

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

17 September 2020
6.00 - 8.20 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Barnett (Chair), Moore (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Davies, Davey, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Robertson, Smith, Jones, Kavanagh and Taylor

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb
Enforcement Team Leader: Nick Kester
Anti-social Behavior Officer: Rachel Fairhead
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Other Officers in Attendance:
Detective Sergeant Mazur

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/8/EAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair - EAC

The Committee Manager took the chair whilst the East Area Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Baigent proposed, and Councillor Massey seconded, the nomination of Councillor Barnett as Chair.

Resolved unanimously that Councillor Barnett be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Barnett assumed the chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

Councillor Baigent proposed, and Councillor Herbert seconded, the nomination of Councillor Moore as Vice-Chair.

Resolved unanimously that Councillor Moore be Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

20/9/EAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from County Councillor Whitehead.

20/10/EAC Declarations of Interest

Item	Name	Reason:
All	Councillor Baigent	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign & Extinction Rebellion
All	Councillor Smith	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign
All	Councillor Davey	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign
All	County Councillor Kavanagh	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign
All	County Councillor Taylor	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign
All	Councillor Hadley	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign Personal: Member of stolen bikes of Cambridge Facebook Group
All	Councillor Barnett	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign

20/11/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

20/12/EAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

The action sheet was noted, updated, and can be viewed on the link:

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=147&MId=3871&Ver=4>

20/13/EAC Change to Agenda Order

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda to take a petition item from the open

forum first. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

20/14/EAC EAC - Environmental Report

The Enforcement Team Leader introduced the report and made the following comments in response to the Committee's questions:

- i. When officers were litter picking and rubbish could be attributed to a business such as McDonalds, this was photographed to build up a portfolio of evidence.
- ii. Confirmed if individuals were seen littering from a motor vehicle prosecution was taken.
- iii. If members of the public had evidence of individuals littering from a vehicle these could be sent to the Enforcement Team and they would take the matter further.
- iv. Advised Petersfield Recreation Ground was opposite Parkside Pool.
- v. Welcomed the committee's positive comments on the work that had been done on the city council's open spaces and in relation to fly tipping.
- vi. Officers had witnessed groups of individuals using the open spaces and ignoring social distancing (the majority were young people) since lockdown had been lifted. Now the Government had introduced the rule of six people this may have a positive impact. This was not a city council enforcement issue but should be reported to the police.
- vii. If fines were to be issued by the council in future more information from the Government was required on how this would be done.
- viii. Aware the refuse workers did not lock the bins on Bradmore Lane after the rubbish had been collected. The Resident's Association had been provided with the contact details of the shared waste services to directly report this each time.

MOP: Will parents be given the fine that you will be given to the teenagers for not social distancing because unless the Government do not give clear rules, I would think people will appeal those fines.

Councillor Massey:

- i. Currently this was a grey area and only the police could issue fines. The action the police was currently taking was to try and disperse crowds and educate them on the current social distancing rules. If individuals, were underage the parent / carer would also become involved.
- ii. If those individuals were repeating the behaviour, then it was possible the police would take enforcement action.

Councillor Moore:

- i. If the government allocated funding for providing and training COVID marshals, the city council would have the power to give out fixed penalty notices.
- ii. However, the city council did not issue fixed penalty notices (FPN) for offences that they were able to, to under eighteens.

The Chair of the Committee thanked the Enforcement Team Leader for their report and for the hard work of all the officers that had been undertaken since the last report.

20/15/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

Detective Sergeant Mazur presented a report which outlined policing and safer neighbourhood trends and outlined actions taken since the last reporting period.

The committee had previously recommended addressing the following local areas of concern:

- Serious street-based violence, targeting offenders
- Serious street-based violence, youth-based interventions
- Drug related crime and acquisition crime related to drugs

Executive Director of Camcycle: Cambridge residents are fed up with cycle theft. Police statistics suggest cycle theft rates have been lower over the last few months compared to last year, however, the number of anecdotes seems to be higher than ever. We know that many people do not report the theft of their cycles as they do not see the point when nothing is done. Cycle theft has also had a lot of attention in the media lately and the negative impact on people's lives has been well documented. People are giving up on cycling and it is not surprising when their cycles (often multiple cycles in a family) are repeatedly stolen and they can no longer afford to replace them or keep up with insurance premiums. Cycle theft is estimated to cost Cambridge residents over £1.5 million a year.

The Cyclepoint is the worst spot in Cambridge for cycle theft and many now avoid using this facility altogether. It is in a shocking state of disrepair and recalls a graveyard of broken bike bits and destroyed cycle stands.

What can be done to encourage the police to take more action to target cycle theft?

How can we ensure local organisations, businesses etc are supporting police by providing CCTV footage in a timely manner?

What is the city council doing to get Greater Anglia to meet their conditions for the Cyclepoint? They are not providing the police with CCTV in a timely manner. They have known since before the Cyclepoint opened that their stands were insecure and have not done anything to fix this. They are not keeping the Cyclepoint tidy and in good repair. People using the security intercom have had no response. Station staff give inconsistent and at times incorrect information about reporting cycle theft and requesting CCTV footage. They state there are regular security patrols but many question whether this is happening as security staff are not observed visiting the Cyclepoint. They have weaselled out of their commitment to provide another 1,000 cycle parking spaces by 2020. They have not established the cycle stakeholder group for the area.

What is the city council doing about their own cycle parking facilities to make them more secure against cycle theft?

More information in Camcycle's blog post here: <https://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2020/08/it-is-time-for-police-to-take-cycle-theft-in-cambridge-seriously/>

Detective Sergeant Mazur responded with the following:

- i. Acknowledged cycle theft and associated cycle crime was an issue in Cambridge which the police did take seriously; understood there was a frustration with the lack of positive outcome to cycle crime investigation.
- ii. More was being done on the matter of cycle crime than in the past. The neighbourhood teams now had the responsibility to ensure a dedicated focus on this issue. This would improve the ability of Neighbourhood officers across the City to identify and disrupt offenders and handlers of stolen property.
- iii. Police did not have any control on Cyclepoint but had met with Greater Anglia and suggested several recommendations and advisory points to increase security. However, any changes had to be done by Greater Anglia.
- iv. Cycle theft statistics had been lower over the last few months compared to last year, this was not a sign that the problem was going away but

they were aware this was due to lockdown as there had been fewer people in the city.

- v. The best prospect of enforcement against those individuals involved in cycle theft was when the police were able to act against intelligence and recover large number of cycles.
- vi. Requested the public kept reporting cycle theft via police channels, including 101 and online; if cycles were recovered there had to be evidence to show they had been stolen and this needed to be shown on either the police systems, nation bike register or media appeals to link the cycles with the crime reported.
- vii. This year there had been positive outcomes on the matter of cycle crime with several people arrested and some resulting in custodial sentences.

Councillor Massey:

- i. The city council had held meetings with Greater Anglia and since lockdown had ended was trying to engage further to discuss the security of the Cyclepoint site. Discussion had also taking place with the police and she would continue to liaise with Greater Anglian for updates on what improvements had been made.
- ii. The city council was in the process of arranging a cycle safety task force; this would concentrate on cycle theft in the short term working with external agencies such as the police and Camcycle.
- iii. Believed cycle theft had increased during lockdown and continued to be a problem particularly when the students returned and whose main transport were bicycles.
- iv. Had been working with the Superintendent on how the online reporting pages for cycle theft could be made more accessible and user friendly.

In response to questions and comments from the Committee, Detective Sergeant Mazur said the following:

- i. Noted the committee's thanks for the work that had been undertaken with the city council and county council on street drinking and anti-social behaviour in the community.
- ii. Would talk with the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner's office on the scope the police had to undertake work regarding e-mail scams and what was being done across the county that could be tailored for the city.
- iii. Would speak with the Cambridgeshire Constabulary representative who sat on Action Fraud, the UK's national reporting centre for fraud and cybercrime to enquire what work was being undertaken with banks; fraudulent correspondence was very similar to the account modelling used by banks.

- iv. When a crime was reported (including cycle theft) online this was read and inputted by an individual who would acknowledge the incident; these were monitored continuously so it would be possible for an acknowledgement to be sent late or in the early hours of the morning.
- v. Noted the comments regarding anti-social driving in Abbey Ward particularly on the Whitehill Estate and Peveral Road; had been made aware of these issues very recently and had looked at the issue log. Would have expected a higher number of reported incidents.
- vi. Anti-social driving would be tackled city wide at local level as the same concerns had been raised at West, South and North Area Committees. Additional training on the use of the decimeter would be given to the local teams to assist with enforcement action.
- vii. To request additional support from the Road Policing Unit (RPU) which consisted of three police forces, evidence was needed to show why they were required; would encourage members of the public to report these incidents of anti-social driving to either the police or the city council's anti-social behaviour team to increase the number of reported incidents.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to approve the following as local areas of concern:

- i. Anti-social driving
- ii. Cycle theft
- iii. Drug dealing and the protection of local young people – child criminal exploitation

20/16/EAC Open Forum

Two members of the public living in Abbey Ward presented the committee with a petition regarding McDonalds on Newmarket Road, speaking on behalf of residents (at the time of the meeting there were a total of 1488 signatures).

