

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

11 July 2011
7.30 - 10.40 pm

Present:

City Councillors: Taylor (Chair), Blackhurst (Vice-Chair), Al Bander, Ashton, Dryden, McPherson, Pippas and Stuart

County Councillors Carter and Heathcock

Officers Present:

Development Control Manager – Peter Carter
Environmental Projects Manager – Andrew Preston
Safer Communities Manager – Lynda Kilkelly
Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

Also Present

Representatives of Cambridgeshire Police
Head of Road Safety and Parking (County Council) – Richard Preston

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

11/31/SAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2011/12

The Committee Manager opened the meeting and invited nominations for the role of Chair for 2011/12. Nominations were received for Councillor Taylor and Councillor McPherson. Councillor Taylor was elected by four votes to three.

The Chair invited nominations for the role of Vice Chair for 2011/12. Nominations were received for Councillor Blackhurst and Councillor McPherson. Councillor Blackhurst was elected by four votes to three.

11/32/SAC Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Swanson.

11/33/SAC Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the addition of reference to the fact that the public also asked questions on the libraries item, not just members of the committee.

11/34/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

There were no matters or actions arising from the minutes.

11/35/SAC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Al Bander declared a personal interest in 11/40/SAC as a member of Trumpington Residents Association.

Councillor McPherson declared a personal interest in 11/40/SAC as site manager for the Cherry Hinton Summer Festival.

Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest in planning item 11/41a/SAC due to being an acquaintance of the one objector. Councillor Taylor opted to not participate in the item.

11/36/SAC Open Forum

The Chair announced a number of forthcoming community events.

It was agreed to defer specific comments, statements and questions to the relevant agenda items.

11/37/SAC Safer Neighbourhoods

Mr Richard Taylor addressed the committee and made the following comments

- i. Why did the Police not advertise the relevant Area Committee meetings through police.uk?

- ii. Could information and issues arising from police surgeries be shared with the public?
- iii. A breakdown on the violent crime figures was requested, with specific request for information regarding violent crime against strangers.
- iv. The presence of a member in the audience of the Police Authority was highlighted.

Inspector Kerridge responded to the questions and made the following comments

- i. It was agreed that the use of Police.uk would be investigated. The Inspector reminded the meeting that the relevant Area Committees were publicised through the e-cops emails.
- ii. It was explained that the surgeries were a different form of engagement, which may involve personal or sensitive information being shared with the Police. The Inspector explained that trends or significant information arising from the surgeries would be shared with the Area Committee when appropriate.
- iii. The Inspector explained that the violent crime heading included all different types of violent crime and wasn't routinely further subdivided. The meeting was reassured that violent crime levels were very low in the South Area

The committee received a report from the Inspector regarding issues affecting South Area over the last three months.

The committee and members of the public asked the following questions regarding the Safer Neighbourhoods report.

- i. Reference was made to a recent Home Office report, which had highlighted the significance of vehicle related anti-social behaviour. Clarification was requested on why there was no reference in the report to these types of issues. The Safer Communities Manager explained the process for setting the Community Safety Partnership priorities and it was indicated that the issue had not featured highly in the consultation responses therefore had not been adopted as a Community Safety Partnership priority. In response to further comments it was agreed to

investigate the possibility of including a breakdown of the vehicle related ASB issues in future Safer Neighbourhoods report.

- ii. The Police were thanked for work undertaken in the Arran Close area of Cherry Hinton in relation to tackling drug-taking related issues, but it was explained that the problems continue to exist. The Inspector acknowledged and welcomed the progress to date and emphasised the importance of breaking the cycle of problems. It was agreed to review the options for further work to tackle the problems outside of the meeting.
- iii. The possibility of extending the recommendation regarding ASB on Cherry Hinton High Street to include Arran Close and Rectory Terrace was suggested.
- iv. Clarification was requested on what powers the Council and other agencies had in relation to tackling problems between neighbours. The Inspector outlined the main mechanisms available to tackle the problems highlighted. It was agreed to address the issues highlighted outside of the meeting.
- v. The low level of violent crime was welcomed but it was agreed that any level of violent crime was unacceptable. It was suggested that a breakdown of violent crime would be useful in future reports.
- vi. With reference to the problems associated with scooter related ASB, it was suggested that a circuit existed starting at Nightingale Avenue and ending at Cherry Hinton Rec (and vice versa). Concern was also expressed about the increased prevalence of dangerous behaviour associated with scooter usage.
- vii. Concerns were raised about the increasing numbers of cyclists riding on the pavement. The possibility of enhanced road safety training and engagement with language schools was suggested. Specific problems in relation to students attending Netherhall School were noted. Potential safety issues with the use of existing cycle lanes (e.g. litter, poor design) were highlighted as a possible reason for extensive cycling on the pavement.
- viii. Clarification was requested from the Police on whether there has been any reports of underage sales of alcohol from specific premises on Cherry Hinton. The Inspector advised that no significant reports had been received, but would continue to be reviewed.

- ix. Speeding issues on Church End were highlighted. The Inspector explained that a survey had been undertaken and agreed to feed back the results to the Ward Councillors.
- x. It was questioned whether the Police had the power to confiscate scooters. The Inspector explained that s59 of the Police Reform Act allowed action to be taken against vehicles and drivers, where it was a proportionate response.

Resolved to adopt the following priorities

- i. Anti-social behaviour on Cherry Hinton High Street including Arran Close and Rectory Terrace.
- ii. Scooter and moped related ASB in Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith's

11/38/SAC 20 MPH Speed Limit: Wulfstan Way Area, Cambridge

Mr James Woodburn addressed the committee on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

- i. Advocated the extension of 20 MPH limits to all non-through roads in the city
- ii. Highlighted widespread public support for the implementation of the scheme, specific reference was made to a popular poll on the Cambridge Evening News website.
- iii. The positive impacts achieved by a scheme in Portsmouth were highlighted. The committee were advised of the key elements of the scheme.
- iv. The potential use of yellow backed signs or roundels painted on the road was suggested.

The Head of Road Safety and Parking (County Council) addressed the committee and outlined the development of the scheme. The meeting was advised that the project was designed to provide a reduction in speed limits

without heavy engineering to the road environment. The meeting was also advised that the Area Joint Committee had requested that the scheme should have minimal signing.

The Head of Road Safety and Parking explained that the County Council Cabinet had recently adopted a new policy in relation to speed limits, which allowed communities to more effectively influence the speed limits in their localities.

The committee and members of the public made the following comments on the committee report

- i. The risk of confusion due to the different speed limits in the area, and the logic of not covering the whole of the Gunhild Estate was questioned.
- ii. The need to include Spalding Way in the 20 mph area, due to the number of near misses particularly in icy weather.
- iii. The potential psychological effect of identifying the scheme as an experiment may be potentially counterproductive in reducing speed levels.
- iv. The importance of implementation backed by initially proactive high levels of enforcement was suggested.

The meeting noted that the original proposed scheme was to include the whole estate but that in light of local member representations at the time the Area Joint Committee agreed a smaller initial scheme.

Inspector Kerridge responded to the comments regarding enforcement. The meeting were advised that Cambridgeshire Police had recently agreed to enforce 20 MPH limits, but that enforcement was only one part of a larger strategy to reduce the levels of speed in a particular area. The meeting noted that Speed Awareness training was not designed for breaches of 20 MPH and there were also capacity issues in the courts managing the fixed penalty notices process. A press release issued by Portsmouth City Council was highlighted by a member of the public, which indicated that Speed Awareness training had been provided as an option, as part of their scheme. The comment was noted.

Inspector Kerridge also provided a verbal update on recent levels of compliance. It was explained that during a recent enforcement period only one

vehicle (a bus) had exceeded the limit and threshold for prosecution (10% + 2 MPH) out of 200 vehicles. The Inspector highlighted that any enforcement action was generally highly visible, therefore had a deterrent effect.

The committee agreed that it was important to consider the unique circumstances of Cambridge, specifically the very high levels of cycling and pedestrian traffic in considering the most appropriate speed limit.

The committee and members of the public made the following additional comments on the report

- i. The need to consider the implications of the new primary school (Queen Emma's) on Queen Edith's Way due to open in September 2011.
- ii. Issues with potentially late running buses exceeding the speed limit along Queen Edith's Way.
- iii. Ongoing issues with inappropriate parking reducing the traffic flow on certain parts of Queen Edith Way, which may be encouraging speeding on other sections.
- v. The safety issues associated with inappropriate parking such as cats or a child hidden behind vehicles was highlighted as a reason for continuing to need to reduce the speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph.
- vi. Clarification was requested on the cost of implementing changes to the road environment, such as painted roundels or additional signs. The Head of Road Safety and Parking highlighted the following estimates
 - Roundels - £500
 - Additional Signs - £50/£100 each
 - Vehicle Activated Signs – up to £5,000 each

Reservations were expressed about the potential divisive nature of the revised County Council policy. The Head of Road Safety and Parking acknowledged the concern, but explained that certain schemes would never have been completed under the old policy because they were not a high enough priority and that the new policy allowed communities to bring forward the schemes.

