

**WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

24 June 2014  
7.00 - 10.15 pm

**Present:** Councillors Tucker (Vice-Chair), Bick, Cantrill, Holland, Ratcliffe, Reid, Reiner, Smith, Cearnis and Nethsingha

**Officers Present:**

Head of property Services: Dave Prinsep

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Project Delivery and Environment Manager: Andy Preston

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

**Also in attendance:**

Capital and Funding Manager (Cambridgeshire County Council): Daniel Clarke

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**14/34/WCAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair - WAC**

The Lead Officer, Dave Princep, took the chair whilst the West Area Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Reid proposed and Councillor Cantrill seconded the nomination of Councillor Smith as Chair.

Councillor Holland proposed and Councillor Ratcliffe seconded the nomination of Councillor Hipkin as Vice Chair

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the nomination of Councillor Tucker as Vice Chair.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to elect Councillor Smith as Chair of the West / Central Committee for the ensuing year.

Resolved by **(5 votes to 0)** to appoint Councillor Tucker as Vice Chair of the West / Central Committee for the ensuing year.

**14/35/WCAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Hipkin.

**14/36/WCAC      Declarations of Interest (Planning)**

No declarations were made.

**14/37/WCAC      14/0414/FUL: Milton House, Christ's Pieces, Cambridge**

The Committee received a report for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought planning permission for retrospective development consisting of the installation of three sections of timber fence.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that a letter of complaint had been received from the applicant about the notice period that had been given to advise of the meeting. The applicant was unable to attend due to a pre-arranged appointment and was unable to rearrange due to the short notice given.

The Committee were advised that the invitation had been sent to the applicant on 17 June 2014 which was the standard seven day time frame for all applicants.

Councillor Radcliffe withdrew from this item and did not vote as he had not undertaken any planning training.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to part approve and part refuse retrospective planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for reasons set out in the Officer report.

**14/38/WCAC      Chair's Announcements**

The Chair announced that a written statement from the Signals & Systems Engineer, Cambridgeshire County Council, regarding works to the traffic light signals at Northampton Road/Magdalene Street/Chesterton Lane/Castle Street, was available for information for members of the public and would be sent direct to the Committee.

**14/39/WCAC      Declarations of Interest ( Main Agenda)**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Smith	14/09/WCAC	Personal:      Employed      by Cambridge University

**14/40/WCAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 24th April 2014 were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the correction of two clerical errors on page 45 of the agenda pack.

**14/41/WCAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**14/29/WAC

Councillor Reiner recommended that the item concerning the renewal of the temporary planning permission for a Coach Station Kiosk on Parkside should be placed under this item. The matter had been discussed at the previous meeting and agreed that the decision needed to come to West / Central Area Committee.

Councillor Reiner informed the Committee that the item had been called in and as yet had received no update from Officers despite repeated requests. **(ON GOING)**

14/30/WCAC

Councillor Cearns stated that the topic of street lighting should have been added to this item and reported that a meeting had taken place with County and City Councillors and representatives of Belfour Beatty as agreed at the last meeting of West / Central Area Committee.

Councillor Cearns reported that both County Council and Belfour Beatty had agreed not to provide more than the standard street lighting in residential areas. Therefore the heritage lighting in these areas would be removed.

Due to the change in administration at the City Council it had yet to be confirmed if the Council would continue with additional funding to assist in the provision of providing higher quality street lighting in the City Centre. **(ON GOING)**

14/18/WCAC

Councillor Cantrill informed the Committee that a more permanent solution had been made to the road surface in St Andrew Street. **(CLOSED)**

13/58/WCAC

Regarding the outstanding item on why Cambridge University Sports Centre had been opened without an approved management plan, Councillor Cantrill reported to the Committee that the University had agreed to open the Sports Centre to the public. Over the next month information would be released on their website to inform residents.

Councillor Reid reiterated it was good news that Cambridge University had given access to the wider community and recommended that the City Council's Head of Arts and Recreation communicate this City wide. **(ACTION)**

**14/42/WCAC      Open Forum****Colin Rosenstiel:**

**I would like to make the Committee aware of the amount of heavy vehicles that are using King Street passing close to residential housing, especially at Manor Place. I would like to see proposed weight restrictions in Kings Street which are long overdue.**

The Chair noted the concern raised and thanked Colin Rosenstiel for this comments.

**Hester Wells, Cambridge Cycling Campaign**

**I would like to express concern at the increase of traffic that the University's North / West development will bring to the area and will have an adverse effect on the junction. How will Councillors ensure the development delivers on its promises?**

Members' Comments:

- Endorsed the comments made by the public speaker on this issue.
- The junctions on Madingley Road required more attention in the planning stages; this applied to a majority of junctions in city such as Long Road.
- Expressed frustration at how the proposed new developments were linked into the existing infrastructure and felt that this could be improved.
- It would appear that the needs of cyclists and pedestrians had been relegated, particularly at the Madingley Road Junction.
- Not too late for City and County Officers to meet to discuss how the traffic management could be improved for North - West development.

- Stated that the cycling provision had been considered inside the footprint of the development but not in all directions outside the development. Expressed concern at the proposed opening from the University Site onto Huntingdon Road and the impact that this would have on cyclists.
- Acknowledged that Huntingdon Road required much needed cycle improvements.

Councillor Nethsingha advised that she would be happy to meet with County Officers and representatives from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign to discuss how this could be improved **(ACTION)**.

### **Timothy Sykes**

**There is lighting that is not working on Jesus Green which is dangerous and can lead to crime and antisocial behaviour. What are the City and County Councils doing to fix this problem?**

Councillor Reiner advised that there were path improvement works which would be taking place and that she would be happy to investigate the matter further.

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager confirmed that the lights had recently been disconnected on the diagonal paths ready for the improvement works to start. These would be replaced with the same style of lantern on Parker's Piece and standard lighting on the tow path.

### **Mr Price**

**Speaking as a private individual on behalf of several residents on the North side of Portugal Street, could I ask why the authorities consistently fail to do anything about the way in which the footway on the North side of Portugal Street in front of our houses is frequently obstructed by vehicles that are parked on it? Sometimes there are more vehicles on the pavement than on the road and it is now beginning to become damaged, uneven and a trip hazard.**

**The Highway Code states in rule 244:**

**'You MUST NOT park partially or wholly on the pavement in London and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or push chairs'.**

**There are no signs permitting footway parking in Portugal Street. The traffic wardens are not authorised to issue tickets for this offence and the police consistently refuse to do anything about it on the grounds that, in their opinion, the vehicles are not causing an obstruction.**

**In the report for the agenda item on the Environmental Improvement Programme, it refers to Portugal street as “a well-used route for walking between the City and Jesus Green”.**

**Why are the needs of pedestrians consistently ranked below those of private motor vehicles in this City?**

Councillor Bick stated the obstruction of pavements had been set as a Police Priority at the previous West / Central meeting when the Police had been in attendance. The Police would be in attendance at the next West / Central meeting to report on the progress on the priority settings. It was suggested that Mr Price to reiterate this particular issue he had raised.

Councillor Ratcliffe echoed the comments of Councillor Bick and spoke of the dangers that parking on the pavements caused.

The Chair asked if this specific example could be reported to the Police between meetings and remind them that there was a priority set to tackle this issue. **(ACTION)**

**Bev Nicolson**

**Is there a plan to sort out the pavements in the City?**

Councillor Nethsingha replied that monies had been allocated in the County Council Roads and Repair budget, which was available to spend and there was a small amount of evidence to show that the money was being spent. It was important to report any repairs / works that were required to ensure that the money would be spent on pavement repairs.

**Councillor Cantrill**

I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee and to the public the City Council's proposed changes to the structure of the Area Committee meetings, which will be considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee for consideration before going to full Council in July 2014. The changes are as follows:

- i. Transferral of planning applications to the Central Planning Committee.

- ii. Change the frequency of the number of meetings held throughout the year.

#### Members' Comments:

- i. Noted that Central Planning Committee was held during working hours which could create difficulty for people to attend.
- ii. The Open Forum of the Area Committees offered an opportunity to hold elected members to account on a diverse range of items.
- iii. Explained there was a possibility to change the timing of the Central Planning Committee to make the meetings more flexible to the public.
- iv. The removal of planning from Area Committees would allow more time for the Committee to spend working with the public on local issues relevant to areas which they live in.
- v. Queried if there had been a clear consultation process with the public regarding the removal of planning from Area Committees.
- vi. Expressed concern at changing the format to Area Committee meetings which were of great value to the public.
- vii. Stated that any consultation process should include County Councillors.
- viii. Welcomed the scrutiny, in particular the cost of holding the meetings.
- ix. Would like to see alternative ways to engage the public in the democratic process.
- x. Suggested that the Central Planning Committee offered expertise and experience when considering applications.
- xi. Highlighted that figures produced by Officers had shown that Area Committees had a better success rate on planning decisions unsuccessfully challenged at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate, compared to Central Planning.
- xii. Queried if there were plans to remove further delegated decision making from Area Committees.
- xiii. Stated that Area Committees offered close contact with residents and that Members of the Committee were able to make decisions on planning matters on areas that they know extremely well.

#### Comments from members of the public:

- i. Would the removal of planning from the West / Central Area Committee impact the meeting times, perhaps they could start earlier?
- ii. Removing planning from Area Committees could have a negative impact on those residents who were disabled or vulnerable, as they might not feel as comfortable attending a meeting in a formal environment of the Guildhall and have travel out of their ward.

The Chair explained that it was within the gift of the Committee to decide the start times of the meeting. However an earlier start time did not equate to an earlier finish.

### **Councillor Cearns**

I would like to bring to the public's attention that refurbishment to the University Arms Hotel on Regent Street is due to start in the autumn. Before construction starts a meeting with the contractor, City and County Officers, will take place to address concerns regarding the impact this would have on the surrounding area. I hope that there would be opportunities for the public to make comment.

### **14/43/WCAC Future Agenda Items**

The following items were put forward for consideration:

- Business Improvement District (BID): To invite representatives from the Board of BID to present an update on the scheme and advise of future plans. **(ACTION)**
- North / West City Development: To invite senior members of Cambridge University to give a presentation on this development and their aspirations for other key sites in the west / central area. **(ACTION)**
- The City Deal: To invite representatives to explain what this means for the City, the impact that it may have and the opportunities that it would bring. **(ACTION)**

### **14/44/WCAC Environmental Improvement Programme - WAC**

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environmental Manager.

The report requested that the Committee determine which of the proposed new Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) schemes should be allocated funding as part of the 2014/15 Environmental Improvement Programme, from those listed in Appendix A of Officer's report. This included the allocation of necessary third party funding for schemes that had secured contributions from Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highway Improvement Programme.

The report also requested the Committee considered the reallocation of funding currently allocated to projects that are either not feasible or no longer required.



The Project Delivery & Environmental Manager informed the Committee that the calculations of the recommendations in the report had changed (original text ~~strike through~~ and amended text underlined).

The following recommendations were put forward for the Committee's consideration:

- i. To reallocate the £10,000 currently allocated to the Eltisley Avenue Planting Scheme that has proved not to be feasible.
- ii. To allocate additional funding of £5,000 to the existing Grantchester Rd Traffic Calming Project.
- iii. To allocate additional funding of ~~£7,000~~ £4,000 to the existing Kite Area Parking Project.
- iv. To allocate the required ~~£33,000~~ £28,000 of match funding to the schemes that have secured a contribution from Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highway Improvement Programme.
- v. To allocate the remaining ~~£12,159~~ £18,159 to the remaining proposed projects in Appendix A of this report.
- vi. To approve all new projects for implementation, subject to positive consultation where required and final approval by Ward Councillors.
- vii. To note the progress of existing schemes listed in Appendix C of this report.

Comments from members of the public:

**Alistair Storer, Cambridge Cycling Campaign**

Item WC3 (Appendix A): We support residents parking schemes on the basis that they should reduce commuter parking in the city.

Item WC4 (Appendix A): We support the scheme but note only a small amount of funding has been allocated and would like to see a major project in the area that links to Barton Road.

Item WC7: We support the scheme but advise that the word 'vehicles' should be replaced by 'motor vehicles'.

Item WC8 (Appendix A): We support the removal of the barriers as they would allow none standard cycle bikes through such as cargo cycles and cycles with trailers.

Item WC9 (Appendix A): We support the scheme and hope in the future that the end of Kings Road is closed entirely to all motor vehicles.

Item WC10 (Appendix A): We appreciate that the road is not best for pedestrians but the road is already narrow and narrowing this would make the environment hostile to cycle users.

Item WC11 (Appendix A): We are in agreement with Park Street Residents' Association that parking should not be permitted on the footpaths.

Item WC12 (Appendix A): We support the development of double yellow lines as this would reduce obstructions for cycle users.

### **Colin Rosenstiel**

Item WC5 (Appendix A): Has the Committee considered the cost of maintenance in this area for existing and additional planting and does the Committee agree that that the cost should be met with payment taken from the car park?

Item WC11 (Appendix A): If the installation of double yellow lines is not supported by the Park Street Residents' Association should this scheme be considered?

Item WC9 (Appendix A): Would like to see the end of Kings Road closed entirely to all motor vehicles

Both Councillors Cantrill and Reid acknowledged that money had been spent from the car park funds on previous schemes and it would be beneficial to investigate if this was possible once again.

Councillor Cantrill commented that some of the trees already planted were not well maintained and there was a need to ensure that the maintenance was carried out on a regular basis.

Councillor Bick stated he was aware of a similar approach taken at the County Council used by the Highways Division and suggested that the Project Delivery & Environmental Manager talk to the relevant City Council department responsible and investigate if funding could be obtained. **ACTION: Project Delivery & Environmental Manager**

### **Richard Price, Park Street Residents' Association (PSRA)**

Item WC11 (Appendix A): We were surprised to find this item on the list in the Environmental Improvement Programme. We had no idea that this matter

would be up for consideration and are concerned at the suggestions 'to allow partial footway parking'.

At short notice, a meeting of PSRA committee was convened last evening and I have the committee's full support to oppose any plan to permit even partial footway parking of vehicles in Portugal Street. Could I ask the Committee, when this item is considered, to confirm that vehicles will never be permitted to park on the footway in Portugal Street?

For the sake of clarification any proposal to replace the existing single yellow line by a double yellow line on the North side of Portugal Street would not be supported by residents in the PSRA area who do not have off street parking.

**Mary Wheater, Windsor Road Residents' Association**

Item WC8 (Appendix A): We welcome and support the allocation of funds to improve safety at the school end of the Warwick Road – Windsor Road passageway and do not wish to cause any delay to it.

The Windsor Road end of the passageway is also hazardous as cycles and children can exit it at speed into traffic. It too deserves modification to make it safer, and will require a separate allocation of funds at a later stage.

In addition, work at the Windsor Road end must be coordinated with other plans in the local area. The first is the new foul sewer for Darwin Green planned to run down Windsor Road. The second is a scheme, to mitigate the increased traffic along the Oxford Road/Windsor Road link between Histon and Huntingdon Roads that is anticipated to result from the University NW development. S106 money is already allocated for this.

**Rosemary Young supported by DR White (written statement)**

Item WC5 (Appendix A): I would like to support the proposals made by Councillor Tim Bick in connection with visual improvements to the Adam and Eve Street Car Park.

A few years ago the railing along this car park had fallen into disrepair, several were missing and others were damaged. The Council replaced these with functional but unattractive boards and bright yellow metal posts which did little to enhance the visual aspect of the car park, which is on the boundary of the conservation area.

In addition, some of the trees are now in poor condition, we have seen an increase in the number of industrial sized rubbish bins which are clearly visible from the road.

I would support any suggestions for greening the street edge of the car park, possibly using urban friendly plants similar to those in the existing beds at the ends of Paradise, Grafton and John Street which require little maintenance. In due course when the trees die it might be an improvement to replace them with similar mountain ash to those already thriving in the area. This would create a cohesive identity for all the local planting as well as a degree of screening for the car park.

I agree with the eligibility comments that this would provide a “direct lasting and noticeable improvement to the appearance of the street”, and would be “publicly visible”, and would welcome any improvements which work to this end.

### **Anna Snowden**

Item WC5 (Appendix A): I support the written statement from Rosemary Young; the current layout is hard and unattractive, particular the colour of the railings. The area is industrial looking and unattractive. Any kind of border planting would soften the view.

### Members' Comments:

- i. Welcomed the allocation of funding to the existing Kite Area parking project as the public had been waiting three years for the completion of the scheme.
- ii. Pleased to note the recommendation of £5,000 to the existing Grantchester Road Traffic Calming Project.
- iii. Questioned whether additional projects could be put forward for consideration.
- iv. Hoped that item WC4 could be extended with future s106 funding.
- v. Commented that the cost of item WC2 was high.
- vi. Queried what would happen to the money that the County Council had agreed to provide funding contributions to if the Committee did not elect that scheme.
- vii. Enquired if the County Council had a reserved list of schemes and where would match funding come from.
- viii. Highlighted specific streets for item WC12 (Appendix A) in the Castle Ward - McManus Estate, Warwick Road, Carisbrooke Road and Tavistock Street as requiring urgent attention.
- ix. Recommended the cost of the physical changes be removed from the costing of item WC3 (Appendix A).
- x. Suggested that an external agency be used for the design of the resident

- parking for item WC3 (Appendix A).
- xi. Requested that Barton Close be removed from item WC3 (Appendix A).
  - xii. Noted that the schemes for the Environmental Improvement Programme could be hi-jacked by transport schemes due to the funding contributions from County Council.
  - xiii. Questioned if the entire budget for item WC7 (Appendix A) was necessary and if the scheme would be fully supported by the public.
  - xiv. Suggested that funding be allocated for a full public consultation (to include stakeholders) only.

### The Committee:

At the request of the Committee the Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately, with the exception of recommendation V of the Officer's report. Each scheme in that recommendation (Appendix A) would be voted on separately.

The Chair proposed the funding of £2,000 recommended for item WC2 (Appendix A) of the Officer's report be reduced to £1,000.

**Resolved unanimously** to do so.

Councillor Cantrill proposed the funding of £5,000 recommended for item WC3 (Appendix A) of the Officer's report be reduced to £2,000 to cover the cost of consultation only.

**Resolved unanimously** to do so.

Councillor Bick proposed the funding of £10,000 be reduced to £2,700 for item WC7 (Appendix A) to cover the cost of consultation only.

**Resolved unanimously** to do so.

Councillor Bick proposed that item WC11 was withdrawn from the EIP Scheme.

**Resolved unanimously** to do so.

Councillor Cantrill proposed the remaining funding of £4359 be allocated to an additional scheme entitled W13 (Newnham Croft).

**Resolved unanimously:**

To approve recommendation (i) of the Officer's report.

To approve recommendation (ii) of the Officer's report.

To approve recommendation (iii) of the Officer's report.

To approve recommendation (iv) of the Officer's report.

To approve recommendation (v) of the Officer's report as follows (original text ~~strike through~~ and amended text underlined):

WC1: Histon Rd pedestrian crossing		£3000
WC2: All Souls Lane road sign & noticeboard	<del>£2000</del>	£1,000
WC3: Newnham parking consultation	<del>£5,000</del>	£2000
WC4: Barton Road / Newnham Road / Grantchester improvements		Street junction £500
WC5: Adam & Eve Street car park		£15,000
WC6: Albion Row		£15,000
WC7: Elm St / Prospect Row		£2,700
WC8: Warwick Road / Windsor Road passageway		£1,000
WC9 King Street weight limit		£500
WC10: Newnham Road footway		£500
<del>WC11: Portugal Street</del>	<del>£500</del>	
WC12: North Newnham and Castle areas		£3000
<u>*WC13 Newnham Croft</u>		<u>£4359</u>

To approve recommendation (vi) of the Officer's report.

To note the recommendation (vii) of the Officer's report.

**14/45/WCAC West Area Corridor Funding (Corridor Area Transport Plan).**

The Committee received a report from the Capital and Funding Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council.

The report set out to inform Members of the process for allocating Corridor Area Transport Plan (CATP) S106 funding and provided an update on progress on funding and schemes which the Committee had proposed at a meeting of West / Central Area Committee in November 2013.

The Committee were asked for their views on additional schemes for consideration and assessment for eligibility of funding.

**Members' Comments:**

- i. Noted that the current funds available were £156,874 for the Western Corridor.
- ii. Requested that Newnham Councillors and residents be involved in the Ring Road Signage Scheme.
- iii. Queried why the cycling improvements on the junction of Mill Lane and Trumpington Street suggested at the November meeting had not been included in the Officer's report.
- iv. There was no signage for cyclists on Trumpington Road between Brooklands Avenue & Bateman Street junctions cycling out towards Trumpington which make it hard to determine if the lights are on green or not – could this be investigated by County Officers?
- v. Queried how the ratings (value for money) for each scheme had been calculated as referenced in the Officer's report, particularly for Midsummer Common.
- vi. Important to get the scheme right on Midsummer Common and ensure proper public consultation.
- vii. Expressed an urgent need for Magdelene Bridge area to be resurfaced as reference in 8.1 of the Officers report.
- viii. Queried if the Park and Ride on Madingley Road could be expanded under the CATP scheme.
- ix. Stated the importance to improve the cycle ways on Huntingdon Road.
- x. Recognised that it had been recommended that £400,000 should be allocated to the renewal of the cycle paths on Midsummer Common but queried if £156,874 could be allocated in the first instance for work to start.

Comments from members of the public:

- i. Reiterated that the junction between Mill Lane and Trumpington Street required cycling improvements.
- ii. Felt that there had been no public consultation with regards to the scheme on Midsummer Common.

The Capital and Funding Manager advised of the following:

- i. Improvements to the junction of Mill Lane, Trumpington Street and Silver Street would be included in the access and capacity study under the 6.4 of the Officers report (package of measures to make Cycling Safer on Trumpington Street).
- ii. Resurfacing of the highways was not included in the scheme but the request would be taken back to the relevant Officers.
- iii. A copy of the value for money calculations would be e-mailed to the Committee for their information (**ACTION**).
- iv. The expansion of the Park and Ride on Madingley Road did come under the CATP scheme.

The Committee:

Councillor Holland proposed that the current funds of £156,874 be allocated to 5.3 of the Officer's report towards cycling in improvements on Huntingdon Road ( **rejected by 1 vote to 9**)

Councillor Holland proposed that the decision was deferred.  
(**rejected by 1 vote to 9**)

Councillor Reiner proposed that the current funds of £156,874 be allocated to 5.4 of the Officer's report to start improvement works in part on key paths on Midsummer Common.

**Resolved (by 9 votes 1)** to do so.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

**CHAIR**