The main concerns of the petitioners were:

- i. The health and wellbeing of residents.
- ii. The rise of anti-social behaviour including noise (not just from members of the public but staff).
- iii. Pollution and the environmental impact on the area (including the build-up of rubbish around the area).
- iv. Safety of residents (including school children who cross the highway) and the public who used the area.

- v. The volume of traffic which used the highway and roundabout; believed the roundabout to be one of the most dangerous and busiest that a McDonalds was located on.
- vi. Traffic congestion.

The petitioners then stated the following:

Since the reopening of McDonalds following lockdown, deliveries had increased to seven days a week and refuse collection every day. The smell and the noise pollution had become increasingly more noticeable. McDonalds management were contacted on a regular basis regarding these issues, but the response could be negative, rude, argumentative, belittling and accusations the facts being presented were falsified.

After lockdown it was apparent what a detrimental effect McDonalds had on residents in the area as during lockdown there was no visible pollution, congestion and the air smelt fresh.

After lockdown lifted it was then decided that a petition was required to make these issues public and incident logs were also being kept covering Wadloes Road and Nursery Close which had brought the entire community together.

All incidents were reported with the relevant external agencies and McDonalds directly. There had been involvement with the local PCSO (Police Community Special Officer) and on occasion called 111 or 999.

A survey was taken on 29 vehicles using the drive through asking a series of questions including 'if McDonalds was relocated would they visit', the majority said yes, 'do they think McDonalds was in the right location', the answer was no and 'if the drive through shut down would you visit this McDonalds' and all those drivers said no. Most users were from the CB4 area, including CB1.

In total 114 vehicles counted in 1 hour 45 minutes using the drive through, taking between 17-19 minutes for 1 vehicle to enter the drive through to leaving.

A local councillor has visited the site but there had been little or no engagement since, Abbey People Community Group had also been spoken to on this matter who supported the actions being taken.

Anti-social behaviour had been recorded which included illegal parking, queuing on the highway, deliveries in the early hours of the morning (outside of

the agreed planning conditions). Evidence which could be shared with interested parties to take the matter forward.

The formal application for the extension of the double yellow lines outside resident properties stated that residents had been consulted and agreed. Stated that none of the residents were consulted and residents did go to the Joint Area Committee on October 22 to voice objections as the double yellow lines were used as extra car parking spaces and had made no difference.

Would like to see McDonalds relocated to an area which is suited to their needs as they had outgrown the site; were aware that the land was owned by McDonalds. But they could be prosecuted and sanctioned for some of incidents that had been witnessed. The situation had impacted resident's human rights.

Wished to work with representatives from McDonalds to resolve how residents' lives could be made better and have a positive impact on the neighbourhood whether relocation was possible or not these were:

- i. Traffic management of the area could be put in place to ensure a safer environment for residents; traffic regulations were continually breached as witnessed by residents on numerous occasions.
- ii. Possible closure of the drive through leaving just the restaurant; recognised this was the only drive through in Cambridge but the site could no longer facilitate the capacity that was using this service.
- iii. Double yellow lines had no impact, there was a continuous noise of beeping horns as the road was permanently blocked and were also used by delivery drivers. Questioned if an alternative could be investigated by officers such as no turning. The road was also the main bus route, the route to the dialysis centre and tankers who drove down to the depot at the end of the road.
- iv. Queried if there could be licenced security on site at the weekend as this was when there was an increase in anti-social behaviour.
- v. Queried if there could be enforcement to stop the regular bin collections at 4am and conditions that delivery and refuse vehicles should only be permitted between 7am -11pm.

The committee were informed that the unit was not franchised but owned by McDonalds and had been advised by management they would not consider relocation but the possibility of opening another unit elsewhere to alleviate the issue of congestion.

The lead petitioners thanked the committee for their time and proposed a working party should be formed with residents, McDonalds representatives, environmental officers, highways officers, police, and councillors. Believed a working party would help to improve the neighbourhood and tackle the issues raised such as the anti-social behaviour. Concluded that they would welcome support, assistance, advice and help from the committee.

The Chair of the committee thanked the petitioners for their presentation and asked members of the committee for comment which were as follows:

Councillor Massey said the following:

- i. Welcomed the petition.
- ii. Advised if people were parking on double yellows lines it was a matter for the police but also to keep reporting these matters to herself as the Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety, dial 101 and take photographic evidence.
- iii. Anti-social behaviour (that was not a criminal issue) could be reported to the City Council.
- iv. It was not acceptable to have bin collections at 4am and this was an issue that could be investigated and dealt with by the City Council **(ACTION)**.
- v. Had held several meetings with Highways (County Council) as lockdown lifted to discuss the traffic issues on Newmarket Road. The issue was that the traffic had been at normal levels (before lockdown) when officers had visited.
- vi. Football matches would be an added pressure to the highway and see an increase in the use of McDonalds when they returned.
- vii. Would continue to push for something to be done with the roundabout and would carry on speaking to the Greater Cambridge Partnership on this issue and better active travel. **(ACTION)**
- viii. Would be happy to meet with the lead petitioners to discuss the matter further. **(ACTION)**

Councillor Moore said the following:

- i. It was clear that there was an impact on resident's lives.
- ii. She had experienced the congestion problem when visiting the Abbey Ward Food Hub and witnessed anti-social driving.
- iii. She would speak with officers to see what could be done regarding noise, smell, and pollution as these came under her portfolio as the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre. **(ACTION)**

- iv. She would be happy to meet with petitioners outside of the meeting.
(ACTION)

DS Mazur said the following:

- i. Was aware of the issues raised and agreed these seemed to have increased since lockdown.
- ii. Clarified the double yellow line enforcement in Cambridge was not a police matter because it was in a special enforcement area and was a county council matter who had delegated powers.
- iii. The police had identified the barrier had not been secured after closing time allowing entry into the carpark. Police had visited the site to advise Managers what action would be taken if not rectified. Had been assured this had been resolved which should have an impact on reducing anti-social behaviour. Asked if the petitioners could advise if this was still the case, if not further sanctions could be taken.
- iv. Would be happy for a police representative to join a working party to contribute to problem solving in the area and compliment the work of other external agencies. **(ACTION)**

County Councillor Jones said the following:

- i. Advised that she would contact County Councillor Whitehead to take further action where required. **(ACTION)**
- ii. Queried if there could be no left turn into McDonalds and the yellow box could be raised with the senior traffic managers. **(ACTION)**
- iii. Congestion problems should be looked at by the County Council regardless of the petition. **(ACTION)**

Councillor Johnson said the following:

- i. Supported the petition and expressed concern at the behaviour of some McDonald representatives.
- ii. Had been advised the day before this meeting the works at the drive through started at 5am and not 8am as contracted. The City Council had tried to contact McDonalds to inform them of this breach, but as the works were due to last only a few days enforcement may not be possible. There appeared to be a lack of concern regarding the impact this had on residents.
- iii. Happy to support the working party.
- iv. Had arranged additional city council litter patrols and if there was continued issues with litter it would be brought to the attention of McDonalds.

- v. Colleagues had written to McDonalds and suggested they should consider relocating to a different site such as Newmarket Road retail park.
- vi. McDonalds should recognise the site was probably one of the few, if not the only unit in a residential area. Questioned if planning permission would be given today as policies had changed in the last twenty years when the application was first considered.

Councillor Davies said the following:

- i. Thanked the petitioners and advised Abbey Ward Councillors had discussed the issues regularly as these were perennial issues which had been exacerbated through lockdown.
- ii. Health and wellbeing of residents and the impact of air pollution were just as important as anti-social behaviour and littering. The congestion in the area, particularly the roundabout was due to the drive through had been raised with the County Council and McDonalds directly as it impacted on residents.
- iii. City council ward councillors had contacted city council environmental health officers regarding the litter since lockdown had been lifted as the amount of litter had increased. Would continue to raise these issues with officers. **(ACTION)**

Councillor Baigent said the following:

- i. Believed that planning application 14/0507/s73 (McDonalds) stated deliveries were not permitted between hours 2300 and 0700.

MOP: McDonalds does not just effect Wadloes Road it effects all Abbey residents and the drive thru needs to go.

