

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

29 November 2021

7.00 - 8.35 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Hauk (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Ashton, S. Davies, Dryden, Lee, Goodliffe and Slatter

Officers:

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep
Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager: Wendy Johnston
Planning Policy Manager: Jonathan Dixon
Principal Planning Policy Officer: Stuart Morris
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers in Attendance:

GCP Transport Director: Peter Blake

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/21/SAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Beckett, Cox, Flaubert, McPherson and Page-Croft.

21/22/SAC Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

21/23/SAC Notes of Previous Meeting

The notes of the 6 September 2021 meeting were submitted to this meeting for councillors to note.

21/24/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

The committee action sheet was noted.

Councillors would send any updates to the Committee Manager outside of the meeting.

The Committee Manager referred to 21/20/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods.

- Action: Maureen Tsentides to investigate if a Public Space Protection Order could be implemented so that noise activated speed cameras can be set up to combat noise caused by mopeds driven in an anti-social way.
- Progress:
 - The Community Safety Manager has been looking at the issue of PSPOs as there have been requests for them. Officers would update in due course.

21/25/SAC Open Forum

A member of the public raised the following issues via a written statement read by the Committee Manager:

- i. What was the current status of the adoption of the Abode development from Countryside to the Council?

Major Projects & Programme Manager: The City Council have adopted some small areas of green space on abode, including the play space. The larger spaces at the entrance of Clay Farm / abode specifically remain in the hands of Countryside. We have some outstanding issues to resolve before we adopt and are working though these with Countryside. Adoptions likely to be complete during mid part of 2022.

Open Spaces Officer – Growth: We have requested an up-to-date adoption plan from Countryside which will be circulated on receipt. As you will be aware the entrance/Frontage of Abode forms part of the Southern Arrival Square, which has not been adopted and was also still with Countryside. The areas forming the Southern Arrival Square which are shown on the master plan should be treated as guidance and may be subject to change as the transfer's progress.

See copy of transfer plan to be attached to agenda as a supplement.

- ii. Please confirm that all currently broken streetlights on the roads in the part of the Abode development being adopted (parcels 10a, 10b and 11) will be repaired by Countryside at their own cost prior to adoption taking place.

Major Projects & Programme Manager: Street lights on City Council adopted areas, which have completed transfer are now the responsibility of City Council, Streets and Open Spaces. Other streetlights if they are part of the highway adoptions will be maintained by County Council. To date the highways adoptions have not been completed so the lighting remains the responsibility of Countryside. It will be Countryside's responsibility to repair / replace or provide suitable funds to the local authority to undertake any work.

- iii. Please confirm that all currently dead trees and shrubberies on the public pathways (i.e. not on private property owned either as a freehold or a leasehold) in this same part of the Abode development being adopted (parcels 10a, 10b and 11) will be replaced by Countryside at their own cost prior to adoption taking place.

Major Projects & Programme Manager: Land adopted by Cambridge City was subject to maintenance and defects process and the developer was responsible for funding repairs and replacements up until the final transfer was completed. There are trees which had not established well / died and as such Countryside provided funds to Cambridge City to replace those trees which are in landscaped areas being transferred to City Council. That tree replacement work has commenced across Clay Farm on site now managed by Cambridge City. Other trees being transferred to bodies other than the City Council remain the responsibility of Countryside until they are transferred to the appropriate body. Prior to highways adoptions (Cambridge County Council transfers) the trees will be inspected and replaced at cost to Countryside. On areas maintained by management company or housing association, the arrangement of cost / responsibility will be down to Countryside and either / management company or housing association to agree.

- iv. Please confirm that all streetlights on the roads in the part of the Abode development being adopted (parcels 10a, 10b and 11) will be managed by the City Council / Highways Agency following adoption.

Major Projects & Programme Manager: There are a small number of streetlights along footpaths / green spaces which City Council are responsible for. Some lights on the street will pass to County Council as the Highways authority, management company or privately owned areas and housing association, depending upon the location of the specific street light.

- v. Please confirm that all trees and shrubberies in the public pathways (i.e. not on private property owned either as a freehold or a leasehold) in this same part of the Abode development being adopted (parcels 10a, 10b and 11) will be managed by the County Council following adoption.

Major Projects & Programme Manager: Cambridge City Council have an approved adoption plan for Abode.

- vi. Please clarify whether the Council considers the public pathways between the houses in the part of the Abode development being adopted (parcels 10a, 10b and 11) will be considered “public rights of way” in this respect and therefore take responsibility for the trees on these pathways as well as those on the roads following adoption.

Major Projects & Programme Manager: Public rights of way in legal terms are responsibility of County Council e.g. adopted footpaths.

21/26/SAC Making Connections: Have Your Say on Greener Travel in Greater Cambridge Consultation - SAC

The Committee received a presentation from the GCP Transport Director.

A member of the public from Trumpington Residents' Association asked what are the next steps and timescale after this consultation?

The GCP Transport Director said:

- i. The Executive Board would review responses following this consultation.
- ii. Follow up action (eg road closures) will then be outlined in a future consultation circa summer 2022.

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

- i. There had been a lot of discussion about bus capacity in the city centre.
- ii. Would there be more dedicated bus lanes in future?
- iii. The loss of bus services led to more people using cars.
- iv. Requested that GCP contacted Ward Councillors prior to undertaking general consultation to get local intelligence on issues, instead of involving Ward Councillors at the end of the process.
- v. How would this GCP scheme be paid for?

- vi. There was no appetite for a congestion charge before alternative transport services were in place.

The GCP Transport Director said in response to questions from members of the committee:

- i. The bus network had not changed in a generation. All bus services were steered towards the city centre, which needed to change.
- ii. How to change was being reviewed:
 - a. The intention was to use cleaner and greener buses as the number of vehicles increased.
 - b. Smaller vehicles could be more practicable.
- iii. Peoples' views on how to make changes were sought through the consultation. For example, cheaper bus fares to encourage people to reduce car usage for 'school runs'.
- iv. If the levels of (general) traffic could be reduced, then segregated bus lanes would not be required. Road space could be allocated to pedestrians/cyclists instead of cars.
- v. The Executive Board agreed there needed to be alternative transport services were in place before a congestion charge was in place.

21/27/SAC Greater Cambridge Local Plan – Consultation

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Policy Manager.

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

- i. How did lessons learnt from previous Local Plans feed into this one?
- ii. Suggested that people felt disenfranchised as consultation results were ignored. For example, no-one wanted the Highways Authority proposals for Cherry Hinton Road, but they were implemented regardless.
- iii. People wanted concrete facts now on what would happen in two years time.
- iv. The consultation would generate a lot of information that could be used for (academic) research purposes. Requested it be made available if not embargoed eg commercially sensitive.
- v. People's housing needs changed over time. For example, Covid led to a shift towards wanting amenity space as people spent more time at home (including working) than they did before lockdown in March 2020.

The Planning Policy Manager said in response to questions from members of the committee:

- i. Officers were working with the Highways Authority to look at the impact of proposals on transport including on rural areas.
- ii. Proposals that went into the Local Plan would have their transport issues assessed.
- iii. Local Plans had to be kept up to date. Having (shared) objectives (eg biodiversity) helped to achieve join up across council plans and strategies.
- iv. The consultation was an opportunity to look at what worked well, or not, in previous Local Plans and review how to improve in future.
- v. As they developed policies, Officers looked at measurements (such as water usage in current developments) to learn lessons from installation and usage.
- vi. The consultation set out proposals on how to deliver affordable business space as part of employment developments, as well as how to secure benefits such as apprenticeship schemes from developments.

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

1. A member of the public from Trumpington Residents' Association said the following in response to Policy S/CBC Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC):
 - i. The Association was strongly opposed to this policy as it was not the best way to meet the health and life sciences needs of the CBC. Why was the policy being proposed when:
 - a. It would cause "very high harm" to the Green Belt and would irretrievably damage high quality agricultural land - against both of which there was a presumption in the Local Plan and national planning policy.
 - b. It would reduce the gap between Cambridge and its necklace of villages which was essential to Cambridge's "special character" according to the current Local Plan.
 - c. It would surround White Hill with development.
 - d. It would take Cambridge's city edge out to Granham's Road.
 - e. There was already "a large supply" of land allocated for economic development in the current Local Plan amounting to 135 hectares, with a number of sites suitable for the Campus's needs identified in the Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Needs Study Appendix H.

- f. There was no guarantee that the CBC would not be back for more when the next Local Plan was prepared threatening the amalgamation of Great Shelford with Cambridge.

The Planning Policy Manager said:

- i. The Local Plan set out various advantages and disadvantages that explored the issues raised (in the questioner's points). For example, the Green Belt Study.
- ii. People were invited to respond to the consultation. Officers would consider the issues raised and report to Members for their consideration.
- iii. The Strategy topic paper was available via https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-11/TPStrategyAug21v3Nov21_0.pdf This set out more detail to supplement the consultation.

2. Regarding Cambridge Airport. What leisure facilities would be built on the Cambridge Airport Site? Given the Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy, will that ensure enough land was allocated for leisure, sports, and arts, so that we don't end up with large areas for housing but few community facilities, as in Queen Edith's?

The Planning Policy Manager said:

- i. Officers said detailed planning of the airport site had not yet been done. Welcomed feedback as the Local Plan developed.
 - ii. Referred to his response to the member of the public at West/Central Area Committee regarding the Wellbeing topic paper and plans to further develop evidence regarding cultural infrastructure.
3. "What consideration have officers given for the proposals for "Cambridge Great Park"? How can they ensure that the land can be safeguarded for this?"

The Planning Policy Manager referred to the Green Infrastructure Opportunities Mapping Project detailed in the Officer's presentation.

21/28/SAC Environmental Report - SAC

The Committee received a report from the Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager.

The report outlined an overview of the council's Streets and Open Spaces, Environmental Health and Shared Waste service activity in the Area Committee area over the past six months.

In response to Members' questions the Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager said the following:

- i. Officers could issue fixed penalties so not all people were prosecuted for fly-tipping. Referred to agenda P35: 2 fines were issued.
- ii. There were enough sites/projects to undertake works with volunteers related to the city's streets and open spaces. Welcomed suggestions on how to do more, or if there were other suitable locations/projects not already being considered if people wanted to undertake their own projects to clean up neighbourhoods etc.
- iii. Vegetation that hung over public paths could be the responsibility of several parties:
 - a. Public land – City Council Streets & Open Spaces Team. There were Team Leaders for North, South, East and West of the City. Please contact them directly about issues to address. Issues can be reported via the councils webforms for the majority of the issues.
 - b. Private land – Highways Authority/County Council.

21/29/SAC City Centre COVID Recovery Project Update - Area Committee Briefing - SAC

The Committee received information report to note from the Head of Environmental Services.

In response to the report Councillor Ashton:

- i. Welcomed the Council was awarded in July 2021 £110K from the Government's Welcome Back Fund to invest in a programme of measures to support the city centre and neighbourhood shopping areas following the pandemic, to be completed by March 2022.
- ii. Would seek further information about this from the Head of Environmental Services.

The meeting ended at 8.35 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank