

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

2 February 2015

7.00 - 9.45 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Blackhurst (Chair), Pippas (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Avery, Dryden, McPherson, Meftah, Moore and Sanders

Area Committee Members: County Councillors Ashwood and Taylor

Officers:

Project Manager: John Richards

Public Realm Manager: Wendy Young

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers in Attendance:

Police Sergeant: Chris Horton

Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/71/SAC Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Crawford.

15/72/SAC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Pippas	15/78/SAC	Personal: Member of Cherry Hinton Baptist Church congregation. Did not vote on this item.
Councillor Sanders	15/79/SAC	Personal: Works on the Addenbrooke's site.

15/73/SAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

15/74/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

14/68/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Blackhurst to clarify 20 MPH consultation response deadline. Details not consistent on City Council website and consultation document hard copies. 05/01/15 suggested response date.”

Councillor Blackhurst had contacted John Richards (County Council) regarding the speed limit consultation. He had written to Mrs Slatter.

15/75/SAC Open Forum

- 1. Mr Woodburn made the following points:**
 - i. Expressed concern regarding the proposed modifications to the large roundabout near Addenbrooke’s Hospital where Hills Road joined Fendon Road. He had specific comments that he wished to feed into the process.**
 - ii. The modification proposals were not widely publicised.**
 - iii. Expressed concern at the perceived lack of join up between City and County Councillors and Officers.**

Councillor Moore said he was aware that residents had concerns about the proposals. The deadline to respond to the County Council consultation was noon 3 February 2015. The consultation had been launched in November 2014. However, the consultation material was difficult to understand (excessively technical), which meant that people felt unable to respond as the consultation matter was incomprehensible. The response deadline had been extended at least once due to this. Councillor Moore had only received details circa 26 January; other committee members said they had received none. Councillor Dryden added that the Addenbrooke’s Board were unaware of proposals too. Councillor Blackhurst noted various concerns were raised about the consultation process and said it was not the responsibility of South Area Committee to publicise it, but Councillors could follow up issues post meeting.

- 2. Three residents raised concerns regarding the Hills Road cycle scheme and in particular the loss of verges which it entails:**
 - i. Took issue with the consultation process.**
 - ii. Green spaces in Hills Road and the surrounding area needed to be protected (approximately seven roads).**
 - iii. An earlier City Council report had stressed the importance of said verges. The City Council report said the green spaces would be protected, but the cycleway consultation did not. This suggested details from the earlier report had been ignored.**
 - iv. Reiterated many residents' concerns at the perceived lack of join up between City and County Councillors and Officers. For example, City Council Tree Officers appeared to be unaware of the potential loss of trees. Residents had approached various City and County Officers about their concerns and were extremely dissatisfied with responses given.**
 - v. There were too many contractors involved in the proposed Hills Road work, which led to a lack of join up. Work appeared to have already been started on moving street lights before the consultation had closed.**

Councillor Taylor said:

- The County Council had undertaken a lot of consultation, but detailed plans had only become available recently.
- Some loss of verges was expected.
- It was unclear at this stage why City and County Councillors and Officers did not have the same understanding of what the consultation entailed and when it would close. SAC (South Area Committee) Members could follow this up after the meeting.
- The County Council Economy and Environment Committee would meet 3 February 2015 to make decisions regarding the Hills Road cycle scheme. This was a public meeting and residents could attend to make their views known.
- The Balfour Beatty street lighting scheme was a separate piece of work to the cycleway/roundabout scheme. Work on this would start in future after consultation had been undertaken. The intention was to replace old street lights with new ones that met British standards. Councillor Taylor was happy to share details upon request.

Councillor Blackhurst said that he would approach County Officers and as SAC Chair and invite them to attend a future meeting. Balfour Beatty had already been invited to the March meeting.

ACTION POINT: Councillor Blackhurst to clarify:

- **Consultation process and response deadline regarding the Hills Road cycle scheme and in particular the loss of verges which it entails.**
 - **The impact of planning application Ref 14/1691/S73: Fendon Road/Hills Road roundabout.**
- 3. Mr Bower suggested that Councillors should thoroughly review projects (eg Perne Road) before continuing with them.**

SAC Members said that national government (infrastructure) funding availability set the timetable for when the County Council could apply for, and use it. The window of opportunity to spend funding was extremely limited once awarded, so rightly or wrongly, County Officers undertook piecemeal projects in order to get some infrastructure work done (rather than trying to undertake joined up work minus funding).

- 4. Ms Allen (as Conservative Parliamentary candidate for South Cambs) offered to work with County Officers and Councillors to look at issues with residents.**

Councillor Taylor said she had already liaised with County Council Officers and Economy and Environment Committee Members on various occasions so they were aware of resident's concerns. Councillor Taylor would be happy to meet up with interested parties again post SAC.

15/76/SAC Policing & Safer Neighbourhoods

The Committee received a report from Police Sergeant Horton regarding policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 13 October 2014. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details). Previous priorities and engagement activity noted in the report were:

- Continue work against Class A dealers.
- Address cycle crime in response to citywide spike.
- Address cycling offences with the return of students and darker evenings (will complement effort against cycle crime and road safety).
- Dwelling burglary.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- i. Work taken to address drug dealing in the area around Rathmore Road and Rock Road.
- ii. Work taken to address drug dealing in Trumpington.
- iii. Drug dealing in Long Road and Sedley Taylor Road.
- iv. Anti-social cycling eg riding on pavements.
- v. Anti-social parking by parents near schools.
- vi. Taking enforcement action against speeding motorists and cyclists.

In response to Members' questions Sergeant Horton said the following:

- i. Money seized from people selling drugs went into a central pot, then was returned to the Police as part of a general use fund. Proceeds of crime seized from a particular area eg Cambridge, would not be ringfenced to be returned to that area.
- ii. Noted Member's interest in learning more about operational details of police work to address drug dealing. Information could be publicised through e-cops and SAC meetings. This would be general so it did not impact on current investigations.

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

1. **Mr John referred to the October 2014 SAC meeting. He said that violent crime was still high and asked why it was not a priority for SAC.**

Sergeant Horton said that addressing violent crime was a citywide priority, so did not have to be a specific to SAC. The high figures may be due to higher numbers of reported incidents, rather than an increase in the overall level. The Police had specialist units to investigate violent crime.

2. **Mr John asked if violent crime figures could be broken down to show types and trends.**

Sergeant Horton said he was unable to provide this information. He had asked for more detail, but was informed by colleagues that only headline statistics would be generated for area committee reports. E-cops could provide more information.

3. **A member of public asked for speed enforcement action to be taken in Long Road where drivers still travelled at 40 MPH although the speed limit had been reduced to 30 MPH for circa one year.**

Councillor McPherson requested a change to the recommendations. He formally proposed to amend the priorities as follows:

- Switching the numbering order so that ‘target the supply of controlled drugs’ was number 1 and ‘reduce dwelling burglary’ was number 2. This would show that ‘target the supply of controlled drugs’ was an important priority for SAC.
- Include a specific reference to Operation Hexham in the ‘target the supply of controlled drugs’ priority.

Councillors Ashwood and Moore requested a change to the recommendation (iii). Amendment:

- Include dangerous/anti-social parking and anti-social cycling.
- Include enforcement action against speeding motorists and cyclists.

The amendments were **unanimously agreed**.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

- i. Target the supply of controlled drugs (Class A); to include a specific reference to Operation Hexham
- ii. Reduce dwelling burglary
- iii. Target road safety by addressing anti-social cycling and dangerous/anti-social parking, and taking enforcement action against speeding motorists and cyclists.

After SAC had agreed their priorities, residents from Porson Road stated their concerns regarding pedestrian, cyclist and car access, traffic flow and safety concerns. They stated Porson Road was regularly used for parking by people going to work and school runs, plus construction workers. Residents stated they had contacted Councillors and Officers about their concerns, but were dissatisfied with the perceived lack of response.

Councillor Blackhurst stated the situation could be monitored through priority 3, but aspects of the problem in Porson Rd would need a new a Traffic Regulation Order to control parking.

Councillor Avery said that SAC was an appropriate forum where residents could raise concerns, but SAC could not take immediate remedial action.

ACTION POINT: Councillor Avery to liaise with Porson Road residents regarding traffic access, flow and parking safety concerns.

15/77/SAC Citywide 20 MPH Project - Phase 3 Consultation Responses

The Committee received a report from the Project Manager.

The report outlined the outcomes of the Cambridge 20 MPH Project Phase 3 (South and West/Central) public consultation and requested that South Area Committee provide recommendations to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport on how the project should be progressed.

The Project Manager said that 'Table 2: Responses from Statutory Consultees' in his report should in fact read 'Table 2: Traffic Sped Monitoring'.

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

- i. The 20 MPH limit should be implemented across the city to be practicable. Implementing piecemeal sent out the wrong messages.
- ii. The speed limit could be reviewed in two years if implemented.
- iii. The speed limit on new housing developments was 30 MPH until they were adopted by the Highways Agency. This placed them outside of the recommendations to the Executive Councillor. SAC Members agreed to prompt the Executive Councillor to accelerate the Traffic Regulation Order process to ensure developments were covered by the 20 MPH limit until adopted by the Highways Agency.

In response to Members' questions the Project Manager said the following:

- i. Other committees implemented the 20 MPH limit where there was a majority of residents in favour, even if not universal.
- ii. Schools had been included in the consultation.
- iii. A normal level of return had been received for responses ie as expected.
- iv. The 20 MPH limit was proposed in residential and business areas, not in arterial routes.

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

1. **Mr Woodburn made the following points about the proposed 20 MPH limit in Cherry Hinton Road:**
 - i. **Stated it was unclear in the Officer's report which parts of Cherry Hinton Road would be 20 MPH and which sections would not.**
 - ii. **Suggested that all sections of Cherry Hinton Road should be 20 MPH.**
 - iii. **Cherry Hinton Road (pavement) was used by many pedestrians, who would benefit from slower moving traffic. IE accidents**

involving vehicles moving at 20 MPH were less severe than those moving at 30 MPH.

- iv. **Requested that Brooklands Avenue be included in the 20 MPH project.**
2. **A member of public asked why the 20 MPH speed limit would be implemented without an evidence base to demonstrate the need. He took issue with the consultation process and stated it did not explore alternative priorities to spend funding on.**

Councillor Moore said there was evidence that 20 MPH speed limits led to better safety. They took time to implement, but people would adhere over time.

3. **A member of public referred to the reported lack of impact of the 20 MPH limit in the north of the city.**

The Project Manager said average traffic speed had been reduced by 1 MPH as expected. Structural features would need to be implemented in the highway to further reduce speed. The Project Manager acknowledged there was some comment in the media to reflect the perceived lack of impact.

Mr Woodburn added that the 1 MPH speed reduction made a small but significant impact as it reduced the number of collisions and deaths.

4. **A member of the public asked if there was any join up between the 20 MPH limit project and the Hills Road Cycleway. Would cyclists be prosecuted if they broke the 20 MPH speed limit?**

The Project Manager said there was no legal power to take enforcement action against unlicensed non-motorised vehicles.

Councillor Blackhurst said that SAC would vote tonight on areas where they would recommend to the Executive Councillor to implement a 20 MPH limit. It was the Executive Councillor's decision on where or not to implement the speed limit in March 2015.

The Committee noted there was some ambiguity in GIS mapping information as to where Teversham Drift became Hinton Drive.

Councillor Avery urged that early consideration be given to extending the 20 MPH limit to the new developments on the southern fringe. SAC **agreed this revision nem com.**

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

Following discussion, Members:

- i. **Resolved (unanimously)** to note the consultation outcomes.
- ii. Recommended to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport (Councillor Kevin Blencowe) and the Environment Scrutiny Committee (where a final decision on potential implementation of the project will be made):
 - To introduce a 20 MPH limit on the unclassified roads in the South Phase area **(unanimously)**.
 - To introduce a 20 MPH limit on the following main roads within the South Phase area:
 - Teversham Drift/Hinton Road **((by 7 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions)**.
 - Southern section of Grantchester Road **(unanimously)**.
 - Both Church Lane and Maris Lane in Trumpington **(unanimously)**.
 - Cherry Hinton High Street **(by 7 votes to 1 with 1 abstention)**.
 - Section of Cherry Hinton Road between Queen Edith's Way and Walpole Road **(unanimously)**.
 - Queen Edith's Way **(by 2 votes to 0 with 7 abstentions)**.
 - Not to introduce a 20 MPH limit on the following main roads within the South Phase area:
 - Brooklands Avenue **(by 6 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions)**.
 - Fulbourn Road **(by 1 vote to 0 with 8 abstentions)**.
- iii. Officers give consideration to extending the 20 MPH coverage to include new developments on the southern fringe.

15/78/SAC S106 Priority-Setting (3rd Round): South Area

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager.

The report outlined that in 2012, the council devolved to area committees decision-making over the use of particular types of S106 contributions, which were collected to address the impact of development. The first two priority setting rounds took place in 2012/13 and 2013/14.

The current (third) priority-setting round was focussed on S106 grant funding to community groups to enable them to make improvements to their community or sports facilities, which would benefit local communities. The Officer's report focused on two grant applications relating to community facilities received from local groups in the South Area.

A fourth priority-setting round would take place later in 2015. Proposals and/or grant applications will be invited in the early summer, with a view to committee reports & priority-setting decisions in the autumn.

The Urban Growth Project Manager said there was a typographical error in paragraph 4.3 of his report. Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground pavilion would receive £180,000 not £80,000 of funding as listed.

The Urban Growth Project Manager revised recommendations in his report:

The South Area Committee is recommended to:

- 2.1 **[NO CHANGE]** defer making a decision on the grant proposal for the Memorial and Meeting Hall on Cherry Hinton Road, to allow an updated application to be considered in the next S106 priority-setting round later in 2015;
- 2.2 **[REVISED]** recommend a grant of £121,000 for the Cherry Hinton Baptist Church Family Centre improvement scheme as currently proposed, subject to (i) project appraisal approval, (ii) community use agreement and (iii) a clear understanding that no further S106 funding will be required for the delivery of this project. This is in place of earlier allocations of S106 contributions to this project by the South Area Committee.

The recommendations were revised in light of late information received from Cherry Hinton Baptist Church. If the Applicant was not able to use the allocated funding, it would go back into the pot for the fourth spending round.

The Cherry Hinton Baptist Church Pastor made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The Church had applied for circa £61,500 of funding from various sources towards its project in addition to s106 monies. Thus the project would not be wholly reliant on s106.
- ii. It was hoped that work would start in August 2015.

In response to Members' questions the Urban Growth Project Manager said the following:

- i. To receive community grants, Applicants have to raise some of their own project funding so they are not solely reliant on s106.
- ii. There should be sufficient funding for Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground pavilion and Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground pavilion in the fourth spending round if SAC went with Officer recommendations at tonight's meeting (2 February 2015).
- iii. S106 funding was finite and the available pot would reduce in future. If SAC supported Officer recommendations at tonight's meeting, there would be less funding available for future projects.

Following discussion, Members **resolved**:

- i. **(By 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** to defer making a decision on the grant proposal for the Memorial and Meeting Hall on Cherry Hinton Road, to allow an updated application to be considered in the next S106 priority-setting round later in 2015.
- ii. **(Unanimously)** to recommend a grant of £121,000 for the Cherry Hinton Baptist Church Family Centre improvement scheme as currently proposed, subject to (a) project appraisal approval, (b) community use agreement and (c) a clear understanding that no further S106 funding will be required for the delivery of this project. This is in place of earlier allocations of S106 contributions to this project by the South Area Committee.

Councillor Pippas did not participate in the vote on (i) due to his declaration of interest.

15/79/SAC Environmental Data Reports - SAC

The Committee received a report from the Public Realm Manager.

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 South Area Committee. The report identified the reactive and proactive service actions undertaken in the previous quarter, including the requested priority targets and reports back on the recommended issues and associated actions to be targeted in the following. It also included key officer contacts for the reporting of waste and refuse and public realm issues.

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

- i. Anonymous reports had been made to Officers regarding dog fouling on Tenby Close. Witnesses would need to provide statements, or Officers

would need to witness incidents occurring in order for enforcement action to be taken.

- ii. Each recommendation could only target one park deep cleanse in a ward at a time. If SAC wanted to change areas for park deep cleanse, new areas would be investigated instead of old ones.
- iii. Kathleen Elliot Way was a private housing estate, so it was not the responsibility of the Council to clean up rubbish on the housing land. However the Council were responsible for the road as it was adopted, along with the play area, and would look to clean the area.

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

1. A member of the public asked the Public Realm Manager to liaise with schools to prevent litter being dropped in Long Road and Sedley Taylor Road.

The Public Realm Manager said Officers worked with schools to discourage littering, particularly primary schools. This work was included under December 2014 priority 9 'Enforcement targeted approach to areas where Addenbrookes site joins residential areas such as Hills Road and Red Cross Lane. Officers would work with Addenbrookes regarding cleaning up of the bus station area. The Public Realm Manager added that Long Road would be approached for joint educational and enforcement work as part of this priority.

2. A member of the public asked if litter could be cleared from Tesco at Fulbourn.

Councillor Dryden suggested referring this comment to South Cambs District Councillor Scarr.

The Committee asked the Public Realm Manager to investigate if the following actions were possible:

- i. Painting Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion at the same time as undertaking general maintenance.
- ii. Making skips available at weekends as well as week days in Tenby Close so residents would have longer to clear out their rubbish for future skip days.

The Committee discussed the following as additional and revised recommendations for action:

Recommendation 1

Add Godwin Way, Godwin Close and Gundhild Way as areas for early morning patrols for dog fouling.

Recommendation 4

Remove recommendation (4) 'Investigation of abandoned kebab trailer on Hulatt Road' as it was no longer required.

SAC agreed this revision nem com.

Recommendations

Following discussion, Members **unanimously resolved** to approve priorities for action as amended for the quarter of January to March 2015.

Continuing priorities

- i. Early morning patrols for dog fouling on Godwin Way, Godwin Close and Gundhild Way as well as Bliss Way/Tenby Close, Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground and Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground).
- ii. Installation of litter and recycling bins to be placed within the South Area, and removal of old litter bin on Cherry Hinton High Street
- iii. Deep cleanse of the Tins bridge to include removal of graffiti (pending ownership confirmation from the County Council)
- iv. Enforcement targeted approach to areas where Addenbrooke's site joins residential areas, such as Hills Road and Red Cross Lane; and to work with Addenbrookes towards the bus station area being cleaned up; and to liaise with Long Road Sixth Form.

New priorities

- v. Enforcement patrols for illegal advertising and to contact estate agents regarding their legal responsibility
- vi. Enforcement to work with the County Council, against utilities and companies that damage the verge on Mowbray and Fendon Road
- vii. Park deep cleanse, to include removal of graffiti, flyposting, litter, dog fouling, vegetation cut back and sweeping at Cherry Hinton Hall and Gunhild Close Recreation Ground.

The Committee asked for the minutes to show their appreciation for work Officers were undertaking to keep the city clean.

The meeting ended at 9.45 pm

CHAIR