

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

5 October 2015

7.00 - 9.40 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Meftah (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Avery, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas and Sanders

Area Committee Members: County Councillors Crawford and Taylor

Leader of the City Council: Councillor Herbert

Officers:

Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement: Wendy Young

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers in Attendance:

Project Manager (Cambridgeshire County Council): Grant Weller

Project Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council): Vanessa Kelly

Team Leader, Cycling Projects (Cambridgeshire County Council): Mike Davies

Design Manager (Skanska): Keith McWilliams

Scheme Delivery Manager (Skanska): Steve Lander

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

SAC/104/15 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashwood and Dryden.

SAC/105/15 Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

SAC/106/15 Minutes

The minutes of the 29 June 2015 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

SAC/107/15 Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

15/98/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor McPherson to liaise with Mike Davies (Team Leader - Cycling Projects, Cambridgeshire County Council) regarding Hills Road Traffic And Safety Scheme to:

- **Seek a more joined up approach between City and County Councils in response to residents’ concerns.**
- **Request a County Officer attends next SAC meeting.”**

This would be an agenda item for later in the meeting.

Councillor McPherson stated there was an inference in the 30 March and 29 June 2015 South Area Committee (SAC) meetings that Mr Davies was expected to attend. Mr Davies had not been invited to attend in person, so had submitted reports as required instead. Communication issues had now been resolved and Councillor McPherson apologised to Mr Davies for any confusion.

15/101/SAC Environmental Data Report “Action Point: Wendy Young to investigate if mobile CCTV cameras can be placed on street lights to monitor dog fouling in/near recreation areas.”

Wendy Young confirmed that CCTV cameras were not allowed solely for the purposes of watching owners not clearing up their after their dogs.

Street Lighting

Street lighting would be an agenda item for later in the meeting. The Safer Communities Manager tabled a map showing proposed street light coverage in future and referenced a document setting out the Balfour Beatty Street Light Complaints Number.

Public Exhibition: East Cambridge Urban Park

The material on display was part of the developing ideas from the Anderson Group for the urban country park in the area around the lakes, south of Coldham’s Lane. At this stage it was an update on how things were progressing and the emerging ideas. The Anderson Group welcomed feedback from members of the public as they developed proposals. These ideas would also be on display at East Area Committee later in October.

This was not part of a formal planning consultation on the masterplan; that would occur later.

SAC/108/15 Open Forum**1. Mr Cocks and Ms Joslin raised the following issues:**

- They had liaised with Councillor Crawford regarding concerns about traffic issues and verge parking in the area of Headington Drive and Fulbourn Road.
- This had only been an issue for the last 18 months, it had not been a problem beforehand.
- Residents had signed a petition giving suggestions for solutions, such as double yellow lines.

Councillor Crawford said she had liaised with PCSO Bailey. This was a Police/Highways Authority issue. Enforcement Officers would need to issue tickets, this could not be done by PCSOs. PCSO Bailey acknowledged parking issues had only arisen in the last 18 months, and would investigate why.

ACTION POINT: PCSO Bailey to liaise with Enforcement Officers regarding the issuing of parking tickets in the area of Headington Drive and Fulbourn Road. Councillors Crawford and McPherson to also monitor the situation in conjunction with the Highways Authority.

2. Mr Storer raised concerns regarding cyclists riding into bollards (generally in the dark) on the cycleway alongside the guided busway. He queried if the bollards were needed.

SAC agreed with Mr Storer that the bollards represented a hazard. Taller and more visible ones would be more appropriate.

Councillor Taylor said she was campaigning for the busway to be lit so the bollards would be more visible.

Councillor Avery said adopting a maintenance track as a cycleway had led to issues that required retrofitting to make the cycleway fit for purpose (it was being used in a way it was not designed for).

The Team Leader (Cycling Projects) said bollards were required to prevent people from driving onto the track alongside the busway. He asked for suggestions from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign on alternative bollards to use instead of the current type. Comments would be passed to the County's Busway Operations Team

ACTION POINT: Councillor McPherson to write to Graham Hughes (County Council Executive Director of Economy, Transport & Environment) to make him aware of issues raised at South Area Committee regarding the bridleway alongside the Guided Busway.

3. Ms Davies thanked Officers for making the 27 August 2015 Queen Edith Community Action Morning a success.

SAC/109/15 Cycling Projects Update

The Committee received an information report from the Team Leader (Cycling Projects), Cambridgeshire County Council regarding:

- i. Hills Road Traffic and Safety Scheme.
- ii. The Chisholm Trail.
- iii. Cambridge Station to Leisure Park Feasibility Study.

Members of the public made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Sought reassurance that Hills Road would not be left in an unsafe state as cycleway work continued ie pedestrians and cyclists could use the shared pavement. Also rubble had been dumped in local roads such as Glebe Road, so residents wanted reassurance this would be put right.
- ii. Queried what was happening at the junction of Long Road and Hills Road. This question had been raised at the start of cycleway work, but not responded to.
- iii. Queried details of cycleway work and completion date, also the impact on verges and pavements. Would the pavement be shared by pedestrians and cyclists in future, and if not, how to stop cyclists using it?
- iv. Raised the following concerns regarding contractors:
 - Parking on verges.
 - Leaving vehicle engines running whilst not moving.
 - Queried what action was being taken after reports were made to the City/County Council that contractors were not working on regular occasions.
- v. Large areas of the city were not cycle friendly. For example the crossing on the cycle path going out of town on Luard Road.
- vi. Hills Road did not need alterations to the cycleway. Resources would have been better directed in making other areas more cycle friendly. Work being undertaken had caused problems for cars and bikes.
- vii. Signposted a petition on the County Council website to support the Abbey – Chesterton bridge. A formal consultation on the whole route from the main railway station, to the new station (Cambridge North)

- would begin 19 October 2015. There was a group opposing this bridge and they also had a petition.
- viii. Queried if a usage survey had been undertaken, and if usage was likely to increase due to the number of houses on growth sites, rather than because the cycleway had been 'improved'. IE how the impact of the cycleway would be evaluated.
 - ix. Queried how £4m was spent on infrastructure projects, and the financial impact if projects overran. For example, the cycleway project was now taking twice as long to complete as expected.
 - x. Queried why bus stops were now used for advertising.

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

- i. Work had not been completed to date on the city bound road side of the cycleway. Queried if it would be possible to complete this and the Addenbrooke's bound road side by the end of March 2016.
- ii. Expressed concern about the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers whilst cycleway work was being undertaken. Also the loss of bus shelters, which had a particular impact on people with sensory/mobility impairments, as did the uneven pavement surface as a result of cycleway work. Lighting (or lack of) along the cycleway in general was seen as a potential hazard.
- iii. Requested:
 - More signage.
 - Less cones.
 - Enforcement of parking restrictions.
 - Lights at bus stops to signal a potential hazard to cyclists.
- iv. Queried how to signal a potential hazard to cyclists where pedestrians crossed from traffic islands to the pavement.
- v. Queried what would happen in December when work was suspended. Also, why was work being suspended?
- vi. Queried how lessons would be learnt from past actions. The Cherry Hinton scheme seemed to be suffering from similar issues to Hills Road ie lack of information was a major issue. Suggested undertaking a consultation then holding regular feedback meetings with residents to keep them informed of city and county issues.
- vii. Queried progress on the Botanical Garden project.

The Team Leader (Cycling Projects) said the following in response to questions from Councillors and members of the public:

- i. The County Council had imposed an embargo on road/cycleway works in December as a result of concerns by businesses who thought it would

- reduce their trade. Work would be halted in December to aid the flow of traffic, then resumed after Christmas.
- ii. Work was expected to begin on the Trumpington Road scheme in January 2016 if a sub-contractor could be confirmed. A design had been settled upon.
 - iii. Letter drops had been undertaken in the Hills Road area to give residents details about works and contact details should residents wish to report comments, questions or concerns. Meetings had been held with a lot of residents. The Team Leader (Cycling Projects) had been on-site at 09:00 every Friday at the beginning of the Hills Road project to meet residents if they wanted to raise any issues. This had stopped due to lack of participation from residents, but the Team Leader (Cycling Projects) or a Skanska representative were willing to resume visits to the site outside Homerton College at 09:00 every Friday if residents wished.
 - iv. There were no penalties as such for late delivery in the cycleway contract. Skanska were working towards a target cost, so they would make more profit if they completed work quickly. Factors out of their control were outside of the target cost, so Skanska received compensation for these. For example, the December working embargo. The project was within expected cost boundaries.
 - v. £4m had been allocated to seven projects. Four of these had been completed ahead of time, so there was unallocated funding remaining for use by the remaining three projects.
 - vi. Funding had been granted for general cycle infrastructure improvements across the city.
 - vii. A consultation would be held in 2016 for City Deal funded projects.
 - viii. Acknowledged residents' concerns regarding safety and contractors work rate etc. Lessons learned from the city bound cycleway on Hills Road would lead to better work practices on the Addenbrooke's bound side. Changes in personnel had led to better work rates from contractors. Different teams were involved in the project, so occasionally it may appear that people were doing nothing as they were between jobs.
 - ix. 2.3m wide cycle lanes would be implemented as a result of the work. They should better cope with the expected increased cycle traffic from Addenbrooke's as a result of the pending 17,000 jobs expected in future. The old cycle lanes would not have had capacity to service this level of traffic.
 - x. Multiple types of evaluation work would be undertaken once Hills Road cycleway work was completed to analyse its impact.
 - xi. The intention was that the pavement would be for pedestrians, and cycleway for cyclists. The pavement would not be shared once the cycleway was completed, but would be until it was.

- xii. When bus stops were replaced on the cycleway part of Hills Road, the intention was to use ones without advertising signs. Contractual obligations required the County Council to implement ones that included advertising signs to match those already in place on other parts of Hills Road. Officers acknowledged residents were unhappy about this.

Skanska representatives said the following in response to questions from Councillors and members of the public:

- i. Apologised for issues to date.
- ii. Robust action had been undertaken to address reported issues with sub-contractors, such as speed of work.
- iii. Reiterated that lessons learned from the city bound side of the cycleway would lead to a more successful implementation of the Addenbrooke's bound side.
- iv. The intention was to have two gangs working on the cycleway in future, instead of one, to speed up work.
- v. Acknowledged residents had raised the following concerns regarding contractors:
 - Parking on verges.
 - Leaving vehicle engines running whilst not moving.
 - Use of pedestrian unfriendly barriers ie ones with stands that posed a trip hazard.

ACTION POINT: Skanska representatives to monitor and take enforcement action regarding the following contractor actions:

- **Leaving vehicle engines running when stationary.**
 - **Parking on verges.**
 - **Use of pedestrian friendly barriers ie ones that did not pose a trip hazard.**
- vi. Side roads would be made good at the end of the cycleway project eg repairs to damaged verges.

The Team Leader (Cycling Projects) re-iterated the following points:

- i. On-site visits would be held outside Homerton College at 09:00 every Friday if residents wished.
- ii. The intention was to finish the Hills Road project by the end of March 2016.
- iii. Double yellow lines would be painted in cycle lanes to prevent general parking, but would allow loading/unloading. A loading ban was not in place currently, but could be implemented in future. This would require lots of signage to notify drivers of the ban.

Councillor McPherson invited Skanska representatives and the Team Leader - Cycling Projects Major Infrastructure Delivery to the next SAC meeting to report on Hills Road cycle way progress.

ACTION POINT: Skanska representatives to attend next South Area Committee and give general work progress feedback.

ACTION POINT: Team Leader (Cycling Projects) to attend the next meeting to report on Hills Road cycle way progress.

Re-Ordering of 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 agenda.

SAC/110/15 Environmental Data Reports - SAC

The Committee received a report from the Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement). She brought the report up to date by stating a typographical error on agenda P27 incorrectly listed priority 6 as 9.

The report outlined 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 reported back on the recommended issues and associated actions. It also included key officer contacts for the reporting of waste and refuse and public realm issues.

The following were suggestions for Members on what action could be considered for priority within the South Area for the quarter of October to December 2015:

Continuing priorities¹

Number	Priority details
1	Early morning, <i>daytime and weekend</i> patrols for dog fouling on Bliss Way/Tenby Close, Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground,

¹ Amendments to continuing priorities are shown in italics

	Godwin Close, Godwin Way, Gunhild Way and Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground.
2	Enforcement targeted approach to areas where Addenbrookes site joins residential areas such as Hills Road and Red Cross Lane and to work with Addenbrookes to work towards the bus station area being cleaned up.
3	Enforcement to work with the County Council, against utilities and companies that damage the verge on Mowbray and Fendon Road.
4	Enforcement action against nuisance vehicles being repaired at Arran Close.
5	Enforcement joint working and patrols to deal with littering from students of Long Road Sixth Form in the areas of Long Road and Sedley Taylor Road.

New suggested priorities

Number	Priority details
6	Park deep cleanse, to include removal of graffiti, flyposting, litter, dog fouling, vegetation cut back and sweeping Aberdeen Avenue play area, Kathleen Elliott Way play area and Tenby Close play area.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- i. Bins left on the pavement caused an obstruction.
- ii. Refuse collectors had ignored Hills Road residents' complaints that bins were not being emptied correctly. The same residents had also received poor customer service from council switchboard staff.
- iii. A new seat and dog poo bin were needed under the tree at the junction of Church End and Fulbourn Old Drift.
- iv. Vehicles were parking on verges in Mowbray Road.

In response to Members' questions the Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) said the following:

- i. There was no law against anti-social behaviour or pavement fouling by cats as there was for dogs. Any concerns passed to the Operations Manager would be passed onto the Dog Warden or RSPCA to investigate.
- ii. Gullies in Rathmore Road were being cleaned.
- iii. Leaving bins on the street was a civil rather than criminal matter, so the Council had limited options to address this. It encouraged people to remove bins from the street when not being collected on bin day.

- iv. The Environmental Health Officer would investigate complaints where people were burning rubbish on council allotments, as there was a policy to prevent this.

The Committee discussed the following as a revised recommendation for action:

Recommendation 1

- i. Replacing Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground with Cherry Hinton Hall.

Following discussion, Members **unanimously resolved** to approve priorities for action as amended below.

Continuing priorities

Number	Priority details
1	Early morning, <i>daytime and weekend</i> patrols for dog fouling on Bliss Way/Tenby Close, Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground, Godwin Close, Godwin Way, Gunhild Way and Cherry Hinton Hall.
2	Enforcement targeted approach to areas where Addenbrookes site joins residential areas such as Hills Road and Red Cross Lane and to work with Addenbrookes to work towards the bus station area being cleaned up.
3	Enforcement to work with the County Council, against utilities and companies that damage the verge on Mowbray and Fendon Road.
4	Enforcement action against nuisance vehicles being repaired at Arran Close.
5	Enforcement joint working and patrols to deal with littering from students of Long Road Sixth Form in the areas of Long Road and Sedley Taylor Road.

New suggested priorities

Number	Priority details
6	Park deep cleanse, to include removal of graffiti, flyposting, litter, dog fouling, vegetation cut back and sweeping Aberdeen Avenue play area, Kathleen Elliott Way play area and Tenby Close play area.

SAC/111/15 County Council - Lighting Proposal

The Committee received a report from the Safer Communities Manager, as introduced by the Leader of the City Council.

The report outlined that following major budgetary reviews, the County Council proposed to dim street lighting and to turn off lights in a number of areas across the County overnight, with midnight to 6am the current proposed hours.

As the proposals would have a significant impact in Cambridge City, the City Council raised a number of concerns with the County Council around the safety of the public, if the planned lighting goes through as currently proposed.

The County Council have agreed to an extended consultation period and the input from the 4 Area Committees would be welcomed on the lighting proposal in order to inform the planned future negotiation with the County.

Members of the public asked the following questions in response to the report:

- i. What energy savings would be made?
- ii. What regulations allowed street lights to be dimmed or switching off?
- iii. Queried the type of street lights to be used, such as LED.
- iv. Asked if individual streets could pay to implement lights as a result of safety concerns due to lack of lighting.

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

- i. Main roads were well lit, side roads were not.
- ii. Expressed safety concerns due to a lack of light.
- iii. The County Council had given assurances on light operating times, which it had gone back on.
- iv. The County Council was not obliged to light all roads, so would concentrate on just the ones it had a statutory duty to light eg main roads.
- v. New street lights should lead to 45% energy savings.
- vi. LED lights were not being used as they were too expensive when the contract was drawn up eight years ago. This could be reviewed in future. The contract included penalty clauses for not implementing lights in a timely manner, which may deter the contractor from delaying the scheme to negotiate changing to LED lights, unless the County Council revised this contract clause. Councillors felt the project was being delivered late, so a short delay to negotiate moving to LED street lights was justified in order to get more efficiency savings.
- vii. Third party financial contributions towards lights were invited from parish councils in rural area (to pay for their own street lights), but this scheme was not being implemented in the city.

- viii. It was desirable to avoid a two tier lighting scheme where affluent areas could afford more lights than others.
- ix. Financial savings by the County Council switching off lights may lead to higher operating costs for other organisations eg more admissions to hospitals due to accidents.
- x. An on-line consultation regarding lighting was planned in the next few months. In the meantime, members of the public could make representations to the County Council Highways Committee.

The Chair read a statement by Tom Blackburne-Maze, County Council Head of Assets and Commissioning:

It was not possible for a County Officer to come tonight.

The County have undertaken a period of three months consultation with local Councils, (over four months with the City Council), and were currently reviewing their responses. The County haven't started wider public consultation yet. This is due to start at the end of the month and details will be provided on the County website and via the local media as soon as these are finalised. This will be the mechanism where individual residents may feedback their own personal views and comments to the County.

In response to comments from Councillors and members of the public the City Council Leader said the following:

- i. Views would be fed back to the County Council, Police, Further and Higher Education institutions.
- ii. The street lighting consultation was not well publicised until the City Council raised concerns to the County Council. People were encouraged to respond to it.
- iii. The intention was for the City and County Councils to work more closely on lighting issues in future, without the City taking on County responsibilities.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)** to note the Strategy and Resources Committee Report on the County Council lighting proposal and to comment on any areas of concern that they would like taken up with the County in the planned negotiations.

ACTION POINT: Councillor McPherson to invite Tom Blackburne-Maze (County Head of Assets and Commissioning) to attend next South Area Committee and speak about County's street lighting proposal.

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank