

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

2 December 2021  
6.30 - 9.00 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors D. Baigent (Chair), Bennett, Copley, Davey, H. Davies (Vice-Chair), Healy, Moore, Pounds, Robertson, A. Smith, Thornburrow, Bulat, Shailer, Howitt and Goodliffe

**Officers:**

Deputy Chief Executive: Andrew Limb

Strategy and Economy Manager (Greater Cambridge Planning Services):  
Caroline Hunt

Anti-Social Behaviour Officer: Rachel Fairhead

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Police Sargeant: Jim Stevenson

Transport Director, The Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership: Peter Blake

Technical Lead, The Greater Cambridge Partnership: Jo Baker

Communication Manger, The Greater Cambridge Partnership: David Charlesworth

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****21/54/EAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

No apologies were received.

**21/55/EAC Declarations of Interest**

Item	Name	Reason
All	Councillor Baigent	Personal: Cam Cycle
All	Councillor Smith	Personal: Cam Cycle

**21/56/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 September were then noted as a correct record.

## **21/57/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods**

The Chair welcomed Sargeant Stevenson (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), Carol Leonard, Executive Committee Member (Cambridge City area) Cambridgeshire Neighbourhood Watch and Rachel Fairhead (Anti-Social Behaviour Officer) to the meeting.

The Committee received a report from Sargeant Stevenson regarding policing and safer neighbourhoods' trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the last reporting period. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details). Previous local areas of concern and engagement activity noted in the report were:

- i. Anti-social driving
- ii. Cycle theft
- iii. Drug dealing and the protection of local young people – child criminal exploitation.

The virtual Area Committee would not be making a decision, so would not vote on priorities set by the Police. The Police reported back on the local areas of concern they were currently focussing on. Councillors and members of the public could not change these, but they could suggest ideas/issues for the Police to focus on.

It was suggested that anti-social behaviour was included to the drug dealing and the protection of local young people – child criminal exploitation.

In response to Members' discussion Sargeant Stevenson provided the following responses:

- i. Noted the comments regards vehicles breaking the 20pmh speed limit in Romsey and Abbey (particularly the Whitehill Road area).
- ii. Requested names of the streets could be passed on so they could be monitored. Residents could also report these offences on the 101-phone number or the relevant web page.
- iii. The Police could issue a traffic offence report if drivers were caught breaking the 20mph limit.
- iv. Residents could join the community volunteer programme Speed Watch which enabled volunteers to raise awareness of the dangers of speeding with training on the necessary Police equipment.

- v. The Speedwatch co-ordinator could arrange for advisory notices to be issued. There was a contact at Parkside Police Station who could facilitate resident groups. [speedwatch@cambs.pnn.police.uk](mailto:speedwatch@cambs.pnn.police.uk)
- vi. Cycle theft was no longer the top crime in Cambridge and down 24% from the previous year.
- vii. It was important to cycle owners to keep a record of the frame number of their bike which could be placed on the national bike register [www.bikeregister.com](http://www.bikeregister.com) or the Immobilise website [www.immobilise.com](http://www.immobilise.com) which
- viii. Stolen cycles could also be reported to via 101 or the Cambridgeshire Constabulary website.
- ix. Noted the comments regarding drug dealing and anti-social behaviour in Burnside (Romsey) and the request for CCTV in the area. Advised all issues should be reported as was only aware of a couple of incidents. In conjunction incidents should be reported the City Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Team.
- x. The mobile CCTV units were assets of Cambridge City Council. Between this team and the Police, the two would determine where the location of the mobile CCTV units should be placed based on the number of the incidents reported.
- xi. Not aware that Anti-Social Behaviour was higher than usual in Mill Road at this current time.
- xii. Racially motivated crimes were automatically dealt with by the Neighbourhood Policing teams to investigate and were treated very seriously.

The Cambridgeshire Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator advised she would be happy to co-ordinate those Neighbourhood Watch Groups who wished to work on the Speedwatch scheme. **ACTION Councillor Davies**

Councillor Thornburrow advised that Cambridge City Council were working with external partners on a Cycle Prevention Task and Finish Working Group examining cycle parking at the train station. Suggested a report could be brought to a future meeting on the work was being undertaken. **ACTION Councillor Thornburrow.**

The Anti-Social Behaviour Officer advised she would find out the location of the CCTV in Petersfield as requested by Councillor Howarth. The Committee were then advised of the Cambs against County Lines which had been delivered to over 300 secondary school students. The project had received positive responses and would continue to be shown in January.

The Cambridgeshire Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator advised that a separate meeting could be set up to discuss the work of the Neighbourhood Watch. Councillor Baigent advised a Member briefing session would be passed on the relevant Officer who could arrange this if there was interest.

A member of the public raised the following question:

**On policing & antisocial behaviour: many residents in the East Area are reporting antisocial behaviour by noisy motorcyclists/moped late at night. After 11 pm, very clearly and persistently audible from Edward Street (near Norfolk Street).**

**What exactly is being done to address this?**

**Is the problem just being shifted around by targeting Area A, shifting it to Area B?**

Sergeant Stevenson added the named streets to the list for patrol.

### **21/58/EAC Making Connections: Have Your Say on Greener Travel in Greater Cambridge Consultation**

The Chair welcomed Peter Blake, Transport Director, Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership (GCP) to discuss the Making Connections Consultation which could be viewed at the following link:

<https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/A9TjCgp1SG01AWHZ9-tJ?domain=greatercambridge.org.uk>

The Transport Director said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. An Impact assessment had been published based on the principles of better bus services and charging, highlighting the issues concerning protected characteristics.
- ii. A final publication would be available before a decision would be made by the board; the report would outline what those impacts were likely to be.
- iii. Investigation into the installation and use of light rail had been undertaken in 2018. The current assessment had determined a lack of flexibility and the relative cost in terms of the Greater Cambridge area and population, but this could not ruled out post 2030.

A member of the public asked the following question:

**What policy risk assessments have GCP officers made on their proposals that led to significant public protests several years ago, including but not limited to the Cambridge end of the Cambourne-Cambridge proposed busway, and congestion charging?"**

**"What analysis have GCP officers undertaken/commissioned on elasticities of demand regarding congestion charging? Have they read any literature on the likely reduction in traffic from different levels of charging both with light-rail-based substitutes, and bus-only substitutes available? Do they have contingency plans in place if revenues from charging are much higher or much lower than forecast?"**

The Transport Director responded with the following:

- i. The integrated assessment would outline the benefits and form part of the decision-making process.
- ii. A final decision had not yet been determined and assessments were being undertaken on many areas such as congestion and air pollution.
- iii. Several consultations had taken place including a citizen's assembly. There would also be a final round of consultation after the current consultation had been concluded and analysed.
- iv. Some of the congestion charges had been published and further publications would be forthcoming while working towards a single proposal.
- v. Concerning the light railway-based substitutes, previous assessments had been undertaken by the GCP and the Combined Authority. This mode of transport had been discounted as it was costly and inflexible in terms of delivery for this period of time.

### **21/59/EAC Presentation: Newmarket Road Improvements by Greater Cambridge Partnership**

The Committee received a presentation from Jo Baker, Technical Lead, (GCP) on the Cambridge Eastern Access Newmarket Road improvements as part of the Eastern Access Consultation.

Further information could be found at the following link:

[www.greatercambridge.org.uk/NewmarketRd2021](http://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/NewmarketRd2021)

In response to Members' question the Technical Lead said the following:

- i. There was currently no safety data on the cyclops junctions; the Histon Road junction had been opened in November and was therefore premature to provide any information at this stage.

The following questions had been received from a member of the public:

**What assessment have officers made of past historical studies and proposals for improved Eastern Access into Cambridge? (Including but not limited to the Cambridge Futures2 study, the airport proposals from the late 2000s, and other proposals stored in the Cambridgeshire Collection and County Archives).**

**"Do officers accept that whatever proposals they come up with for Newmarket Road, the additional number of homes and the future direction of development in East Cambridge means that road will never have the capacity to transport such an increased number of people into the city centre?"**

**"What direct conversations are GCP officers having with the senior management, and fans forums of Cambridge United Football Club regarding Eastern Access given the traffic congestion on match days?"**

The Technical Lead responded with the following:

- i. The relevant policy documents had been looked at; the strategic outline business case would have such documents into account as the Cambridge East Area Action Plan 2008.
- ii. The future of the East Cambridge was very much focused on a range of issues such as the climate crisis and the challenges that modern living brought.
- iii. Recognised that a dependency on road traffic was not the solution which was why the Making Connections Scheme had been brought forward.
- iv. It was critical that all alternatives to the road and private vehicle traffic were being investigated to accommodate growth in the area.
- v. Cambridge United Football Club was one of the stake holders and was not treated any differently to any other stakeholders that the GCP engaged with.
- vi. Acknowledged there was an issue of congestion on match days around Newmarket Road most of which related to informal and off-site parking.
- vii. As Cambridge United Football Club had limited parking on site, the GCP were investigating better controls of residential parking to deter car usage and the provision of better alternatives to make it easier for football fans to access the stadium. The relocation of the Newmarket Park and Ride would increase capacity which should significantly contribute.

## **21/60/EAC Open Forum**

The Chair welcomed Joe Lewis from Cam Skate who gave a presentation to promote the revamping of the skate park on Donkey Common and asked Councillors to support their proposals.

A copy of the presentation could be found on the following link:

[Choose agenda document pack - East Area Committee 2 December 2021 - Cambridge Council](#)

Following a discussion on the presentation several councillors expressed their support for the scheme. The Head of Corporate Strategy reminded the Committee that these expressions of support did not commit to any formal kind of decision or Council endorsement.

## **21/61/EAC Presentation: Greater Cambridge Local Plan by Greater Cambridge Planning Services**

The Committee received a report from the Strategy and Economy Manager regarding the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals consultation. Further information regarding the consultation could be found via: [Greater Cambridge Local Plan \(greatercambridgeplanning.org\)](#)

In response to Members' questions the Strategy and Economy Manager said the following:

- i. The preferred options documents provided a summary on the position of the water supply issue and more detail within the topic paper supporting the plan.
- ii. Water Resources East were currently developing a management plan ready for publication due August 2022.
- iii. Work on the reservoir had started through a 'rapid process', through Cambridge Water and Anglian Water and the current water management plan.
- iv. Water Resources East were looking at a range of issues including water lost through leakage, agricultural use, water efficiency measures, and giving a wider message that water is a scarce resource that we should all use cautiously.

Members of the public asked several questions, as set out below

**Re Cambridge United FC's women's team, for as long as I can remember the team has had to play its home matches outside of the city, sometimes outside of the county. What scope within the local plan is there for a new ground for the club, esp given the rising popularity of women's football and the number of women and girls taking up the sport?**

The reference to identify the Abbey Stadium as a development opportunity would potentially give the opportunity to look at both the men's' and women's team. There were no specific proposals for a new stadium, however the issue could be looked at further as the Plan developed.

**Was the previous local plan (2006) a success? Is there a report that you can publish and publicise that highlights whether the city built the amount of social housing the plan said was needed? Did it build the overall number of homes that was planned?**

This Plan first proposed the Major Urban Extension such as Clay Farm, Eddington Darwin Green, and development north of Cherry Hinton to name a few examples. There had been a success in bringing those developments to fruition. Cambridge always had a five-year supply of land and was on track with the targets.

Annual Monitoring Reports were published every year to show how the plans were performing.

**I am concerned about the accuracy of some of your consultants' reports, on leisure facilities such as swimming pools, and Cambridge's night life. I am concerned that your consultants are not sufficiently modelling for demand for such facilities that comes from outside Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. What is the formal process for challenging the conclusions of consultants?**

Members of the public were encouraged to make comments on the evidence based documents through the First Proposals Consultation process and express any concerns they had.

**In the New Local Plan, how will existing Policy 23 be carried forward to strengthen protection of (a) the northern half of St Matthew's Piece (\*not\* a designated "potential development site"; cf Fig. 3.9 in the 2018 Local Plan) and (b) the New Street allotments? Should both areas be removed from the "Eastern Gate Opportunity Area"? If other explicit protections would be *more* effective, what are they and how would this be achieved?**



Existing local plans placed a high priority on the protection and enhancement of green spaces, and this is proposed to be continued by the First Proposals. The proposal to continue the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area in the First Proposals [Policy S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge](#), which included the green spaces identified, does not infer that the Councils are proposing development for these spaces. Inclusion of these green spaces within the Opportunity Area are rather to ensure that this area is considered in the context of any development.

The adopted Plan explicitly protects St Matthew's Piece and New Street allotments as Protected Open Spaces, and the policy directions set out in the First Proposals including [Policy BG/PO: Protecting open spaces](#) and [Policy BG/GI: Green Infrastructure](#) – which sought respectively to protect open spaces, and to support protection and enhancement of existing green infrastructure including allotments, show that it is highly likely that the Greater Cambridge Local Plan would do the same.

Views on the proposed approaches set out above via [consultation website](#).

**In the New Local Plan, how can existing Policy 60 (on Tall Buildings) be strengthened so that it is actually *applied* per its wording (i.e, when a proposal does significantly exceed the surrounding built form)?**

Adopted Local Plan policies including Policy 60 were matters for consideration at the planning application stage.

For the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, the [First Proposals](#) Great Places theme includes a number of proposed policies relevant to design, and [Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design](#) proposes the approach to tall buildings. These proposals would be developed into draft policies following the consultation. Opinions on the proposed policies could be placed on the [consultation website](#) so that Offices could take them into account in preparing the draft plan, including how tall buildings should be approached

## **21/62/EAC Title: City Centre COVID Recovery Project Update - Area Committee Briefing**

The briefing paper was noted.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

**CHAIR**