

NORTH AREA COMMITTEE

13 December 2018

6.30 - 10.00 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Bird (Chair), Todd-Jones (Vice-Chair), Dalzell, O'Reilly, Sargeant, Sheil, Thittala, Tunnacliffe, Manning, Meschini and Scutt

Officers:

Anti-Social Behaviour Officer: Maureen Tsentides

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers in Attendance:

Police Inspector: Paul Rogerson

Project Manager (Milton Road and Histon Road): Paul van de Bulk

Team Leader, Cycling Projects: Mike Davies

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/67/NAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Gawthrop, McQueen and Smart. County Councillor Manning provided apologies for lateness.

18/68/NAC Declarations Of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

18/69/NAC Minutes

County Councillor Scutt asked that comments detailed in 18/63/NAC Q2 (p5 of the agenda) which referred to comments made by County Councillor Scutt were deleted and replaced with:

Councillor Scutt said she and colleagues had undertaken informal consultation on residents parking with residents of Ascham and Elizabeth, the latter with Councillor Tunnacliffe. She and Councillor Tunnacliffe had met frequently with County officers to discuss residents' parking in that area, the issues, the problems and the wishes of the residents as expressed to us both. She said that informal consultation had also been conducted of Hurst Park Estate Area

around the same time. The Hurst Park Estate Area Residents Association had been most helpful in this regard. She stated with the boundary changes to the County Divisions in 2017, when elections took place in May of that year she was no longer Councillor for Hurst Park or Elizabeth, so was constrained in what she could do. She had proposed a workshop for all residents of the three areas, with County officers to explain the residents' parking scheme rules and requirements. The workshop went ahead with five County officers and residents of Ascham, as the Councillor responsible for Hurst Park and Elizabeth decided against participation. Parking schemes go through a formal consultation run by the County Council, not the Councillor, and then go to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which is what has happened here. Due to the stage of the scheme, any changes would need to be agreed by all affected residents of the scheme and parking schemes could not be amended on an individual basis. Residents should make representation to the County Council by 28 September.

County Councillor Scutt corrected an action point detailed in 18/63/NAC Q5 (p6 of the agenda) to remove reference to Councillor Scutt (deleted text struck through)

Action Point: ~~Councillors Scutt &~~ Manning to liaise with residents and trade representatives to ensure they have enough visitor and tradesperson exemption permits to park in the De Freville Avenue area.

County Councillor Scutt corrected an action point detailed in the Committee Action Sheet for 18/63/NAC Q5 (p19 of the agenda) to remove reference to Councillor Scutt (deleted text struck through).

18/63/NAC Q5

Open Forum: ~~Cllr Scutt &~~ Manning to liaise with residents and trade representatives to ensure they have enough visitor and tradesperson exemption permits to park in the De Freville Avenue area.

The minutes of the meeting held on the 12 September 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the corrections outlined by Councillor Scutt.

18/70/NAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

The Action Sheet was noted and an updated copy could be viewed at the following link under 'Committee Action Sheet':

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/b12312/Committee%20Action%20Sheet%2013th-Dec-2018%2018.30%20North%20Area%20Committee.pdf?T=9>

18/71/NAC Open Forum

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

- 1. Referred to 18/63/NAC 'Diversion routes – Thundering Trucks' and asked when the situation would continue to, as it had been on-going since June 2018. She noted that the A14 Management Team would be attending the North Area Committee in March 2019 and also noted that the police had asked for their response not to be published.**

Referred to Highways providing 'improved signage' but asked what happened when drivers did not obey signage. Asked whether geofencing could be installed as geofencing involved a steering system which would only accept HGVs with electric or hybrid techniques and controlled the speed limit of vehicles.

Councillor Scutt undertook to discuss geofencing with Highways officers but noted that the issue of 20mph and HGVs could impact on other roads.

Councillor Todd-Jones commented on the involvement that he had to get restrictions on HGVs for Victoria Road. He commented that this was some time ago but that he had worked with the police and that a mobile CCTV camera had been used to gather / provide evidence for the HGV restriction.

Inspector Rogerson explained that he had asked for the Police response not to be published because the Police were not the lead authority for the issue. The Police had not been consulted on any HGV routes. It was for the County Council to gather statistical data.

Post meeting response from County Council Highways:

Geofencing is a system that can be used as a virtual perimeter around an actual geographic area, where a location aware device such as a mobile phone or a Sat Nav can have a pre-defined set of boundaries activated.

If a vehicle enters the Geo-fence an alert would be triggered on the mobile / Sat Nav letting the driver know what they have done.

A Geofence system would require a haulage company to implement and install equipment on the vehicles and would rely on drivers reading the triggered messages and complying with them. It would be up to the haulage companies to monitor the scheme themselves and deal with infringements.

We are not aware of any Highway Authorities using such systems on highways and is not something that is being considered or used currently by Cambridgeshire County Council. There are no specific laws relating to its use in the UK, but user location data can be a sensitive issue, and the gathering of such information must not infringe the guidelines of the Data Protection Act which states that someone's data must only be used for 'limited, specifically stated purposes'.

We have had some success with a voluntary agreement with a number of local hauliers signing up to the HGV covenant to agree that their HGVs will not use unsuitable routes and will stick to strategic routes (unless they have legitimate business in the vicinity) details are at <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/roads-and-pathways/heavy-or-abnormal-loads-on-the-highway/> we understand that some of these companies have vehicle trackers installed on their vehicles and do monitor the routes taken by the vehicles.

It should be remembered that HGVs may have legitimate business in an area and even if a weight limit is in place HGVs can enter for loading /unloading or access depending on the wording of the order.

- 2. Referred to 17/17NAC – Double Yellow Lines on Carisbrooke Road and confirmed that a revised LHI bid had been re-submitted in cooperation with Cllr Scutt. They had asked for yellow lines on Carisbrooke Road but there had only been an extension of school markings. A response had to be given by 4 January 2019. She also commented that HRARA had been asked to pay a contribution of £50 and asked as a voluntary organisation whether there was any help available to pay this sum.**

Councillor Scutt agreed to follow this query up. County Councillor Manning and Councillor Sargeant confirmed that if the scheme was agreed by the LHI panel then they would get a contribution from the City Council.

- 3. Queried parking fees in the Histon Road Co-Op local store area as residents had concerns regarding the rules and regulations, the lack of signage and mixed messages on store doors. It was noted**

that the land was in private ownership. She asked if there could be a guarantee that those customers who had been fined £100 would be reimbursed in full because of the substandard signage and also asked when fully visible signage to the customers entering in the front and back parking area would be put in place?

Councillor Richards commented that she had been in contact with the County Council and understood that the land was in private ownership and managed by a private parking company but the owner could specify the processes undertaken by contractors. She agreed that the signage was not at eye level or clear. Commented that Councillor Payne had been working on this matter and had been in contact with the owner of the land, who had said that signage would be improved. Councillor Richards had written to the owner again that day.

Another member of the public stated that he had received a Parking Charge Notice (PCN); parking was for patrons only and Histon Road Co-Op customers were excluded. The public were driving into the car park and were unaware of the restrictions and were getting parking tickets. He had formed a community action group and asked what support the council could provide and how they could get the company to withdraw their PCNs. There was conflicting advice by other organisations whether to appeal the PCN or to challenge the validity of the PCN.

Councillor Manning commented that as the land was owned privately the County Council had limited powers but Councillors could apply pressure. He noted Councillor Payne was already in contact with the owner of the land but he was keen to speak with the member of the public.

- 4. Raised an issue with a rented property on Milton Road and the tenants who did not know where or when to put their waste bins out. This matter had been raised with Kings Hedges Councillors and Councillor Smart had been liaising with the resident regarding the waste bins which had been put in the back garden and were over flowing.**

Councillor Meschini confirmed she would work with Councillor Smart regarding this issue.

- 5. Raised an issue regarding air pollution monitoring outside schools.**

Action: Cllr Sargeant to follow up issue raised by a member of the public regarding a pollution sensor outside schools and to raise the issue of pollution with parents who drive their children to school.

- 6. Commented that Stagecoach had said that the guided bus would stop on Milton Road, but no buses had been stopping on Milton Road.**

Councillor Sargeant commented that there had been lots of changes to buses stopping on Milton Road. Stagecoach had reduced the number 9 bus, which was the bus to Ely. Whippet had withdrawn services. Asked the member of the public to let him know which bus stops did not have buses stopping at them as there were meant to be buses stopping on Milton Road.

- 7. Asked what was going to happen with the proposed housing on the Jenny Wren Public House site as it was understood that the building was going to be refurbished to become a bar/restaurant rather than housing.**

Councillor Dalzell recalled a planning application had gone to Planning Committee a year and a half ago regarding the Jenny Wren Public House.

Post meeting note: 17/0927/FUL permission was granted for a public house with residential units. There is currently a section 73 application to vary condition 2 of permission 17/0927/FUL (New building comprising of a Public House at ground floor with nine residential units on the upper floors (two 1xbed units & seven studio units) along with car and cycle parking and associated landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings) as follows:- 1) omission of the basement; relocation of bin and bike store to external structure and relocation of cellar from basement to former bin/bike store and 2) increase in building height by 300mm.

18/72/NAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The Committee received a report from the Safer Neighbourhoods Inspector and Safer Communities Team regarding policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the last reporting period. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details). Previous local issues and engagement activity noted in the report were:

- i. Criminality in and around East Chesterton
- ii. County line drug dealing.
- iii. Summer and hot weather ASB in green and open spaces

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

1. Asked if different sectors of the community were treated differently.

Inspector Rogerson commented that certain cultures and lifestyle choices meant that certain sectors of the community could be anonymous from public authorities. Members of the public were all treated fairly but this did not mean treating everyone the same.

2. Commented that issues on Chesterton Road needed to be addressed and that the planning development process should be used to address this. For example the Cambridge Northern Fringe East development project.

In response to Members questions Inspector Rogerson responded:

- i. The Police ICT system was due to be delivered in the New Year so that crime data could be provided to Area Committees.
- ii. Confirmed that the Police would like to run a road safety project every 2 weeks between area committees meetings to target particular road junctions for phone use, people not wearing their seatbelts, driving through red lights etc. Asked the Committee to nominate 4 junctions for the police to attend and monitor.
- iii. He was aware that sometimes the public felt that their information was not acted upon but even if a police officer was unable to attend an incident, the police would consider and review all information and intelligence provided to them to create a profile of an area. This would then enable the police to undertake operations and act as necessary.
- iv. Actionable intelligence was as much information as possible but included descriptions of individuals, clothing, what was handed over, distinctive haircuts etc.

Action: Cllr Manning to liaise with Civil Enforcement Officers to see whether there was a protocol between them and the police regarding people parking on zig zag lines.

The Committee were asked to nominate their local issues for focus over the coming months.

The following local issues were agreed (unanimously):

1. Criminality in and around East Chesterton.
2. County line drug dealing.
3. Road Safety

18/73/NAC Histon Road / Milton Road / Chisholm Trail / Arbury Road / Green End Road update

The Committee received two presentations, the first presentation provided an update on Milton Road and Histon Road schemes and the second presentation provided an update on cycling schemes in north Cambridge.

The update on Milton Road and Histon Road schemes presentation outlined:

Histon Road:

- i. A consultation was undertaken in the summer, comments from the consultation and Local Liaison Forum (LLF) were used to formulate the scheme.
- ii. The final design on Histon Road / Gilbert Road / Warwick Road junction had a segregated use scheme but wasn't fully supported by safety officers. The matter was taken to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly where the design was reverted back to a 'shared use' design. Further consultation resulted in a reconfigured design with segregated elements and pedestrian priority crossings.
- iii. Junction designs had been presented to the GCP Board in December 2018 and they approved the detailed design award stage.
- iv. Hoped the scheme would begin construction at the end of 2019.

Milton Road

- v. The Milton Road consultation had recently ended and he was working through the responses, which were positive and gave a clear steer what local people wanted.
- vi. In the New Year he would be working with a consultant to work through the responses and modify the design in line with consultation responses.
- vii. The project aimed to go to the GCP Board in March 2019.
- viii. Commented that consideration would need to be given for the timing of construction for both the Histon Road and Milton Road projects. If construction hours were limited this could mean the project could take longer to deliver but having the two projects constructed at the same

time would mean more disturbance for residents but the project could be completed quicker.

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

- i. Asked if there could be traffic lights to stop cyclists when there was a conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
- ii. Asked for provision to be put in the budget for an analysis of measuring conflict for pavement use so that there was imperial data to review if any improvements needed to be made or inform future development.
- iii. Commented about floating bus stops and mitigating measures.

In response to Members questions the Project Manager (Milton Road and Histon Road) said the following:

- iv. To put in traffic lights to stop cyclists for shared use crossing could become complicated. Footway zebra crossings emphasized that pedestrians had priority.

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

1. The plans for the Histon Road project which were consulted on were significantly altered without a further consultation and he asked how the public could be assured that the same thing would not happen with the Milton Road consultation. He also asked whether the LLF signed off projects before they went to the GCP Assembly and Board.

The Project Manager (Milton Road and Histon Road) confirmed that the issue with the Histon Road project arose as a result of recommendations from the Road Safety Audit Team.

Councillor Todd-Jones commented that unfortunately the Histon Road final preliminary design was modified by the Road Safety Audit Team and Cycling Project Team, this was a lesson learnt that the Road Safety Team needed to be consulted on a project prior to it going out for consultation. The LLF could only advise and make recommendations.

2. Queried pedestrian and cyclist conflicts.

The Project Manager (Milton Road and Histon Road) commented that shared use areas, could create uncertainty between pedestrian and cycle use so cyclists naturally slowed down. Segregated use meant that each user (pedestrian and cyclist) had their own area to be in. Confirmed there would be tactile paving to alert the visually impaired to junctions.

The presentation regarding the update on cycling schemes in the north of Cambridge outlined:

Abbey-Chesterton Bridge

- i. The Abbey-Chesterton Bridge would take a year and a half to deliver, the project included replacement of the timber jetty and utility diversions.
- ii. There would be some night working around the bridge but once exact dates were known these would be publicised to residents. It was anticipated that the bridge would be lifted in during the night as there would be no traffic on the river or trains running.
- iii. The Fen Ditton cycle route would be closed for a period of time during construction but dates would be publicised to residents.

Arbury Road

- iv. The mini roundabouts had been removed on Arbury Road and replaced with raised tables. In January 2019 works would continue from North Cambridge Academy to Leys Avenue.
- v. There was funding for a 'phase 3' which would look at North Cambridge Academy to Milton Road. The engagement process could consider road closures, one-way systems and residents parking schemes.

Green End Road

- vi. Cycle segregation had been introduced.
- vii. Commented that where tree pits had been put in, utility companies had been called to protect their services.

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

- i. A safety report needed to be undertaken; the road should not be narrowed. There should be a zebra crossing when you came off Fen Road.
- ii. The County Council Safety Audit Team should be consulted on projects prior to a consultation exercise being carried out.

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

1. Commented on the Arbury Cycle Path that residents in Leys Avenue were not happy with the proposals. It was a cul-de-sac that people walked and cycled through. No public drawings had been provided. There was no boundary as a hedge had been removed, which increased risk to users. After a protest a Senior Officer at the County Council admitted that a safety audit had not been completed. A rat run had been created with a two and a half metre wide cycle path. The neighbourhood

had not been consulted, resident's did not feel that they had had a fair voice in this project. Requested a pause on the project for further consultation and alternative options to be considered.

Councillor Manning expressed concerns regarding the project as local councillors had not been consulted and said that he had left a message with the Executive Director, Place and Economy at the County Council to discuss further.

Councillor Sargeant commented that the Histon Road project had gone through a consultation exercise in 2016 and recommendations had gone through the GCP Assembly and Board.

2. Hurst Park Estate Residents had received a letter last week giving 4 days' notice for the start of work on the shared-use pedestrian / cycle path to be developed between Arbury Road and Leys Avenue. Councillors were asked if they were aware of the plans and raised the following issues:

Post meeting response from officers have been included between questions:

Yes, officers worked closely with local councillors over several years on the Arbury Road Cross City Cycling proposals. A public consultation took place in January 2016. The relevant consultation drawing was displayed at the consultation event at the Meadows and has been on the Greater Cambridge Partnership website since the consultation:

https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/P_5040190_HW_CP_103_B.pdf

The drawing includes widening the path on the east side of Arbury Court Play Area to 2.5m, removal of barriers and removal of the hedge.

(It should be noted that following traffic monitoring and feedback from residents, it was decided not to proceed with the closure to motor vehicles of Mansel Way at the Arbury Road junction.)

The Arbury Road cycleway scheme has been delivered in a series of phases working north to south, and ahead of each phase communications have gone out to local residents and local members.

- a. Pedestrian and cyclists should have clearly marked sections designated by a white line, or different coloured tarmac to avoid confusion and pedestrians feeling intimidated by speedy cyclists.

At 2.5m, the shared use path will not be wide enough for formal segregation between pedestrians and cyclists but pedestrian and cycle symbols on the surface of the path will indicate which side users should aim to be on.

- b. As there was going to be no barriers at either end, asked that proper measures would be taken to avoid cyclists shooting out at the ends of the path onto the pedestrian footpaths/roadway. The footpath on Leys Avenue was used by all ages to access Arbury Court and also by young children accessing the play area.

Tactile paving, a SLOW marking towards the end of the shared use path and a central bollard with a reflective band have been added to the design.

- c. Cyclists waiting to turn right from Arbury Road into the new path are properly protected from motor vehicles on Arbury Road.

Less confident cyclists will be able to use the new zebra crossing on Arbury Road to access the Play Area path.

- d. We currently have a lot of problems with motorcyclists illegally cutting through the cycle throughway between Leys Road and Highworth Avenue. Request that there is very clear, enforceable signage, and CCTV, to make it really obvious that motorcyclists are prohibited from using this new path.

We are liaising with City Council officers over signage and other possible measures.

- e. A large number of trees and hedging was going to be removed. Requested assurances that they would be replaced by suitable mature trees, not saplings.

We removed 4 trees all of which were in very poor condition. The City Council Tree officer said "I am in favour of the trees being removed and replaced by the County Council to mitigate their poor health/decline".

Yes, the 11 new trees will be mature specimens.

- f. Asked that lighting would be good, and not the dim and inadequate lighting there was currently on the estate.

Following the 2016 public consultation for the Arbury Road cycleway scheme, the lighting was replaced as part of the County Council's PFI agreement - it was a direct replacement installation with no street lights removed but with upgraded lanterns. The lighting is in line with other footpaths across the county.

- g. Asked if the plan for the new cycle-path between Arbury Road and Leys Avenue had been subject to a formal safety audit – particularly regarding the conflict points where the cycle path emerges onto the pedestrian paths at Leys Avenue and at Arbury Road.

Yes

- h. Asked to see a copy of the safety audits.

These will be sent to HPERA.

- i. Asked if a detailed design and construction drawing for the proposed cycle path existed.

Yes

- j. Asked to see a copy of the drawing.

The relevant documents (1, 2 and 5) can be found here: <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/arbury-road/>

The Team Leader – Cycling Projects commented that the consultation did make it clear that the path would be a shared use path and barriers and hedging would be removed. A detailed response to all questions would be provided following the meeting.

3. Asked what consideration had been given to address the volume of traffic affecting pollution levels. Referred to data from the Strada fitness app, there were 8000 logged journeys at the Milton Road end of Arbury Road and only 5000 logged journeys on the west end. The east end of Arbury Road was more congested by cars. Referred to stage 3 of the Team Leader's Cycling Project's work.

Action: Councillor Sargeant to organise a meeting with residents regarding stage 3 of the Arbury Road scheme.

4. Commented that no public consultation had been undertaken on the Arbury Road scheme, he regularly used Arbury Road and was only alerted to the matter by Councillor Manning.

Councillor Sargeant commented that the GCP did undertake a consultation but it was not a good consultation and that this needed to be addressed.

The meeting ended at 10.00 pm

CHAIR