

**WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

16 March 2023

6.30 - 7.40 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Gilderdale (Chair), S. Smith (Vice-Chair), Bick, Holloway, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer, Gay and Rae

**Officers:**

Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager: Wendy Johnston

Community Funding & Voluntary Sector Manager: Julie Cornwell

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**23/1/WAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Sweeny.

**23/2/WAC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**23/3/WAC Notes of the Previous Meeting**

Councillor S Smith advised that he had not been recorded in the minutes as being present at the meeting on 24 November which was an error.

The Chair agreed that the notes would be updated

*\*Committee Manager note: The electronic version has been updated and Councillor S Smith recorded as present.*

[Agenda for West Central Area Committee on Thursday, 24th November, 2022, 6.30 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

## **23/4/WAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes**

Reference: 22/19/WCAC Open Forum: Councillor Porrer requested that Ward Councillors were updated on any actions / outcomes from the multi-agency officer meeting scheduled for 22 March.

### **ACTION: Head of Environmental Services**

Members then noted the updated action sheet which could be found at the following link:

[Agenda for West Central Area Committee on Thursday, 16th March, 2023, 6.30 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

## **23/5/WAC Re-Ordering Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used their 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.

## **23/6/WAC Environmental Report - WCAC**

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 Member's comments the Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager said the following:

- i. Illegal camping referenced in the report referred to individual or groups who had erected tents to sleep overnight or to stay in a tent. This did not include rough sleepers or pop-up structures for children in the summer.
- ii. Acknowledged that Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street were hotspots for littering; the number of fixed penalties for that area was increasing.
- iii. How often street cleaning occurred was very much dependent on the area. Parked cars did cause an obstruction, therefore main roads were swept more often than a side street with vehicles parked down.
- iv. The Government set a standard which the Street Cleaning Teams had to work towards. Officers aimed for a minimum of a B grade, minimal mulch, or detritus at the side of the road.
- v. Officers were currently working on a 'Bins on Street' Campaign across the city. The process was restricted as the power to deal with persistent

owners of bins (which caused an obstruction) had been decriminalised by the Government ten years ago. A civil notice could be issued to residents who persistently obstructed pathways (yet had an alternative location to store them), this could be followed by a civil penalty.

- vi. Noted the positive comments regarding the engagement with volunteers.
- vii. Would pass on the Committee's thanks and praise for their work; particularly highlighted in Market Ward and the ascension burial ground.

### **23/7/WAC Area Committee Grants 2023-24**

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

Councillors were reminded that the Committee could not make decisions whilst the Area Committees were taking place virtually, but any discussion / debate would be taken into consideration by Officers when the delegated decisions were made.

In response to Members' questions officers said the following:

- i. Acknowledged that Christ Pieces Resident Association had been successful in the past but had not met the funding criteria on this occasion. The application had not demonstrated how they would evidence an impact around social and or economic deprivation or provided any evidence that the beneficiaries couldn't fund the activities themselves. Would be happy to support the Resident Association to seek alternative funding.
- ii. Friends of Midsummer Common would receive an increased award from the previous year although not the full amount Requested as they also receive support from another Council service
- iii. There had been unprecedented demand for funding, but bids had been given rigorous scrutiny from officers. Funding was allocated where the criteria were met.
- iv. Reasons why applications were not proposed to be awarded area committee grant funding included:
  - a. Significant funding had already been provided by the council through the main community grants fund.
  - b. Poor or insufficient detail regarding benefit to residents in the west area of Cambridge; where appropriate officers would liaise with applicants where their application would be better made to the main community grants fund.
  - c. Inclusion of inappropriate costs (e.g. equipment only requests).

- d. Financial need of applicant group not demonstrated or over reliance on Community Grants funding.
- v. Recommended that organisations read through the guidance and talked with Grant Officers before applying.
- vi. Money that had been underspent within West Central Area would be placed into a central 'pot' for funding.
- vii. Would like to carry out a review of how effective area committee grants were with only one funding window. A member briefing had been arranged in September to discuss this matter with all Councillors.
- viii. Officers would review the amount of detail included within the reports and would be happy to discuss any further detailed queries outside of the meeting.

### **23/8/WAC Open Forum**

Members of the public put forward the following statement, as set out below.

1. A member of the public raised the following issues:
  - i. Jesus Green Association proposal some years ago was to refurbish the pavilion. After a professional survey it was found to be past renovation. The Association agreed with the Council that a new Rouse Ball building should be erected as a new entrance to the swimming pool and should contain a cafe/restaurant, new toilets, and dressing rooms for the pool and new up to date toilets for visitors including the disabled. It would also contain meeting rooms and details of the history of Jesus Green. The pavilion has now deteriorated markedly and is dangerous.
  - ii. The toilets whilst having a temporary refit are now hardly fit for purpose. Section 106 funds were proposed, and Trinity College had agreed a small donation in memory of Rouse Ball a member of the College and a City Councillor whose legacy included the pavilion.
  - iii. We think it's important for a Capital funding proposal to be initiated by the Council to ensure these most important improvements to Jesus Green are implemented as soon as possible.

Councillor Gilderdale provided the following response provided by Cambridge City Council Officers:

- i. Confirmed (as the member of the public had alluded to) there was a relationship between the Lido and the Pavilion created from the project planning.
- ii. Improvements to the Lido had been focussed on what is available via S106<sup>1</sup> Swimming Pool contributions<sup>2</sup> to include improvements to the pool tank with the S106 funding have been prioritised to address and improve accessibility and usability for users by
  - a. Profiling the pool tank to make it shallower throughout to create more shallow areas for children and less able swimmers, also to reduce unnecessary depth to promote natural warming of the water.
  - b. Inserting thermal insulation (retaining heat).
  - c. Creating a deck level pool (easier access/egress and offers a natural filtration of surface debris and leaves).
  - d. making upgrades and improvements to changing and toilet/showers to improve accessibility and better support year-round use.
- iii. Along with some capital funded improvements to the pool plantroom housing the filtration systems.
- iv. These improvements impact on when and what the Council could do at the Rouse Ball pavilion.
- v. The plans to relocate the Rouse Ball Pavilion to the pool, to create a community café & multi use space, toilets changing etc were unaffordable and undeliverable in the short - medium term in the current financial environment.
- vi. It was still the ambition to deliver these facilities as part of a future leisure offer for the Lido when the current Leisure Contract expired at the end of March 2026 and work is now commencing on what a new leisure contract can deliver for the City over the coming year.
- vii. Officers could start work with the Friends Groups on what a new facility may look like; where it could be sited and outline designs to proceed to a position where planning permissions for a building may be obtained, but delivery of the facility would be part of the new leisure provision after 2026.
- viii. In the short term, the Streets and Open Space team had considered options for both the Rouse Pavilion and its associated toilet provision and have made improvements to toilets and sublet part of the Pavilion to

---

<sup>1</sup> funding from developers to mitigate the demands arising from growth of the city which cannot be provided on site

<sup>2</sup> Around £350k available now

And a further £535k forthcoming in the next few years

support the punters on the river. The toilets were in good condition and serviced every day.

- ix. The Council also made periodic repairs and remove graffiti as it appears, and the building remains fit for purpose, and we accept this is a short-term solution.
- x. The Council would include Friends groups when discussing options for change medium to longer term.

Councillor Porrer respond with the following:

- i. The Council had been looking at this issue for several years and would want to be part of any work to bring the project to conclusion; was happy to meet with Jesus Green Association.
- ii. There had already been cuts to the public conveniences in the city, Midsummer Common toilets would only be open part of the year and those on Chesterton Road had been closed. This meant that the pressure on the public toilets on Jesus Green would increase.
- iii. Disappointed that the funding would not be looked at for three years due to the time the Council had been working on this project irrespective of the Lido.

Councillor Bick stated the following:

- i. The public toilets did not meet the public demand for Jesus Green. This was the case before the Council part closed Park Street and Midsummer Common public toilets and now having closed Chesterton Road signposting Jesus Green as an alternative increase demand for an inadequate out of date public conveniences.
- ii. Would query the maintenance costs of the Jesus Green was cost efficient as would assume the costs were high.
- iii. Savings had been made from the closure of public toilets in the city and yet there had been no provision for the investment in supplying sufficient facilities on Jesus Green.

The member of the public concluded with the following points:

- i. Did not agree with the Officers that the pavilion was fit for purpose, the roof was in bits and was leaked when rained. The survey carried out six or seven years stated the condition of the roof was in too bad of a state to repair and recommend the removal.
- ii. The toilets were not suitable for disabled use; being “spruced up” from time to time was not enough.
- iii. The project would be suitable to apply for heritage lottery funding and would ask if Officers had explored this route.

Councillor Gay suggested that Trinity College could also be contacted regarding the matter of funding.

Councillor Gilderdale thanked the member of the public for their time and hoped a meeting could be arranged with officers to discuss a way forward (**Action: Cllr Gilderdale**)

2. A member of the public sent in the following statement:

I live in Cambridge city centre, on City Road quite close to the Grafton Centre. My question relates to engine idling by cars and vans in this area.

At the end of City Road where it meets the Grafton St area, the rear of the Grafton Centre near the car park behind Next and Starbucks, and in fact anywhere a car can pull up to offload shoppers heading for the Grafton, there seems to be a complete lack of understanding by car drivers of the polluting effect of their idling engines on the air quality where we live. Sometimes I speak to them and politely request that they turn off their engines, and nearly always am met by bafflement as to why this is necessary.

My understanding is that an idling engine can emit twice as much pollution as a moving vehicle, and that there has been some discussion in Westminster about introducing on-the-spot fines for engine idling. At present I believe drivers can be issued a fine if they fail to turn off their engine within 60 seconds of being asked to do so.

Section 42 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 prohibits leaving your engine on when it is not needed. I believe we need to tackle engine idling as an important part of our efforts to reduce pollution in Cambridge. In the light of all this, would it be possible to have a number of anti-idling posters and signs put up in the area? Any other measures aimed at sorting out this problem would also be welcome

Councillor Porrer stated the following:

- i. Agreed with the points raised as experienced the same issues.
- ii. Had recently spoken with the traffic warden who were trying to enforce it but they were not there every minute of every day.
- iii. Would support a poster campaign designed by local school children on this subject matter and queried if this could be supported / arranged by

the City Council. Aware that in certain areas that could be heritage issues but would like Officers to explore the suggestion.

Councillor Gilderdale highlighted that the following points

- i. The Head of Environmental Services had provided an in the Matters and Action sheet concerning, reference 22/19/WAC Open Forum Q2, as the matter had been discussed at a previous meeting.  
[Agenda for West Central Area Committee on Thursday, 16th March, 2023, 6.30 pm - Cambridge Council](#)
- ii. There were powers in the Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions)
- iii. (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002, which, on application, would allow local authorities to enforce but the Council did not have the resource to actively police this matter.
- iv. Would go back to the Head of Environment Services with the suggestion of signage, highlighting the suggestion of the school children competition **(Action: Cllr Gilderdale)**.

The meeting ended at 7.40 pm

**CHAIR**