enforcement Team.

North Area resolved to revise Priority 2 *nem con*:

Added- St Albans Recreation Ground, Scotland Road area (including alleyways), Searle Street area

The Committee resolved unanimously to prioritise:

Priority 1

Enforcement patrols to tackle fly tipping on communal archways and green areas at Minerva Way area (including Augustus Close, Hercules Close,

Neptune Close and Apollo Way), Arbury Court, Hazelwood/Molewood Close area, Church Street recycling centre, *Crathern Way / Cameron Way, Cockerell Road, Dundee Close and Sackville / Aragon Close recycling areas*

Priority 2

Patrols to address dog fouling on Chesterton Recreation Ground, St Albans Recreation Ground, Scotland Road area (including alleyways), Searle Street area and Molewood / Hazelwood Close area including early mornings, evenings and weekends.

Priority 3

Enforcement patrols to tackle abandoned vehicles across the East Chesterton ward

Priority 4

Enforcement patrols to deal with illegal camping at Logan's Meadows

The meeting ended at 9.25 pm

CHAIR