MOP: The council have just signed up to the objective in climate change which states it will reduce traffic congestion so how will this go forward?

Councillor Moore: The city council had agreed to sign up to the climate change objective with an aim to improve air quality to enhance the living standards in the city. As the City Council were not the highways authority this could only be achieved by working with external agencies such as the County Council, the Combined Authority and Stagecoach. There had been some changes and would continue to work with these agencies to ensure that the city was as healthy as possible.

The Enforcement Team Leader confirmed that there had been additional litter patrols; the area was inspected daily to monitor the situation. McDonalds had

sent through the litter picking frequency and the area which was covered from the restaurant. The biggest issue was litter being thrown from vehicles and the volume of the vehicles which used the site. Confirmed that Environmental Health were aware of the situation and this was being looked at.

Councillor Barnett asked if ward councillors would bring an update to the next East Area Committee on this matter (**ACTION all Abbey Ward Councillors**).

Abbey Ward Resident: I am looking to raise a concern about the lack of progress on controlling vehicle use (and abuse) in the Cambridge ward, to the detriment of the environmental health of the Abbey ward's residents. I am referring to the following issues:

1. Congestion backing up at the Barnwell / Newmarket Roundabout, with McDonalds. This leads (at least) to increased air pollution and ambient noise levels for those living in the area -- a detriment to human health and wellbeing. This still occurs extremely frequently, many times per week. The issue was raised to councillors when it first started, by individuals and through media reports. Is there any substantial update? Any indication that real progress was made, other than perhaps some natural decline from the first few days of the restaurant's reopening? Has the situation settled to a new norm of extended McDonald's drive-thru queues, backing up onto the main roads?
2. Anti-social driving, especially in the Peverel Road, Whitehill Road, Newmarket Road, and Barnwell Road areas. This has become more apparent and disturbing to those of us who have transitioned to working from home this year, although it has been an issue raised to councillors on multiple occasions over the last few years. It has a detrimental effect on environmental health (noise and air quality), and poses safety risks to walkers, cyclists, and children playing outside. It also affects the way residents feel about their neighbourhood. The UK Government set out a [significant News piece on the social, economic, and environmental impact of this problem just over a year ago](#).

11 months ago, Councillor Haf Davies informed me of the possibility to have speed control measures installed where this is a problem, but nothing has materialized since; please can the committee comment further? How about antisocial driving on Barnwell / Newmarket Road? Do the existing speed cameras work?

Is the committee aware of the government's commissioned study on the noise-aspect of this problem? ("*Roadside vehicle noise measurement: phase 1 study report and technology recommendations*", published by

the UK DfT). Of the existing methods cited in the report to address the problem: Option A, online reporting tools, are the only existing solution. However, Option A is inadequate in Cambridge due to the lack of police resources to handle the reports. Indeed, trying to report such a problem online results in a rejection of the report.

If the interested committee members would review Option A in the government report, they would understand why Cambridge is not even meeting those basic standards for tackling antisocial driving. Furthermore, by the very nature of antisocial driving, it is audible to many people, but visible to few, so reporting of cases is impossible. How does the committee, or the police, expect us to deal with a problem of that nature? Shall we call / report a loud noise from a vehicle, but tell you we cannot provide any further information?

Councillor Massey:

- i. The City Council had been working with external agencies regarding anti-social driving and speeding in 20mph zones in East Area and what could be done.
- ii. This was not just an area for the police but required action from all agencies, such as looking at ideas whether a highway improvement bid would help on certain roads, the use of speed indicator devices (one had been allocated to Abbey Ward) which would be rotated around the area on a monthly basis and data sent back to the police.
- iii. Speed Watch was another avenue which could be used; Abbey Ward Councillors took part before lockdown and caught several drivers breaking the speed limits.
- iv. Would encourage residents to volunteer for Speed Watch.
- v. The message to residents was to report these issues to the police on 101, the more incidents recorded the higher the priority the police would give.

Councillor Davies:

- i. Had been in touch with residents concerning anti-social driving on Peverel Road and Whitehill Road as this was an ongoing issue which had intensified with lockdown.
- ii. Would recommend that Peverel Road was one of the first roads that the speed indicator was used on.
- iii. Would be applying for traffic calming measures on Peverel Road through the highway's improvement bid.

Representative from CamCycle: The Grand Arcade has reduced opening hours and now closes at 7.30pm instead of 11.30pm. The City Council

website has not been updated with these new hours. Some people have been caught out and had their bike locked in overnight. With cycle theft issues in Cambridge, this more secure cycle park is more important than ever and relied on by key workers and shoppers. The closure goes against efforts to encourage more people to cycle and to visit the city centre especially considering the city council decision to reduce car parking fees.

- Was the city council involved in this decision?
- Were city councillors involved in this decision or informed about it?
- When was this decision made?
- When did the new hours start?
- Why have the hours been changed?
- When will the normal hours be reinstated?

Councillor Massey:

- i. Was not aware that the Grand Arcade cycle park had changed its hours; would ask Officers to investigate this and would respond directly to the member of the public. **(ACTION)**.

Petersfield Resident: Mill Road feels significantly safer now without vast amounts of through-traffic, with pedestrians able to use the edge of the road safely to pass others with 2m, and the change is in line with the government's policy which (to quote) "expects local authorities to make significant changes to their road layouts to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians."

However, the County Council's implementation feels very incomplete, and no-one argues that the current layout of buildouts is optimal.

The cycling campaign has called for months for a range of changes during the temporary closure, to support social distancing and businesses.

- Better signage at each end, with signs like "Amazing shops this way"
- Increased cycle parking along the street
- Short-stay car parking bays for shoppers, dotted along the street and at sideroads
- Marked delivery bays
- Removing delivery restriction times: these are not needed now
- Disabled car parking
- Maybe disabling the traffic lights at Gwydir Street
- Improvements for those with disabilities
- Bollards to prevent pavement parking

- **Use of proper plastic disabled ramps, not shoddily-added bits of tarmac**
- **Moving cycle parking off the pavement**
- **Outside seating areas to provide space for customers of local food businesses in a safer way than indoor serving**
- **Tree planters next to the pavement widenings**

These are all complementary changes that would back up the current temporary changes. So far the County Council seems to be been deaf to these ideas, and hasn't replied to the Cycling Campaign on them.

The removal of through-traffic means there is now space for new delivery bays, on-street short-stay shopper car parking, disabled parking bays, cycle parking, and removal of delivery time restrictions. Bizarrely, traders have not been pushing for these - the cycling campaign is ironically the only body who has publicly proposed addition of car parking and delivery bays.

Would councillors agree with these ideas, in particular addition of cycle and car parking and delivery bays, dotted along the street and at sideroads, and outdoor seating areas reclaimed from the road, during the temporary changes period? And will you push the County to get on with these as soon as possible, with a sense of urgency?

County Councillor Jones said the following:

- i. Believed the scheme was providing advantages for both pedestrians and cyclists.
- ii. Had been working with officers to change the build out slightly to make deliveries easier and optimise the safety for pedestrians. As the scheme was put in after the design process there had to be a safety audit for any changes to be made.
- iii. Reminded those present the scheme had been approved due to COVID-19 to ensure safe social distancing on the narrow pavements and the encouragement of safe active travel.
- iv. Encouraged residents to make comment on the scheme during the six-consultation period; the initial review would begin in the new year which would consider the comments received.
- v. Some of the suggestions recommended in the member of the public statement would need to take place under a permanent traffic regulation order which would require further work in the longer term.
- vi. The issue of signage and bike racks were raised in June when the design was first shared; it was hoped that cycle users would see an improvement in bikes racks on the Petersfield side of the bridge in the next couple of weeks.

County Councillor Kavanagh said the following:

- i. Had walked along Mill Road the day of the meeting with Councillor Jones and officers to look in detail at the build out and the signage and what improvements could be made. This was an ongoing process.
- ii. Had received many comments from the public which had been shared with officers as part of the consultation process.

Councillor Baigent:

- i. Requested that the relevant City Ward Councillors were invited to the next on-site meeting on Mill Road with County Councillors and Officers.

20/17/EAC ROD; Urgent Officer Decision. East Area Community Grand Funding 2020/21

Councillor Moore queried why the Kings Hedges Family Support Group and the Merry Go Round Toy Library had been allocated funding as they were not in East Area.

Councillor Smith stated she would speak to the Community Funding & Development Manager and advise of the response. **(ACTION)**

The decision was noted.

20/18/EAC Outside Body Appointment: Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee

Resolved that Councillor Davey be the representative for the Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee for the ensuing year.

20/19/EAC Outside Body Appointment: East Barnwell Community Centre

Resolved that Councillor Johnson be the representative for the East Barnwell Community Centre for the ensuing year.

The meeting ended at 8.20 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank