

**SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE**

30 November 2020

7.00 - 9.30 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors McPherson (Chair), Thornburrow (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Dryden, McGerty, Page-Croft, Summerbell, Crawford and Taylor

**Officers:**

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Senior Asset Development Officer Anthony French

Play Development Officer: Dan Mitchell

Public Realm Enforcement Officer: Bree Donovan

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Gary Clift

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Network Rail Consultation Manager: Sophie Moeng

Network Rail Consents Development Manager: Mike Blissett

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****20/24/SAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Ashwood

**20/25/SAC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Dryden	8	Member of the committee of The Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall
Councillor Ashton	8	Chair of Cherry Hinton Residents Association and member of the

		committee of The Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall
Councillor McGerty	6	Has donated professional time to 'Abbey People' Food Hub

## 20/26/SAC Minutes

The following amendments were requested to the minutes of the meetings held on 7 September 2020:

### 20/17/SAC Minutes

A member of the public referred to minute reference 20/08/SAC in 9 March 2020 minutes and queried if Dutch style roundabout costs were correct. ~~Expressed concerns that costs had risen from £800,000 to £1,800,000.~~

The original point made by the member of the public was that attendees were given inaccurate information by officers in the March SAC. They said that the difference between the original £800k and the £1.8m announced at that time was due to extra utility works during construction. The member of the public believed this was inaccurate because people learned this year (2020) that the cost had already escalated to more than £1.5m before construction started in September 2019. The committee should receive an explanation from the county council for this. Councillor Taylor had asked for a report to go to County Highways and Transport Committee.

Action: Councillor McPherson to write to Councillor ~~Baisley~~ **Bates** [Chair of County Council Highways and Transport Committee] to request cost information on the Dutch style roundabout.

Action: Councillors McPherson and McGerty to seek cost/benefit analysis figures and accurate project cost estimate figures from Councillor Bates on the Dutch style roundabout.

### 20/19/SAC Open Forum

Councillor McGerty offered to liaise with the member of the public after the meeting about issues raised.

**Councillor Taylor said Greater Cambridge Partnership had shut the road without consultation. The County Council Councillors had advised Greater Cambridge Partnership that residents would not be pleased. Re-iterated a Greater Cambridge Partnership consultation on possible Nightingale works would start in November and residents were encouraged to respond to this.**

5. A member of the public said Hills Road Area Residents Association want to protect the tree lined green space and wildlife corridor between Hills Road and the Hills Road Access Road in front of Nightingale Avenue. Can the project team working on the Hills Road and Babraham Road Cycleway plans reassure them that this loved local green space will be protected?

~~Councillor Taylor said Greater Cambridge Partnership had shut the road without consultation. The County Council had advised Greater Cambridge Partnership that residents would not be pleased. Re-iterated a Greater Cambridge Partnership consultation on possible Nightingale works would start in November and residents were encouraged to respond to this.~~

Councillor Taylor offered to liaise with the member of the public after the meeting about maintenance issues raised.

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2020 will be resubmitted for approval as a correct record at the next committee 8 March 2021.

## **20/27/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes**

The committee action sheet was noted. Councillors would send any updates to the Committee Manager outside of the meeting.

Councillor McPherson had walked around Burnside Lakes (formerly known as Cambridge Lakes) with council and police officers. They were looking at how operations could change to mitigate anti-social behaviour in the area.

## **20/28/SAC Open Forum**

A member of the public raised the following issues:

- i. Given the announcement in last week's spending review of further government endorsement of, and investment in developing the Oxford-

Cambridge Arc, what engagement have councillors on this committee had or been offered on the topic.

- ii. Do councillors agree that it is important that residents are kept fully abreast of this project and, if so, how can Cambridge City Council best achieve this?

Councillor Ashton said that the matter had come up in a planning meeting earlier that day to discuss the local plan, and it was mentioned during that meeting that the Oxford Arc should be considered. Resident's associations would be invited to further meetings to allow their input.

Councillor McGerty said that it can be difficult for members of city and county councils to get a 'seat at the table' with large, UK wide projects such as the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. The public could feel control of these matters was moving further away from them. Councillor Smith (Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council) was acting as the Environmental Lead on the Ox-Cam Arc board. Councillor McGerty hoped the city council would receive updates from her, possibly if invited to do so directly to residents at a public forum such as this one.

Councillor Thornburrow said she had been contacted by Councillor Smith from South Cambridgeshire Council to say she was going to try to raise the issue of the environmental aspects of what may happen with the Ox-Cam Arc, and hoped this dialogue would continue.

## **20/29/SAC 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 published agenda.

## **20/30/SAC Food Hubs - Coronavirus Community Response**

The Committee received a report from the Play Development Officer regarding support given to Food Hubs as part of the Coronavirus community response.

The report outlined:

- i. That Cambridge City Council have been working with community and faith groups, partner agencies and over 1500 volunteers to support 700 households during lockdown and distribute £14,000 of grant funding

- ii. The City Council supported Cambridge Sustainable Food in the creation of eight food hubs since March, which in addition to five existing food banks were aimed at tackling food poverty during the pandemic. In addition, Cambridge Sustainable Food were also being supported to set up a permanent food distribution hub.
- iii. Food banks in the city require a referral and voucher provided by a doctor, community work, school or similar, whereas food hubs were not means tested. 113 tons of food had been distributed by food hubs in Cambridge, including 10,000 cooked meals prepared and delivered.
- iv. Council staff from several departments had been redeployed since March to support the emergency food effort.
- v. Local communities had organised support networks, websites, telephone schemes and groups to help each other which has given a strong sense of community and connectedness.

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

- i. Councillor McPherson stated this would be a good time to mention the Volunteer for Cambridge Awards 2020, details of which are available on the council website. He also thanked the officer for everything they, and all other volunteers had done.
- ii. Councillor Dryden thanked the volunteers, including those around the Cherry Hinton area, and Councillor Collis who has been organising the food hub in his area.
- iii. Councillor Thornburrow thanked the volunteers and the manager of Cambridge sustainable food. She also stated that while the Trumpington food hub had moved from two days per week open, to one day once the first lockdown ended, she has now seen an increase in contact to her again, at a higher level than previously. European residents are finding it difficult where they have been furloughed and have no access to other funds, and so access to the food hub schemes are likely to remain essential until at least the spring of 2021.
- iv. Councillor Ashton asked whether it was possible to be provided with figures specifically for the south area of the city, which councillors can provide to their residents. He also thanked the officer for the work they had been doing on this initiative.
- v. In addition to others already discussed, Councillor McGerty gave thanks to Sam Davies, QECF, Queen Ediths churches and other volunteers within his ward, and Councillor Summerbell gave thanks to Philippa Slatter for acting as a link between food hubs and community organisations.

The Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Figures from the presentation specific to the south area could be supplied to members in future.

Action: Play Development Officer to send Committee (figures from presentation broken down to ward level (instead of cross-city)).

- ii. Agreed that although it is difficult to mention everyone involved, many individuals and organisations deserved thanks.

### **20/31/SAC Network Rail: (Proposed) Cambridge South Station**

The Committee received a presentation from the Consultation Manager and Consents Development Manager (Network Rail). This is published on the City Council website.

Members of the public asked questions or made statements as set out below.

- i. Queried if (sufficient) secure cycle parking with CCTV live feed would be available. A different range of cycles needed to be catered for eg road bikes and cargo bikes.
- ii. Requested a wildlife tunnel under the railway tracks or a bridge for animals to cross.
- iii. Requested construction materials were brought by rail by default and road as a secondary option.
- iv. Would trees planted by Fawcett school children be removed to make space for the western station building and forecourt? Would the trees be replaced?
- v. Noise from the Public Address System would impact on nearby residents.
- vi. Concern that construction workers would drop litter the area. Similarly, the station would encourage litter in Hobson's Park. Could bins be provided?
- vii. What would happen to the outcome of the consultation?
- viii. Employers on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus should subsidise their staff to travel by rail to the new station.
- ix. It was a great shame that this item was being presented the day after the Cambridge South consultation closed.
- x. Did councillors have a view on the fact that the station design catered for approximately 1.8m passenger trips a year when the 2019 Biomedical Campus Transport Needs Review identified a figure of 4m passenger trips a year; and modelling by Smarter Cambridge Transport suggested a figure in excess of 8m trips?

- xi. Queried if any councillors on this committee had submitted a response to the consultation?

Action: Member of the public asked for Camcycle's response to the Cambridge South Station Consultation to be circulated to SAC.

- xii. The new path on the west should be segregated and not a shared space to prevent conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
- xiii. The main station access should be from the existing busway bridge (Addenbrooke's Bridge). This would be more efficient as the station could then be accessed by buses, pedestrians and cyclists by building a deck above the tracks.
- xiv. It was a long walk from the end of the last train carriage to the nearest bus stop. This may deter mobility impaired people.
- xv. Future-proof the station for increased capacity and adopt a concourse approach instead of bridges between platforms to allow commuters to easily flow from one platform to another.
- xvi. Provide cycle parking that is underground. This would be more secure, reduce visual impact and footprint.

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

- i. Re-iterated secure cycle parking and access from the busway was required.
- ii. Re-iterated there was a disparity between the figures quoted by the Department for Transport of 1.8m estimated passengers and the much higher figure of 9m estimated by Smarter Cambridge Transport. Could the station cope?
- iii. Expressed concern about open access to the station by all modes of transport. Requested drop off bays be reserved for disabled badge holders.
- iv. This was a unique opportunity to provide a joined-up transport interchange (trains, pedestrians, cycles and buses).

The Consultation Manager and Consents Development Manager (Network Rail) said the following in response to questions from members of the public and committee:

- i. Initial construction planning work undertaken suggested that bringing construction materials by rail would only be possible during the night because there was no spare rail capacity during the day around Cambridge. This would disrupt overnight freight services and would

require the construction of significant material handling facilities. This may be noisier for residents in the surrounding area as there were no existing sidings or similar facilities in the vicinity.

- ii. Any trees planted by Fawcett school children that would be removed would be replaced.
- iii. Construction hours, traffic and other activities such as constructor behaviour (eg dropping litter) would be outlined in a draft Code of Construction Practice.
- iv. Litter bins would be put in Hobson's Park in response to residents' concerns.
- v. Underground cycle parking would not be included as part of the scheme as it was beyond the budget to provide this.
- vi. Commuter figures came from the Department for Transport.
- vii. The final design of the (west) path would be developed in conjunction with the Local Highway Authority. The intention would be to implement an appropriately sized path for pedestrians/bikes that was suitable for the landscape (to minimise impact on the greenbelt).
- viii. The location of bus stops was not the responsibility of Network Rail.

Action: Network Rail requested to write an interim report responding to questions raised at SAC, then make a further presentation at the next committee 08/03/21.

### **20/32/SAC Cherry Hinton Hall Children's Play Area Consultation**

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Asset Development Officer regarding the Cherry Hinton Hall children's play area consultation.

The presentation outlined:

- i. The amount of S106 funding for the project, £150,000 split between play equipment and landscaping, along with timescales for the tendering process and public consultation throughout 2020.
- ii. The Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall were permitted the opportunity to comment for an additional week after the official consultation had ended.
- iii. The results of the consultation, including that 83% of responses were for the proposal, 12% against and 5% didn't know. Some comments classed as not relevant, such as the opinion that the S106 money should be used elsewhere – even though this was not an option – were omitted from the process.



- iv. Examples of comments, both positive and negative, received during the consultation. Responses to some of the public concerns were also provided, including explanations of why some design choices had been made, and details of plans to mitigate concerns, such as CCTV to avoid anti-social behaviour issues.

A representative from the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall made the following points.

- i. The business case for the play area was being worked on in February 2020 but the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall were not invited to be involved until the end of September, which felt like the group was being excluded from the process.
- ii. The online survey made available as part of the consultation was poor, consisting of two questions and missing out on the opportunity to capture information on which people were engaging with the process, where those people were based and whether the new play area was likely to encourage them to visit the park. Additionally, they believe most of the responses arrived within the first 24-48 hours of the consultation, which suggests multiple responses were from the same people.
- iii. The Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall would like the opportunity to be more involved in a better planned consultation.
- iv. The increase in the footprint would impact on the residents closer to the boundary, including noise from the zip wire. Additionally there were concerns that any CCTV camera should be infrared for use at night, without a light which would disturb nearby residents, and that it must be a monitored camera which was an issue as there were problems broadcasting a CCTV signal from that side of the city to the Huntingdon CCTV control centre.

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

- i. That the option of CCTV had been raised when the matter came for discussion with ward councillors, before the public consultation began.
- ii. Requested CCTV cover the entrance/exit (if nowhere else was possible, but other areas welcome) to give the police a history of who went in/out and at what time.
- iii. Modern CCTV cameras did not need special (bright) lights to provide pictures, so they should not cause any light pollution that would disturb residents.
- iv. That the play area design looked engaging and challenging for all ages and abilities, and that some inclusive play equipment in the current area was mirrored in the new design.

- v. With the area being a 'destination park' for families around the city, was there the option of additional seating for parents, alongside the three picnic benches provided in the design.
- vi. It was unfortunate that the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall were invited to take part towards the end of the process rather than from the beginning.
- vii. Had any thought been given to replacing the unacceptable toilet facilities at Cherry Hinton Hall park. An increase in visitors to use the new play area would likely lead to higher use of the toilets.
- viii. Suggested tweaking the consultation to include whether people were willing to pay to use the carpark .

The Senior Asset Development Officer and the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Undertook to work with The Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall in future.
- ii. The boundary of the new play area had not been taken any closer to Walpole Road, it had only been extended slightly at the top corner to the minimal amount to allow provision for safe fall zones for play equipment.
- iii. Historically there had been little investment in the play area. This was an opportunity to replace some (but not all) equipment.
- iv. Extra benches could be included in the site brief.
- v. Undertook to liaise with the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces regarding toilet provision and car park charges.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces said that toilet provision needed to be improved and made accessible for all. There was funding for this in the current budget. Toilet provision and play areas went hand in hand, so both would be opened together. More bike racks were expected. CCTV provision was subject to consultation.

- vi. Stakeholders/Officers had to be mindful of the cost/maintenance of CCTV. This could be installed on-site, opportunities were being explored where this could occur.
- vii. Council officers monitored CCTV in the area and had a hotline to the police to report issues.
- viii. The consultation was hosted on the City Council website and also undertaken through letter drop, which may have led to generic feedback (rather than responding to questions asked, and so affected responses).

## **20/33/SAC SAC - Environmental Report**

The Committee received a report from the Public Realm Enforcement Officer.

The report outlined an overview of the council's Streets and Open Spaces, Environmental Health and Shared Waste service activity in the Area Committee area over the past six months.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. Fly tipping and obstruction of footway by shop owners' wheelie bins at the back of Anstey Way.
- ii. Garage in Church Way (Cherry Hinton) undertaking vehicle repairs on the public highway. Anti-social behaviour by the garage owners deterred people from reporting issues such as vehicles parking on double yellow lines.

In response to Members' questions the Public Realm Enforcement Officer said the following:

- i. Various instances of verge parking had been investigated. Warning letters sent to vehicle owners had stopped verge parking reoccurring by these individuals otherwise fixed penalty letters would have been sent out as the next stage of action.
- ii. Officers patrolled Church End. Welcomed witness statements from members of the public about garage undertaking vehicle repairs on the public highway.
- iii. There was no fly tipping of rubbish since the Colville Road recycling point closed. The Public Realm Enforcement Officer would ask colleagues to see if the battery and/or clothing bank could be replaced.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

**CHAIR**