The Head of Road Safety and Parking summarised the discussion and reiterated the key points of the scheme

- The schemes were designed to be low budget, with no other physical measures. The potential negative cumulative impact of an excess of particular forms of traffic engineering such as yellow backed signs or vehicle-activated signs was highlighted as a potential issue to be considered.
- Policies had been reviewed in light of the emerging localism bill, and the speed limit policy was designed to give local communities a greater say in the development speed limits.
- The Portsmouth scheme, which had been highlighted, by a number of speakers had cost £600,000 whereas the current scheme cost less than £10,000.
- Support for an extension of the existing scheme to cover the whole estate was a commonly agreed aspiration.

11/39/SAC Environmental Improvement Programme Report

The committee received a report from the Environmental Project Manager regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme. The committee were advised that the County Council were now requesting a commuted sum for maintenance liability for all projects in the highways. It was agreed that the implications of the policy would be presented to a future meeting.

The following comments were made regarding the report,

- i. It was requested whether it would be possible to lower the height of the hanging baskets in Cherry Hinton. The Environmental Projects Manager explained that it might be difficult to change the height of the basket, but other options may exist.
- ii. The possibility of consulting the Cherry Hinton Residents Association on the proposed scheme for Rectory Terrace. The request was noted.
- iii. The potential value of the Mowbray Road scheme was challenged, and it was suggested whether it would be more appropriate to spend the money on another scheme such as additional 20 MPH limits. The Environmental Projects Manager explained that the scheme was designed to supersede the existing by-law and simplify the

enforcement of verge parking. The committee agreed that the proposed scheme had implications for the wider area, which needed to be considered prior to making a decision. The committee noted that the scheme would be subject to further consultation.

- iv. Clarification was requested on the funding arrangements for the proposed Cherry Hinton sign refurbishment. It was noted that a similar project in Cherry Hinton had been part funded by Community Development and Leisure Grants and by community contributions.

The Environmental Projects Manager explained that a new fund had been created by the County Council to jointly fund schemes in the highway. The committee noted that each of the four area committees had been allocated £6250. In response to a question regarding the governance of the fund, the committee were advised that the area committee would be responsible for agreeing the long list of projects but that the final decision for selecting projects would be the responsibility of the Area Joint Committee. The committee requested that the Cambridge Cycle Campaign were included in the consultation regarding the development of the long list of projects.

Resolved to

- i. Approve all the schemes listed in the committee report for further development
- ii. Note that a report outlining the future maintenance liability as a result of the application of the third party assets policy by the County Council would be presented to a future meeting.

11/40/SAC Community Development Grants 2011/12

The committee received a report from the Cambridgeshire Community Foundation regarding Community Development Grants 2011/12.

Resolved to

- i. Approve the grant allocations as outlined in the committee report.

11/41/SAC Planning Items

11a 11/0231/FUL- 13 Beaumont Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire, CB1 8PU
The committee received an application for full planning permission for retrospective consent for the erection of a single storey building for use as a 'garden office'.

The committee received representations from Mr Niall Gormley and Mr Kevin Potts.

Mr Gormley spoke in objection to the application and raised the following concerns

- Excessive size and footprint of the structure
- Lack of similar structures on Beaumont Road
- The nature of the business and associated implications for parking and disturbance.

Mr Potts spoke in support of the application.

Resolved (7 votes to 1) to grant planning permission in accordance with the officer's recommendations for the following reasons

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV7 Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4, 7/2, and 8/10

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

11b 11/0373/FUL - 10 And 11 Brookside Cambridge Cambridgeshire, CB2
1JE

The committee received an application for full planning permission to undertaken alterations and additions, to include erection of garden room, patio and new external stairs at rear of No. 11 Brookside. Change of use of

basement, ground, first, second floors and one room on 3rd floor from B1 (a) office use to residential.

The committee received representations from Mrs Jemima Atkinson and Mr Richard Nightingale.

Mrs Jemina Atkinson spoke in objection and expressed concerns about the lack of privacy and potential overlooking.

Mr Richard Nightingale addressed the committee and spoke in support of the application and addressed the issues outlined by the objector.

Following discussion regarding potential conditions it was agreed that the Planning Officers would keep Councillor Stuart updated on the discharge of condition 6 (screening).

Resolved (Unanimously) to approve the application in accordance with officer recommendations for the following reasons

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4,3/7,3/14,4/11,4/12,5/1,8/6 and 8/10

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

The meeting ended at 10.40 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank