

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

3 December 2020

6.30 - 9.20 pm

**Present**

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

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb  
 Assistant Manager, Neighbourhood Community Development Team  
 Community Services. Vicky Haywood  
 Anti-social Behaviour Officer: Rachel Fairhead  
 Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Detective Sergeant Mazur  
 Greater Cambridge Partnership Communications Manager: David Charlesworth  
 Greater Cambridge Partnership, Technical Lead: Jo Baker

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****20/22/EAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Hadley and Whitehead.

**20/23/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	Personal: Cambridge Cycle

	Kavanagh	Campaign
All	County Councillor Taylor	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign
All	Councillor Barnett	Personal: Cambridge Cycle Campaign

## 20/24/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 20/25/EAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

Councillor Johnson reported that Abbey Ward Councillors had held their first working party regarding Newmarket McDonalds petition on 25 November. In attendance was one of the main petitioners and external agencies, such as the Police, McDonald's Business Manager, County and City Council Officers. The meeting had very productive with actions taken away. The next working party meeting would be held in March.

Councillor Davies advised that some of the issues raised at the last East Area Meeting had been resolved before the working party had taken place.

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

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/mgChooseDocPack.aspx?ID=3872>

## 20/26/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.

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

- i. Noted the request to bring information on the multi agency meetings regarding cycle theft.
- ii. There were no specific wards which county lines took place in; recent enforcement had taken place in Petersfield Ward, off East Road.
- iii. Many issues regarding county lines drug dealing involved young people who had come into the area, as opposed to those that lived in

- Cambridge. Continued to work with local schools on this matter was working well.
- iv. There was now a separate department dealing with the COVID-19 anti-social behaviour issues. Additional officers had been scheduled to work over the next couple of weeks due to the reopening of some licensed premises.
  - v. The Neighbourhood Team continued to work with housing agencies and the city council to deal with COVID-19 breeches and related anti-social behaviour. Groups of young people had been dispersed, and in some cases, taken home then parents fined.
  - vi. With regards to anti-social driving, a timetable had been scheduled for each relevant area of the City (dependent on operational workloads). Neighbourhood officers and specially trained officers would have use of equipment, including the decimetre (to measure noise) and speed enforcement devices throughout December. There would be a further update at the next area committee meeting.
  - vii. The decision to reduce the number of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) was not taken at local level. It would be too early to tell what effect this would have, and the consultation was still taking place. Believed it was the intention to have a PCSO presence in Cambridge.
  - viii. Noted the request to report back and highlight the comment that East Area Committee members were concerned that any loss of PCSOs would equate to the loss of intelligence and knowledge within the wards. Not just the loss of visibility of PCSOs for residents but also the loss of connection.
  - ix. Welcomed the positive comments of community policing throughout East Area.
  - x. Acknowledged the community unrest concerning the incident around Mill Road regarding a vehicle following a lone women pedestrian. Was unable to provide an update in a public meeting but could advise there was not a wider risk to the public.
  - xi. The decision was taken centrally not to include a breakdown of crime in each ward; this was due to the systems no longer able to provide the information in that specific format. This breakdown could be viewed <https://www.police.uk>
  - xii. Could not advise when speed watch training would take place again, particularly during the pandemic.
  - xiii. There was not a priority list of roads for speed watch to be undertaken on. Noted the comments for Coleridge Road, Cherry Hinton Road, Davy Road and Rustat Road concerning excess speeding day and night. Would also encourage residents to report any incidents.

- xiv. Would enquire if Councillor Massey (trained Speedwatch representative) would be able to train members of the public. But believed a decision had been made not to train individuals due to COVID-19.
- xv. Would find out if there would be another Close Pass initiative or if there would any scope to undertake this at local level as part of the driving anti-social behaviour local area of concern

Councillor Massey advised that the PSCO consultation had now closed.

### The Committee

**RESOLVED** unanimously to write to the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner highlighting the Committee's concern regarding any loss of PCSOs in the area. The letter would be signed by the Chair of the Committee, Councillor Barnett, and Councillor Massey (Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety).

**Resolved** unanimously to continue the local areas of concern set at September which are as follows:

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

### **20/27/EAC Food Hubs**

The Committee received an oral presentation from Vicky Haywood Assistant Manager, Neighbourhood Community Development Team, regarding Food Hub provision in the city. Details of the presentation can be found at the following link (item 6).

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=147&MId=3872&Ver=4>

In response to Member's questions and comments the Assistant Manager, Neighbourhood Community Development Team said the following:

- i. GoodSAM and NHS volunteers did operate independently from mutual aid groups.
- ii. Both GoodSAM and NHS volunteers were still working but were not prevalent in Cambridge; believed to be because the mutual aid groups

- were so well organised. The national system had had mixed results across the country, in some places it had done well.
- iii. Noted Member's thanks and the comments on the efforts made by the City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and community groups to respond to this crisis.
  - iv. Would pass on all the messages of thanks to all officers involved and the community groups.
  - v. Believed that public services had recognised the "hidden individuals" within the NHS and local authorities. The pandemic had brought attention to community challenges and needs which should have been supported previously.
  - vi. Acknowledged the concern expressed regarding unpaid carers as they were not involved in the vaccination programme.

Details for [Opening times for Food Hubs in Cambridge](#) and further information could be found via:

[Cambridge Emergency Food Support — Cambridge Sustainable Food](#) webpage.

## **20/28/EAC Open Forum**

**Representative from CamCycle: Many local residents such as myself have found themselves shopping and eating on Mill Road much more this summer, as a result of the measures made by the county council to ensure safe social distancing on the narrow pavements and the encouragement of safe active travel, both in line with government policy.**

**Do councillors too welcome the improved safety for walking and cycling on Mill Road currently, the noticeably improved air quality, the fact that new businesses have had confidence to open in the pandemic, the improved bus punctuality due to the lack of traffic congestion, and the high level of footfall that can be observed, despite the pandemic?**

**Will any of you make efforts, if the trial is successfully continued into next year, to ensure that the County Council actually makes adjustments to the layout of the street, as Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) allow such adjustments? In particular, to replace the plastic bollards with attractive planters and some seating; construct more effective pavement widenings; to remove delivery time restrictions which are now unnecessary; to add new cycle parking off the pavement; and to**

**create new car parking for disabled and short-stay shopper parking? These kinds of positive changes that everyone should welcome are possible now that the road space is not taken up by thousands of cars just passing through and queuing.**

The Committee discussed the questions in detail and stated the Mill Road consultation was still ongoing and would urge residents to complete the consultation to ensure their views were heard.

<https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/mill-road-consultation>

For those who were not online there was a number to ring (0345 0455212) to request a text-based questionnaire which could be filled in and then sent back free post.

The consultation was about the trial closure of through traffic over the bridge. There was a separate question for feedback on the temporary social distancing measures known as 'build outs' currently in place along Mill Road.

The consultation would feed into the six-month review that would take place after six months of the ETRO. The public view would be considered alongside technical information. If the decision were to continue this would still be under the ETRO scheme. It was unlikely the County Council were going to create a picturesque landscape that residents would like as this was a temporary scheme. It had been requested the build outs were significant in terms of scale and were a compromise for the need of the traders to take deliveries and the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.

It was clear that local councillors were very much in favour of the bridge being closed to through traffic. Agreed the street furniture was not attractive but served a purpose. Believed the County Council would be open to having discussion on improving the quality of street furniture if the decision were made to make the closure permanent.

There was also a County Council consultation which was being run parallel to the ETRO consultation; important for residents to undertake the County's consultation as they would be the authority who would make the decision to make the closure permanent. External agencies such as the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) were involved in the decision-making process as they were currently undertaking an access study of Cambridge. Mill Road was not a road in isolation and had to be seen in relation to all the other roads. Consultations worked better when being done collectively looking at a wider

area, such as the impact the closure had had on Cherry Hinton Road and Coldham's Lane in terms of pollution, air quality and the increase of vehicles.

Noted it was a shame that taxis were unable to go over the bridge as there were individuals with disabilities who relied on them as a mode of transport.

**Representative from CamCycle (in response to the points made by councillors):**

- i. The suggested changes I listed are all changes that can be made during the trial period - they were not about permanent measures. Please can you look closer at those ideas?**
- ii. Councillor Kavanagh said that only bollards can be used, but planters have been used on temporary schemes around the country.**
- iii. Would welcome hearing specifically whether car parking and cycle parking can be provided during the temporary period.**

Councillor Kavanagh responded the street furniture had been put in quickly as standard safety equipment, although ugly they were obvious. In the future if the decision were made to make the closure permanent then the furniture would be looked at such as planters etc. Whatever would be put in place had to conform to safety rules.

**Representative from CamCycle: What do councillors think about allowing cars in bus lanes? The bus lane on Elizabeth Way and maybe elsewhere seems to be being suggested for amendment by the county council to allow electric cars.**

**This seems very unnecessary, because it is very rare that northbound traffic on the bridge queues so far back as the two-lane section. This change would lead to a free-for-all as people see other cars using it.**

**People are increasingly buying electric cars now, so that will mean those bus lanes disappear by stealth over time. They should remain for buses, cycles, taxis, and emergency vehicles only.**

Members expressed concern at the scheme and opposed the proposal due to the potential of conflict. Danger to cyclists was increased particularly as the electric cars were so silent. While electric vehicles should be promoted as part of the work on the Clean Air Zone in the city, at the expense of petrol and diesels cars, not at the expense of public transport. The point of the bus lanes

was to encourage people to use public transport and ease congestion on the roads.

The question was also raised as to who would monitoring the vehicles to determine which was an electric vehicle and which was not entering the bus lane.

Councillor Herbert stated the trial was approved in 2019 without consultation with the City Council (who would be responding to County Council Officers). Very few buses used Elizabeth Way Bridge and was therefore concerned this was being used a trial before being rolled out across the city. Was proud that the city had cycle lanes going into (or near to) junctions linked to cycling priority which was a safe refuge for cyclists. The City Council would be responding to County Council Officers outlining the reasons why this scheme would not be supported.

## **20/29/EAC Greater Cambridge Partnership**

David Charlesworth, Communications Manager and Jo Baker, Technical Lead, Greater Cambridge Partnership gave a presentation on the Cambridge Eastern Access Project.

The presentation could be viewed in the agenda pack at the following link:  
<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/mgChooseDocPack.aspx?ID=3872>

In response to Members' questions the Technical Lead and the Communications Manager said the following:

- i. Had closely liaised with City Council Officers on the Council's East Barnwell Future Generation project. The Cambridge Eastern Access Project would complement the work of the City Council with improvement to the public realm in that section of Newmarket Road.
- ii. It would be a challenge to reduce traffic congestion on Ditton Lane and Barnwell Road. There was limited road space on Newmarket Road. Prioritising buses and cyclists would occur at the detriment of car operations.
- iii. Phase B would look at a new public transport route looking at the growth of city and congestion and how buses could beat congestion but reiterated the limited space. Part of the current consultation was to collect individual views on that balance.
- iv. As a default, non-motorised transport had to be a priority. The consultation and modelling work would assist in determining how that

- balance of car vs buses would be struck with guidance from the GCP Board.
- v. Looking to improve the cycle facilities down Newmarket Road when space allowed. Noted the suggestion of connectivity down to Coldham's Lane as this had not been part of suggestions received to date.
  - vi. If the Marshall's redevelopment proceeded alternative cycle facilities are being looked at from the land north of Cherry Hinton with a need for an investment in cycle facilities.
  - vii. Pleased at how the consultation was going and there had been a good level of engagement through virtual meetings, 1-2-1's and live twitter chats, attending other events and parish council meetings. Adverts had been placed in the local press and radio interviews. On-line engagement had worked well and had received high quality feedback.
  - viii. The consultation was not a selection process for peoples' preferred choice, but a collection of what people liked. Anticipated that option B3 (Long Term Rail Opportunity) would be a popular choice. This scheme could not be put in place just by the GCP other external agencies such as network rail had to be involved. However, it would help determine a strategic way forward. Was unable to say what the strategy was at this present time say.
  - ix. The land north of Cherry Hinton (which had planning consent) was a smaller element of what might be provided on the whole of the Marshall site. Work was taking place to improve access and cycle facilities such as cycling from Nuttings Road and Coldham's Common. If the wider development of the area were to proceed, significant support both for a public transport scheme and non-motorised facilities was required.
  - x. Would be happy to meet with Cherry Hinton Ward City Councillors and Residents Associations before the consultation ended.
  - xi. Noted that Romsey residents welcomed the alternative routes being explored out of the east of the city.
  - xii. Acknowledged the recommendation for segregated cycle lanes along Coldham's Lane on either side of the road.
  - xiii. Had been careful to ensure the debates had not focused solely on Mill Road. It was important to recognise there were vehicles that did need to get to the city centre, but there needed to be fewer than there currently were.
  - xiv. The 2017 Bus Services Act enabled Mayoral Combined Authorities to consider franchising as a potential option for bus service provision.
  - xv. Envisaged that through the City Access project there would a lower admission zone or similar in the city centre. A starting point would have all buses up to Euro 6 emissions standard.

- xvi. There were currently two electric buses operating in Cambridge City 6 route, which had been partly funded by the GCP. The daytime service was 100% electric.
- xvii. The next big change to Cambridge railway station would be East/West Rail, potential for new platforms to be provided placed eastern across the tracks. This would be down to Network Rail to take forward but would be something that could be supported by the GCP.
- xviii. Noted comments that it was important to have fast and effective public transport from the north/east villages to the bio-medical campus.
- xix. Space was at a premium in Cambridge. It was not possible to provide separate pedestrian and cycle ways across the city. It was possible to create mixed use non-motorised routes with good surfacing and crossings.

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

**CHAIR**