

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

2 October 2017
7.00 - 9.20 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors O'Connell (Chair), T. Moore (Vice-Chair), Pippas, Avery, Dryden, McPherson, Crawford and Taylor

Officers:

Head of Streets and Open Spaces: Joel Carré

Lead Officer for the CB1 development in the Safer Communities Team:
Maureen Tsentides,

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Other Officers in Attendance:

Police Sergeant: Kevin Mišík

Project Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council: Grant Weller

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/9/SAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Adey, Ashton and Page-Croft.
Councillor Taylor sent apologies for the first part of the meeting as she had to attend a County Council meeting elsewhere.

17/10/SAC Declarations of Interest

None

17/11/SAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 17th July 2017 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

17/12/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

Addenbrooke's Station

There will be a further update on this matter at the next meeting.

Open Forum: Bus related issues

- a) Councillor O'Connell received the following response from the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough in response to issues raised at South Area Committee:

"I am aware of issues with the bus service, not just in Cambridge but across the County and in Peterborough. I have decided that a review of the service is needed and will work with Local Authority partners to provide an independent review of the service."

- b) Councillor Avery confirmed that a good outcome had been achieved regarding bus routes.
- c) Trumpington Residents Association had made some progress regarding service delivery.

Open Forum: Environmental Report

A further update would be provided at the next South Area Committee regarding bin storage space in Ainstey Way.

17/13/SAC Open Forum

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

1. Dara Morefield

- i. It seems that every home which comes up for sale is 'fair game' for developers, building for greed, not for need. Houses are bought, demolished, and replaced with as many 1 and 2 bed units which can be fit onto the site.**
- ii. Notwithstanding the destruction which ad-hoc densification of this nature brings to a neighbourhood, or even a single street, can Cambridge really have no current, or future, need for 3 and 4 bed family houses? Have local residents really stopped having children, or more than one child?**
- iii. Residents can, and do, object to individual developer demolish/replace applications via the planning website, but this appears to be a futile exercise. Developers are, naturally, skilled at coming up with designs which meet all technical planning requirements.**
- iv. Right now, in Queen Edith's ward alone, there are four such planning applications. One application, on the corner of Hills Rd and Queen Edith's Way, has garnered a lot of opposition. It is a striking house, on a striking corner plot. The other three**

applications are unlikely to attract the same level of local attention (after all, only immediate neighbours are ever informed) but the overall principle remains.

- v. Is Cambridge really to become a city whose housing caters only to singles and childless couples?**

Wendy Blyth

- i. Research indicates that there is currently an oversupply of smaller properties.**
- ii. Properties were being purchased by London commuters and by foreign buyers.**
- iii. This is resulting in a shortage of family homes.**

Sam Davies

Local Neighbourhood Planning would help prevent such developments. Councillors could work with local communities to develop these.

Members responded:

- i. Cambridge was a victim of its own success.**
- ii. Owners will seek to make a profit from division of property and without good planning reasons for refusal, there is little that the city Council can do to stop it.**
- iii. Evidence suggests that Cambridge will continue to grow.**
- iv. Suggested that Planning Officers do not see Neighbourhood Plans as the answer.**
- v. The market is driven by developers.**
- vi. Housing need varies from ward to ward and there was an identified need for smaller social housing units.**
- vii. Conservation Area status could be used to defend the character of an area.**

2. Rebecca Jones

Requested an update on the S106 project for Nightingale Recreation Ground

Councillor Pippas stated that it was his understanding that the funding had been agreed and that the local community were taking this forward.

Action: The Committee undertook to provide Ms Jones with an update outside the meeting.

3. Fulbourn Road Cycleway

The Committee had been informed in advance that residents had concerns about the proposed Fulbourn Road cycleway project. Grant Weller, Project Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council, was present to listen to their concerns.

Melanie Atkins

- i. Raised road safety concerns and stated that this was a very busy but narrow road.**
- ii. Residents already suffered from access issues.**
- iii. Cyclists would expect a fast lane.**
- iv. Utility and delivery vehicles would be forced to park across the cycle lane.**
- v. Narrowing the road might not produce the desired speed reductions.**
- vi. Local residents had signed a petition.**
- vii. Initial consultation had been 17 months ago and respondents had not received any feedback from the Greater Cambridge Partnership.**

Peter Forman

- i. Concerned about the north side footpath as cyclists travelling west would be likely to continue on the footpath beyond the point where it stops being dual use.**
- ii. Pedestrians would be at risk from fast moving cyclists.**
- iii. Overall design of scheme was poor.**

Michael Smale

- i. Parking was already difficult and there are not enough spaces for the number of houses.**
- ii. The Available spaces are often occupied by commuters or local workers.**
- iii. Designated resident parking would be helpful but should be free.**
- iv. In the 1950's residents agreed to sacrifice parts of their gardens for the road.**
- v. Residents were lead to believe that the street parking bays would be available to compensate them.**
- vi. Residents would like the original promises to be honoured.**

Mark Baker

- i. **Residents responded to initial consultation in 2016.**
- ii. **Personal details were published without permission.**
- iii. **Comments were acknowledged but do not appear to have influenced the plans.**
- iv. **The Robin Hood junction is very dangerous and plans would not help that situation.**
- v. **Bus stop locations have not been thought through.**
- vi. **Routes to Netherhall School were unsafe.**
- vii. **Road drainage is poor.**
- viii. **Where would drop curbs be located?**
- ix. **Street lights have recently been moved; would they need to be moved again?**
- x. **What alternative parking arrangements would be made during the work?**

Grant Weller responded as follows:

- i. Met with local residents recently and similar issues were raised.
- ii. Letters had been sent to residents in September.
- iii. When finalised, the Robin Hood junction design would link into the Fulbourn Road plan.
- iv. Resulting experience would be better for cyclists and pedestrians.
- v. Was not aware that bus stops were used as layover points and will speak to Stagecoach regarding this.
- vi. Redesigned parking spaces would provide additional spaces by making better use of the existing space.
- vii. Would investigate local businesses using the spaces with companies such as Arm.
- viii. Cyclists would be offered alternative routes to discourage use of footpaths.
- ix. Drainage issues would be addressed.
- x. Residents parking would not be possible until 2019/20 and would result in charges for households.

Councillor Crawford

Residents in the wider area have raised concerns about overspill parking.

Recent on-site visits to the area suggest that poor parking in the existing bay is part of the problem.

Councillor McPherson

Why would it take so long to bring in residents parking?

The resident parking programme has a long lead in time, is current taken up with other projects and the required notices take many months. Resident parking would happen in time but there would be a cost.

Councillor McPherson

What actions would follow from the concerns raised?

Recent concerns had been passed on to the design team. The team accept that the consultation process had been poor and lessons had been learnt.

Councillor Moore

Why can't the entire area be limited to 20 mph?

It was not possible to limit 'A' Roads to 20 mph.

Melanie Atkins

Road Safety issues have not been addressed. If 20 mph is not possible, could flashing signs be installed to tell drivers how fast they are travelling?

Mark Baker

The consultation appears to have been pointless. The project is in the wrong order. Why not complete the junction work first? The process does not address the promises made to residents in the 1950's regarding parking.

Resident

Other projects in the area suffer from similar issues. Addenbrooke's Hospital junction work was undertaken with poor consultation and little notice of changes to bus timetables.

Residents were unclear if the traffic lights would be in operation 24 hours a day or would revert to peak times when the work was completed.

Councillor Moore

The Addenbrooke's traffic light/roundabout changes had been undertaken to improve safety for pedestrians, in particular less mobile pedestrians. Improved sharing of consultation information across the City Council and County Council websites would be helpful to residents.

The Committee thanked residents and the Project Manager for attending the Committee to discuss the project.

17/14/SAC Record of Officer Delegated Decisions in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokesperson for South Area Committee**6a Community Facilities Funding For Refurbishment Of Memorial Hall And Church Hall, Cherry Hinton Road**

The Committee noted the officer delegated decision.

17/15/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The Committee received a report regarding the policing and safer neighbourhoods trends from Maureen Tsentides, Lead Officer for the CB1 development in the Safer Communities Team, on behalf of Lynda Kilkelly, Safer Communities Manager, and Police Sargeant Kevin Misik. The report outlined actions taken since the Committee's meeting on 5th June 2017, identified on-going and emerging crime and disorder issues, and provided recommendations for future priorities and activity. The report listed previous priorities and the actions taken in response:

- Combatting 'county lines' drug dealing;
- Burglary (in response to the recent crime spike); and
- Sexual exploitation (specifically of women coerced or controlled as sex workers).

In discussion, Members:

- a) Thanked the Police for their action regarding drug dealing.
- b) Requested that action be taken to address the problem of pop up brothels.
- c) Noted that increased crime in Trumpington was likely to be due to the increased ward size.
- d) Stated that there had been reports of vandalism in the Cherry Hinton High Street Area.
- e) Requested action to address unsafe parking in the vicinity of schools.

Action: Maureen Tsentides undertook to raise the issue of vandalism in Cherry Hinton High Street with the Multi Agency Problem Solving Group.

Diana Minns stated that Hanover out suffered from anti-social behaviour in the winter months. She requested that this be included in the Police priorities.

Linda Jones asked if the bad publicity surrounding the CB1 area had resulted in increased Police action.

Sargeant Misik stated that the Police would not be influenced by media attention.

There were 6 recommendations from which the Committee was asked to nominate their top 3 for focus over the coming months.

1. Combatting drug use around Coronation Street

We would provide evidence of our proactive work in this area, and ensure enhanced visible patrols of the area

2. Streetlife ASB

We will disrupt members of the street life community from known ASB hotspots around the South of the city, mainly Hills Road and Station Road. We would also evidence activity undertaken to target the most persistent offenders.

3. Combatting 'county lines' issues

We would conduct targeted patrols in known drug-dealing area around the South of the city, prioritising vulnerable individuals being exploited by these organised crime groups and seek to prosecute individuals willingly housing and aiding them.

4. Burglary patrols

We would continue enhanced reassurance patrols in known burglary hotspots. As well as dedicating PCSO patrols to individual crimes as they are reported to deter repeat offending.

5. Road safety

We would evidence work of our efforts to promote road safety in the South of the city, using CRASH data to identify the locations where enforcement of safe driving standards would be most effective.

6. Operation Mantis

We would continue to deliver an enhanced level of activity, particularly around the warning to landlords about their possible criminal liability for the actions of their tenants.

The Committee voted on each priority individually:

1. Combatting drug use around Coronation Street (0 Votes)
2. Streetlife ASB (4 Votes)
3. Combatting 'county lines' issues (8 Votes)
4. Burglary Patrols (7 Votes)
5. Road Safety (3 Votes)
6. Operation Mantis (6 Votes)

The Committee **resolved** to nominate the following three priorities for focus over the coming months:

- i. Combatting 'county lines' issues**
- ii. Burglary Patrols.**
- iii. Operation Mantis**

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

CHAIR