

**SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE**

9 March 2020  
6.35 - 10.00 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors McGerty (Chair), Thornburrow (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Lord, McPherson, Pippas, Summerbell, Crawford and Taylor

**Officers:**

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Public Realm Engineering & Project Delivery Team Leader: John Richards

Resident Engagement Officer, Housing Services, Emily Watts

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Group Manager, Major Infrastructure Delivery: Dorothy Higginson

(County Council Cycling Projects) Senior Project Officer: Vanessa Kelly

Consultation Manager: Sophie Moeng

Consents Development Manager (Network Rail): Mike Blissett

Police Inspector: Paul Rogerson

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**20/1/SAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashwood, Dryden and Page-Croft.

Councillor McGerty said in his welcome address that he had given careful consideration as to whether it was still appropriate to hold a public meeting and expressed the committee's concern for residents in face of a growing Covid-19 pandemic.

**20/2/SAC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Ashton	All	Personal: Chair of Cherry Hinton Resident's Association.
Councillor McPherson	All	Personal: Member of Cherry Hinton

		Resident's Association.
--	--	-------------------------

### **20/3/SAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **20/4/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes**

The action sheet was noted and an updated copy can be viewed at the following link under 'Updates to Action Sheet'.

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=122&MId=3717&Ver=4>

### **20/5/SAC Estate Improvement Scheme**

The Committee received a report from the Resident Engagement Officer, Housing Services.

The report outlined the Housing Scrutiny Committee approved £1 million per annum for 5 years of capital funding for improvement to City Council owned housing estate as part of the Housing Revenue Account medium-term financial strategy. The criteria for each proposal need to meet two fundamental principles:

- i. The proposal will add value to the asset (the estate).
- ii. The proposal should not act as a substitute for the planned maintenance programme, but it may be prudent for the Council to consider including works from the planned programme where it makes sense to incorporate them.

South Area Committee Members suggested the following as projects that could be funded:

- i. A broken light in Teversham Drift.
- ii. Designing out anti-social behaviour and vandalism in Gunhild park and Gunhild Close eg CCTV installation.
- iii. Broken lights at Gunhild Court garages.

**ACTION: Resident Engagement Officer to check with Estates and Facilities Team how streetlights are serviced and maintained.**

- iv. Wulfstan Way:

- a. Canopy for shops.
- b. Fixing light that is permanently on near shops.

### **20/6/SAC Re-Ordering 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 published agenda.

### **20/7/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods SAC**

The Committee received a report from Inspector Rogerson regarding policing and safer neighbourhood 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 priorities and engagement activity noted in the report were:

- i. Address youth anti-social behaviour on the Anstey Way Estate.
- ii. Address youth anti-social behaviour in Trumpington Meadows.
- iii. Continue work to address serious street-based violence, child criminal exploitation and child sexual exploitation.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- i. Anti-social behaviour and discarded drug paraphernalia in Accordia.
- ii. Drug use and associated anti-social behaviour (eg dumping of needles) affecting Cherry Hinton Ward.
- iii. Speeding in Church End.
- iv. Anti-social driving and parking by the car repair business in Church End which congested the road.

Inspector Rogerson said the following in response to questions from members of the public and committee:

- i. Non-emergency crime could be reported to 101 or on-line.
- ii. He would be happy to provide case studies in future of how the Police had taken action in response to information received from members of the public.
- iii. Cycle crime was a known issue in the city.
- iv. New data interrogation techniques enabled the Police to reunite stolen bicycles with their owners when the owner's details were not obvious.

- v. The police could take enforcement action against individuals who drove in an anti-social way, the long term solution was to design out issues in the road layout.
- vi. Undertook to meet councillors and residents in Cherry Hinton Ward to discuss perception and reality of drug issues.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

- i. Address youth anti-social behaviour on the Anstey Way Estate.
- ii. Address youth anti-social behaviour in Trumpington Meadows.
- iii. Continue work to address serious street-based violence, child criminal exploitation and child sexual exploitation.

### **20/8/SAC Update Report on Fendon Road/Queen Edith's Way Roundabout**

The Committee received a presentation from the County Council Group Manager - Major Infrastructure Delivery and Senior Project Officer.

The presentation outlined:

- i. The roundabout had been delayed.
- ii. The roundabout was not expected to be fully open until summer 2020 due to utility cables under it needing to be re-organised and re-routed.
- iii. Queen Edith's Way was expected to be open ahead of schedule in the near future ie March 2020.

The Group Manager - Major Infrastructure Delivery and Senior Project Officer said the following in response to questions from members of the public and committee:

- i. The project costs had increased. A lot of work was going on to strengthen project governance and reduce future issues.
- ii. £3.5m had been allocated to the general improvement of the area. Everyone concerned had been unaware of the multitude of utility cables under the roundabout before work started. Moving these increased costs.
- iii. The significant number of utility cables meant these needed to be re-routed which delayed the project. Re-iterated utility companies and the County Council were not aware chambers were located under the roundabout. When these were discovered, utility companies (such as BT) were able to work collaboratively with the contractors to divert cables and relocate the chambers. As such these works were completed within

a two month period (rather than the five months that would have been required if the diversion work had been carried out before the main works). The County Council retained a map of utility cables etc in the project area, but it would be too resource intensive to map these for the entire city.

- iv. The work done by utility companies would future proof broadband in the local area by making cables more accessible and avoid infrastructure maintenance or upgrade work in the near future. This should benefit the community. Old water pipes had also been replaced as facilities were upgraded near the roundabout.
- v. Utility companies will largely cover the costs of any upgrades to their networks, but the County Council has paid for diversions necessary as a result of the works. They were trying to recoup upfront costs from utility companies where possible.
- vi. The County Council had undertaken all usual preparatory work, but in some instances utility companies did not have accurate maps of cables/pipes etc, these were only found when digging started.
- vii. £800k was estimated for the roundabout pre-work commencing. Project costs rose to £1.8m due to the unplanned utility work. £3.5m was allocated for all project work in the area, so the overall project budget for a wider transport scheme/network in the area has not resulted in an overspend. Higher than expected costs had arisen for this part of the project. The project remained good value for money.
- viii. Consultation results led the County Council to believe residents wanted a Dutch style roundabout. The costs were a matter of public record. The cost/benefit analysis could be made available upon request (except any commercially sensitive information).
- ix. The County Council Economy & Environment Committee approved work on the roundabout in 2016. Information events were held prior to the works so residents could find out details of the works programme, the impact on bus services etc. In 2020 new designs for Queen Edith's Way would be developed.
- x. The cycle paths will be separate from the main carriageway of the roundabout. The County Council had liaised with other local authorities to share knowledge on how to integrate cycleways with other infrastructure.

One member of the public encouraged the Greater Cambridge Partnership and County Council to produce a Draft Cambridgeshire Cycle Guide, based on Oxfordshire's.

## **20/9/SAC Network Rail Presentation: (Proposed) Cambridge South Station**

The Committee received a presentation from the Consultation Manager and Consents Development Manager (Network Rail). This is published on the City Council website.  
<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=122&MId=3717&Ver=4>

In response to the presentation members of the committee and public expressed strong concern that the construction site would encroach onto Hobson's Park.

The Consultation Manager and Consents Development Manager (Network Rail) said the following in response to questions from members of the public and committee:

- i. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus could use their land as they wished. Network Rail had no control over this.
- ii. The strategic compound would be located as close to the construction site as possible. This would be the west side of the site, not the east. The intention would be to minimise the impact on the west side/Hobson's Park.
- iii. The intention was to use the minimum amount of land for the construction site. Network Rail would regularly liaise with stakeholders regarding progress and construction timetable.
- iv. The AstraZeneca compound was anticipated to be located on the east side of the site.
- v. Cambridge South Station could be in place within twenty four months ie 2022. Trains could then service Addenbrooke's Hospital in 2025.
- vi. Cambridge South Station was expected to be staffed.
- vii. Engineers were looking at the advantages and disadvantages of different access routes. Access from the guided busway could not be confirmed at present but the request would be noted.
- viii. Parking enforcement was a council matter to stop commuters parking in the area around Cambridge South Station eg residential areas. The 2018 Local Plan did not allow this type of station to have a car park.
- ix. There was no plan to close nearby stations (eg Great Shelford or Whittlesford) when Cambridge South Station opened.

Cambridge South Station was designated as a Category C station, it would be expected to service two million people per year. Five million potential users could use it per year. Network Rail were liaising with Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the Department for Transport about this difference in potential user numbers.

## **20/10/SAC Open Forum**

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

1. A member of the public raised the following issues:
  - i. Some time ago the Council put forward a consultation about the various cycle routes, and for me that out to Fulbourn was relevant. Could the councillor(s) please provide an update on the results of this consultation and what the next steps in this process are.
  - ii. As a supplementary point, I included in my response to that consultation that work was needed on Snakey Path, beside Cherry Hinton Brook, including the track/road at each end of it. This path is now deteriorating quite rapidly and in places as a result of stream bank erosion the path is badly undercut. I would therefore ask what immediate measures the Council are taking to address public safety on the path.

Councillor Ashton said it had been reported that Snakey Path was in a poor state of repair.

Councillor Crawford said the proposal to make Snakey Path part of a cycle route was rejected due to objections that it would go through a nature reserve.

### **ACTION: Councillor McGerty to seek update on Fulbourn Greenway.**

2. A member of the public asked for cycles and pedestrians to have signal priority on the guided busway near Clay Farm until a bus came along. The signal control chip could be reprogrammed, no 'building work' was required.

Councillor Thornburrow said a survey had been undertaken with CamCycle on the guided busway near the station. The findings had been reported to the Greater Cambridge Partnership and County Council. A follow up meeting would occur to look at how to take action as a result of lessons learnt.

3. Councillor McPherson expressed concern that the length of time given for pedestrians to cross Cherry Hinton Road and Teversham Drift was too short.

**ACTION: Cherry Hinton City and County Councillors to contact Richard Ling (Team Leader, County Council) to compile a list of pedestrian crossings where the timings need to be changed.**

**Councillor Jones asked for examples from across the city to pass onto County Officers via SAC Chair and County Councillors.**

4. A member of the public said it was hard to travel along Coldham's Lane in a mobility scooter to access Sainsbury's from Church End sheltered homes. For example, vegetation overhung the path.

## **20/11/SAC Environmental Improvement Programme**

The Committee received a report from the Public Realm Engineering & Project Delivery Team Leader regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme. The report outlined changes to the Council's Environmental Improvement Programme during 2018/19, and reviewed the latest round of applications received within South Area.

Councilor McGerty expressed concern that Environmental Improvement Programme funding had been allocated to Area Committees, then £75k was taken back by the Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces for reallocation into a central pot.

In response to Members' questions the Public Realm Engineering & Project Delivery Team Leader answered:

- i. Within South area there is sufficient funding available within local area budgets to take forward all of the new project aspirations. Those eligible for centralised strategic or external funding, similarly, are most likely to be affordable at this stage.
- ii. For the new strategic EIP funding allocation there are enough eligible projects to adopt a 2 year programme up to 2021, and this is currently under consideration by the Executive Councillor for Streets & Open Spaces. Further applications for local area funded schemes are expected to be invited later in 2020.

Post meeting note – the list of strategic projects has now been approved by the Exec Cllr, with the projects listed able to progress. [Including Schemes S4 and S11 mentioned below.]

- iii. The Officer's report covered all South Area projects to date. Re-iterated that all could get funding as sufficient was available, with the caveat that projects marked as amber or red required a technical assessment (to be viable). At the initial application and assessment stages projects will not have been looked at in great detail, with some contingency and in some cases caveats included in reporting and suggested funding provisions in order to avoid need to seek further authorisation should, for instance, costs prove greater than anticipated. Projects marked as green are expected to be reasonably straightforward to develop and deliver, whilst those marked as amber are more likely to have technical complexity or further dependencies. Any marked as red are unlikely to be recommended for adoption
- iv. The whole Environmental Improvement Programme budget had been allocated. Project costs may appear high as they included contingency planned costs. If funding was not fully spent, it could be reallocated to other projects as required.
- v. Scheme S4 and S11 were under consideration by Executive Councillor for funding from new strategic EIP block. A decision on this and Year 1/Year 2 combined programme was anticipated March 2020 following consultation with Area Committee Chairs;
- vi. Scheme S3 would be funded from the new InterReg/2 Seas/Nature Smart Cities European tree canopy programme.

Councilor Ashton requested project cost and saving information.

**ACTION: Public Realm Engineering & Project Delivery Team Leader to provide a summary paper of project costs and savings to date.**

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously) to:**

- i. Note the operating amendments to the programme agreed by the Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces following Environment and Community Scrutiny on 21 March 2019.
- ii. Note the allocation of funding to continue with a programme across all areas for the period 2019-21
- iii. Allocate £4,500 from local area EIP funds in 2019/ 20 towards the provision of 26 summer hanging baskets along Cherry Hinton High Street

- iv. Note those new South area project aspirations received in the latest 2019/ 20 round recommended to the Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces for funding from the new central, city-wide, strategic EIP allocation
- v. Consider and approve those new South area project aspirations received in the latest 2019/ 20 round for funding as part of the local South Area programme for 2019/20. (Schemes S1, S2, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9 and S10).
- vi. Support those projects selected for implementation, subject to them being viable, obtaining consents as necessary, positive consultation and final approval by the Council's Place Board, Ward and Executive Councillors, where required.

## 20/12/SAC SAC Area Committee Grants 2020-21

The Committee received a report from the Community Funding & Development Manager regarding Community Grants.

Members considered applications for grants as set out in the Officer's report.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously) to** agree the proposed awards detailed in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report and summarised in the table below:

Ref	Organisation	Project	Award £
S1	Albion Boxing Academy	After school boxing sessions	£2,730
S2	Accordia Residents Association	Music and social event on Accordia Green	£616
S3	Cambridge Royal Albert Homes	Summer day trip to Woburn Safari Park	£530
S4	Cambridgeshire Older People's Enterprise	Monthly older people's club activities	£650
S5	Cherry Hinton Festival Society	Towards festival costs	£2,500
S6	Cherry Hinton Residents' Association	Summer family fun day; volunteer recruitment event	£350
S7	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	Summer trip	£425
S8	Hanover and Princess Court Residents' Association	Summer outing, September barbecue, Christmas event, monthly craft sessions	£975

S9	Home-Start Cambridge-shire	36 weekly support group sessions	£3,000
S10	Huxley House Families	Summer trip	£404
S11	Queen Edith's Community Forum	One-off community event to promote cycling	£900
S12	Romsey Mill Trust	40 after school sessions for 13-18 year olds	£3,000
S13	Trumpington Community Group	Drama 2 rehearsals and 2 performances x 2, theatre trip, scripts and licences	£1,000
S14	Trumpington Meadows Community	3 community meetings; Christmas event	£200
S15	Trumpington Residents' Association	Summer trip	£500
<b>Total</b>			<b>£17,780</b>

### 20/13/SAC South Area Committee Dates 2020/21

The following dates were agreed:

- i. 22/06/20
- ii. 07/09/20
- iii. 30/11/20
- iv. 08/03/21

The meeting ended at 10.00 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank