

WEST / CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE

23 August 2012
7.00 - 10.40 pm

Present: Councillors Reiner (Chair), Kightley (Vice-Chair), Bick, Hipkin, Rosenstiel, Smith, Tucker, Nethsingha and Whitebread

County Councillors Nethsingha and Whitebread

Officers:

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams

Project Delivery and Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Anti-social Behaviour Officer: Sarah Steggles

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Also in Attendance

Chief Inspector Neil Sloan

Police Sergeant Andrea Gilbert

Community Fire Safety Officer Jim Meikle

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/44/WAC Apologies

Apologies were received from County Councillor Brooks-Gordon and City Councillors Cantrill and Reid.

12/45/WAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)

There were no declarations of interest.

12/46/WAC Planning Applications

3a 12/0614/FUL - Radcliffe Court, Rose Crescent

The committee received an application to replace the facade to the existing residential flats, common parts entrances at ground and second floor levels and associated refurbishment.

Ms Dupuont addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant in support of the application.

RESOLVED (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

3b 12/0615/LBC - Radcliffe Court, Rose Crescent

The committee received an application for, Listed Building Consent, to replace the facade to the existing residential flats, common parts entrances at ground and second floor levels and associated refurbishment.

RESOLVED (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

3c 12/0709/FUL - 108 Barton Road

The committee received an application for an amendment to an existing application (10/0805/FUL) relating to the velux windows in the east elevation. The officer recommended approval of the application subject to an additional condition:

The proposed velux windows on the east elevation roof slope facing 106 Barton Road shall serve first floor living space only and not serve any conversion into habitable or storage space of the roof void below the velux windows to serve additional second floor living space.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the occupants of 106 Barton Road (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/14)'

Objectors Ghanim Wadhida and Shadia Taha were unable to attend and had requested that a statement be read out on their behalf making the following points in objection to the application:

- i. The current clear glass and openable windows were installed without permission.
- ii. The windows are not needed for the current configuration of the property, which would suggest the applicant plans to install a habitable floor at a later date.
- iii. Previous development of the property has caused a loss of privacy for neighbours.
- iv. If permission is granted the objector would request this be restricted to obscure glass and non openable.

RESOLVED (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and to approve planning permission subject to the additional condition as detailed above.

12/47/WAC Chair's Announcement: S106 Workshops

The Chair read the following statement regarding S106 Workshops.

Developers are often asked to make payments to the City Council to address the impact of their developments on Cambridge. These developer (or Section 106) contributions are used to provide or improve local amenities such as play areas, parks and open spaces, sports facilities and community centres.

The City Council has agreed to devolve to Area Committees decisions on which new local projects will be funded from particular types of developer contributions. To help inform these decisions, the City Council is holding public meetings in each area to seek views on current facilities and how these could be improved to help meet changing local needs, within the amounts of money available to spend in each area.

The West/Central Area Workshop will be held on Thursday 13 September 2012 at 7.30pm at Castle Methodist Church Hall.

Invitations are being sent out to Residents Associations and local community groups. Members of the public were invited to attend and take part.

The Chair announced that new feedback forms were available on tables around the room and requested feedback from attendees.

12/48/WAC Declarations of Interest (Main Agenda Item)

There were no declarations of interest.

12/49/WAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 21st June 2012 were approved and signed as a correct record.

12/50/WAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes

In the absence of Councillor Cantrill, the Project Delivery and Environment Manager responded to the outstanding action relating to cycle signage on Christ's Piece. The existing signage was agreed to be poor and did not cover all access point to the area. Additional signage would be added at appropriate locations.

12/51/WAC Open Forum

(Q1) Richard Taylor

Was planning permission obtained for moving the windmill on Midsummer Common? If not, why not?

Councillor Cantrill was not present to respond to this question and will be asked to respond to Mr Taylor direct, outside the meeting.

Action

(Q2) Jim Chisholm

Other parts of the Country (Oxford) are taking more pro active approach to enforcing 20phm speed limits. Why is so little action being taken in Cambridge?

Chief Inspector Sloan responded. Action had taken place and the Police force was committed to Road Safety. However, Police action alone would not address this problem. Improved signage, public awareness and education combined with police action would provide a long-term solution. A change of culture and public attitude was needed.

Councillor Whitebread confirmed that the County Council had had productive discussions with Stagecoach regarding the 20mph limit and were making good progress in raising awareness.

Members further suggested that taxis were also part of the problem and further consultations were needed to address this.

(Q3) Martin Lucas-Smith

On behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign the recent Police action requiring cyclist to purchase lights instead of issuing tickets was welcomed.

Members agreed that this innovation was a good approach to an annual problem.

(Q4) Richard Taylor

How is this committee going to respond to the East Area Committees call for a dispersal zone? East Area Committee suggested the order would only be effective if East Road and Burleigh Street were included.

Councillor Bick responded. Dispersal orders were not in the gift of the Council. Area Committees can comment and support orders but cannot impose them. West Central Committee would consider this matter once the Police had had time to respond to the East Area Committee.

(Q5) Peter Constable

Young people gather on Jesus Green in the late evening and cause problems for local residents. What should the public do?

Incidents of this nature should be reported on the Police non-emergency number (101). The police would then decide if the situation warranted a visit.

(Q6) Mr Kellett

Are the trees in Salmon Lane receiving the care and attention they need?

Councillor Bick reported that he had asked someone to inspect the trees. He invited the public to contact him if they had concerns.

(Q7) John Lawton

What progress has been made regarding the Maid's Causeway and Newmarket Road 20mph signage steering group?

The Project Delivery and Environment Manager would be arranging this in the near future. Cambridge Cycle Campaign requested an invitation.

12/52/WAC Street Parking - Emergency Vehicle Obstruction

The committee received an oral report from Jim Meikle, Community Fire Safety Officer from Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service regarding parking obstructing emergency vehicles. He highlighted the following issues:

- Parked vehicles limiting access to narrow streets
- Vehicles parked too close to junctions limiting the turning circle of fire vehicles.

- Vehicle parking over fire hydrants due to lack of public awareness.
- Commuter parking in residential streets.

Members were concerned that the Fire and Rescue Service vehicle fleet did not include appliances designed for narrow streets that are a feature of much of Cambridge. Jim Meikle stated that modern appliances were larger as smaller vehicles did not have the capacity to fight fires. However, he reassured members that, as long as appliances can get into narrow streets, they could reach fires.

Members indicated that they would support an education campaign and some increase in parking restriction but not widespread, increased double yellow lines. Jim Meikle confirmed that his team were looking for small changes that would have a big impact on the problem.

Members agreed that many of the problems were caused by lack of awareness of members of the public. Concerns were raised that the locations of fire hydrants were rarely mentioned in Road Traffic Orders. In addition, many members of the public would not recognise them and might park over them due to ignorance. Councillor Bick stated that this was a complex issue that would require a joint approach. If legally parked vehicles were part of the problem then the regulation might need to be reviewed. If the problem was mainly illegal parking, Police action might be needed. If lack of awareness was the problem, a public education campaign might be needed.

Members endorsed Jim Meikle's proposal that the Neighbourhood Action Group considered the following as potential priorities:

1. Support for publicity campaign/street surgery led by CFRS with partners to highlight risk to residents;
2. Support for caution/enforcement action where highway obstruction occurs particularly at junctions;
3. Request for County Highways to work with partners to identify risk areas and to report back to WAC possible solutions.

12/53/WAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The committee received a report from Chief Inspector Sloan and Police Sergeant Andrea Gilbert regarding the policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the West Central Area Committee of the 26th April 2012. The pro-active work and emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted as below.

- i. Sergeant Gilbert reported successful recent action to address over-ranking at taxi ranks.
- ii. A number of complaints about unlicensed punt tours operators had been received and action had been taken.

Existing Priority: Speed enforcement in support of the 20mph limit.

John Lawton

Police action regarding cyclist includes education, can this also be applied to motorists? Dropping the 20mph priority would send the wrong message to motorists.

Martin Lucas-Smith

Police time should be related to danger to others and therefore the 20mph priority should be retained.

Members asked for a breakdown on action taken to-date and for more information on the type of vehicle involved. Sergeant Gilbert will supply this information. She stated that the culprits were predominately private cars but had included some taxis but no buses.

Members discussed how useful it was to pursue this priority at present. Councillor Bick suggested that other priorities were also important and that this committee should drop this priority for the time being. Dropping this as a priority would not mean that no action would be taken. The committee valued the Police commitment in sending high-ranking officers to West Central Area Committee and welcomed the opportunity for positive joint working in future. Members agreed that returning to this as a priority when the improved signage was in place, possibly linked to a programme of public education, was the best way forward.

Existing Priority: Anti-social cycling in the West/Central area.

Members welcomed the action that had taken place on this priority and suggested that it be retained as a priority due to the approaching dark evenings and the new cohort of undergraduates expected shortly. The North Area Committee also had this as a priority adding weight to the priority. It was suggested that the current approach of education and enforcement was producing results.

It was suggested that there were known hot spots for dangerous cycling, such as Round Church Street at peak commuting times, and that these could be targeted for enforcement action. Tackling cyclist who use mobile phone while cycling was also suggested.

Existing Priority: Mobile phone thefts from City licensed premises.

Members were concerned that an education film aimed at students gave the false impression that they were likely to be targeted in the City. The film would be edited before freshers week to correct this image. Members expressed satisfaction with the work that had been done on this priority.

Suggested New Priority: Anti-social behaviour in Grafton Centre Area.

Councillor Bick proposed adding anti-social behaviour in the Fair Street, Grafton Centre and Fitzroy Street area. This area has had a long history of low-level problems associated with street life and local residents had been quite tolerant. However, a recent residents meeting reported emerging levels of aggression not previously encountered. Mobile CCTV cameras had been requested for the area.

Sergeant Gilbert reported that the East Area Committee had recently requested action on similar problems in the Mill Road area.

Suggested New Priority: Punt Touting

At the request of the police the committee considered adding punt touting as a priority. It was agreed that a multi agency approach was needed. Members debated the timing of this request, as although punting is now a year round activity, there was likely to be less demand as winter approached.

Suggested New Priority: Emergency Vehicle Obstruction

As minute number 12/52/WAC above.

Resolved on a show of hands members agreed the following priorities:

- i. Anti-social cycling in the West/Central area.
- ii. Anti-social behaviour in the Grafton Centre area.
- iii. Emergency Vehicle Obstruction

12/54/WAC Canterbury Street Traffic Calming Environmental Improvement Programme Project

The committee received a report from the Project Delivery and Environment Manager regarding the Canterbury Street traffic calming project.

Anna Crutchley spoke on behalf of the residents of 2–14 Canterbury Street and raised the following points:

- i. This is a narrow road with narrow pavements.
- ii. The problem is not just cars rat running but also heavy goods vehicles.
- iii. Consultations generated low response level as it was unclear how the results would be used.
- iv. Misleading consultation results as it was not clear that those in support were expected to respond.

Members had also received a written statement from Windsor Road Residents' Association in support of the pinch point proposal.

Members suggested that although the consultation process may have had problems, there appeared to be general support from the households most directly involved.

Councillor Hipkin was concerned that to go ahead with the scheme would appear to be ignoring the results of the consultation. He suggested that the residents in the surrounding area were looking for strategic vision rather than a series of small projects that merely displaced the problem.

Members expressed misgivings about the consultation process, which had been approved by Ward Councillors, but agreed, that on balance there appeared to be general support for the proposal. Councillor Rosenstiel suggested that the consultation results were misleading as the street in question was long and some sections would feel the impact of the proposals more than others. He further stated that the next stage of the process would require a Road Traffic Order with the associated full consultation on the formal proposal. This would allow residents a further chance to express their views.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1 and one abstention) to proceed with the road narrowing option one.

The meeting ended at 10.40 pm

CHAIR