Draft minutes – to be confirmed at meeting on 8 April 2010

West/Central Area Committee

MINUTES

Date:	**Thursday 4 February 2010**
Time:	**7:30pm – 10.01pm**
Place:	**The Pavilion, University Running Track, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge**

Committee Manager: Glenn Burgess **Telephone:** 01223 457169
email: glenn.burgess@cambridge.gov.uk or **write to:** Committee Services, Room 11, The Guildhall, Cambridge CB2 3QJ

Council Members Present:

City Councillors for:
Castle (John Hipkin, Simon Kightley and Tania Zmura)
Market Mike Dixon, Colin Rosenstiel, Tim Bick)
Newnham (Rod Cantrill, Sian Reid and Julie Smith)

Also present:
Ian Nimmo-Smith: Leader of the Council

Co-opted non-voting members:
County Councillors: Brooks-Gordon (Castle), Nethsingha (Newnham) and Whitebread (Market)

Council Officers Present:

Cambridge City Council:
Glenn Burgess – Committee Manager
Alastair Roberts – Safer Communities Manager
Andrew Preston – Environmental Projects Manager

Cambridge County Council:
John Preston – Head of Network Management

10/01 APOLOGIES for ABSENCE

None.

10/02 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

10/03 MATTERS and ACTIONS ARISING from MINUTES

09/63 Open Forum: Senate House Passage

The Chair confirmed that Councillors had visited Senate House Passage and were sufficiently satisfied that the paving was being replaced 'like for like' where possible.

09/63 Open Forum: Council policy on riven York stone

The Chair confirmed that he had held discussions with the Head of Network Management regarding this issue. The County Council had no set policy relating to the replacement of riven York Stone, and decisions would be made depending on price and availability of materials. Other surfaces would always be considered if appropriate to a particular area.

The Chair also stated that sawn York stone had been well received by some disability groups as it provided a smoother surface than riven York stone.

09/63 Open Forum: Emmanuel Road speeding

The Police Inspector informed members that a meeting had been held in the last week between the Superintendent and local partners. The outcomes would be available in the next few days and it was agreed that details be circulated to members as soon as possible.

09/63 Open Forum: Cycling ASB

The Chair confirmed that, in response to these issues, the Police and City Council officers were conducting a further campaign on cycling ASB.

10/04 DECLARATIONS of INTEREST

None.

10/05 OPEN FORUM **ACTION BY**

Q) John Lawton: Mooring fee consultation – The consultants report states that fees are on the low side. Why is the level of fees not included as part of the consultation and why is there no Community Charge?

A) The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation stated that this decision had been taken prior to her becoming Executive Councillor. The fees were set to be in line with Council Tax levels, and as yet public opinion had not indicated that this should be revised. As the moorings were not fixed, standard Council Tax could not be charged.

Q) Anthony Bowen: Builders compound near to the bus station – what action has been taken on this since this was raised at the last meeting?

A) The Head of Network Management confirmed that the developers had not yet signed up to the legal agreement. However, the County Council had stated that if the developers had not begun repaving within two weeks, they would remove the compound and make the site safe.

Q) Richard Taylor: Mooring consultation – was it residents, colleges or councillors that prompted the review, and did the Executive Councillor looked at the consultation paper before it was sent out?

Also, why do people have to use the set questions in the consultation paper to formulate their response? The questions are leading and the Council should agree to accept any form of response.

A) The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation confirmed that she had seen the text of the consultation document but not the specific graphic designs that were included. She agreed to view these and if the proposals were unsatisfactory they would not be adopted.

It was confirmed that it was an open consultation and all views would be taken on board, regardless of which method they were submitted in.

Q) John Lawton: Gritting and public safety – can the Council offer more leadership and assistance to enable citizens to clear snow and ice from paths and pavements e.g by purchasing and distributing grit storage bins?

A) The Leader of the Council confirmed that a meeting had been held between himself, the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Health Services, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access and the Head of Network Management to discuss the legal situation and the provision of grit bins around the city. There were legal issues around liability to be considered but preparations for next winter were already being looked into.

It was noted that Suffolk County Council operated a system of registered accredited volunteers that could aid with gritting and this was being looked at as a possible way forward for Cambridge.

Q) John Lawton – accredited volunteers is a laughable solution. All that is needed is grit bins, so that residents can clear their own paths. We need clear processes in place for this year, as we may get more bad weather.

A) This is not just a problem for Cambridge and we have to protect the public against legal action. This is the worst weather in 30 years and the answer is not to provide fully stocked grit bins that may only be used once per year.

Q) Anthony Bowen: Speeding in Emmanuel Road – what action is being taken by the Police, the City Council and the County Council?

A) The Police Inspector confirmed that a joint meeting had taken place in the last week and the outcomes would be circulated to members as soon as possible.

In response to a question regarding taxi responders, the Police Inspector agreed to check that this issue had also been covered at the meeting.

10/06 PRESENTATION: CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY – 'YOUR POLICE FORCE'

A Police Authority Representative presented on the recent consultation being undertaken by the Police Authority. The issues covered included:

- Number of officers and staff
- Priorities
- The tight financial picture
- The future outlook

Questions from Members of the Committee:

Q) It would seem more logical that resources are allocated on the number of incidents and calls per area, and not just on population figures?

A) The Police Authority representative confirmed that the national funding formula did take into account incidents and call rates when allocating funding.

Q) What do you class as extremism and how do you detect it?

A) The Police Inspector stated it would be classed as anyone that had an extreme view that could be seen as being detrimental to their community. If extremism was not dealt with appropriately, it could develop into terrorism. The Police worked with these groups to ensure they are not drawn into terrorism.

The Police Authority representative agreed that more information on this could be brought back to a future meeting.

Q) For normal residents, counter-terrorism, extremism and 'changing communities' would not be their first priority in terms of policing. Do central government or local people set these?

A) The Police Inspector confirmed that the Force were having to look at 'changing communities' locally in terms of the significant changes in the demographics of neighbourhoods i.e the increase of eastern Europeans. The Police had to tailor their services to take into account these changes .

In was confirmed that the Policing Plan, including priorities for the next 5 years, were set centrally. However, local and neighbourhood priorities were put forward and agreed with the input of local residents.

Q) Is there an urban/rural issue with more officers needed to cover some of the large rural areas?

A) The Police Inspector stated that due to levels of crime, the majority of the resources were targeted in the city. Rural areas were however allocated resource when required.

Q) How much resource is spent on increasing 'public confidence' in the Police?

A) The Police Inspector stated that the root to public confidence was good policing. Some work was undertaken with the media to ensure that good news stories got reported, but the key to public confidence was a good core service and speedy results. A survey of victims of crime was used to measure public satisfaction with the Police.

Q) How is the Police Authority held accountable for the money used from local Council Tax?

A) The Police Authority representative confirmed that the money was subject to capping and inspection and audit regimes were in place.

Questions from members of the public:

Q) Richard Taylor – there is a need for more independent and Council representatives on the Police Authority. The PACE Code needs to be followed in Cambridge and not only treated as guidance. The taser issue also needs to be looked at strategically by the Police Authority.

A) The Police Authority representative stated that there were currently 9 Councillors and 8 independent members on the Authority. The other comments were noted.

10/07 PROPOSED S30 DISPERSAL ORDER (HISTORIC CITY CENTRE)

The Safer Communities Manager introduced the report to members and gave some background on the issues.

The Police Inspector confirmed that the views of the West/Central Area Committee were being sought on the possible implementation of the S30 Order to establish if it was an appropriate course of action.

Members raised the following:

- Concern over the lack of qualitative and quantitative evidence in the report.
- Concern that the issues were based on perceptions and not evidence.
- Concern that the problem would just be moved to another area.
- The need for other agencies to be involved to gather wider views.
- The possibility of certain groups being targeting unfairly.
- That ASB, as a result of the nighttime activity, was of greater concern.

The Police Inspector confirmed that the data and evidence was still being collated, and members were simply being asked for an initial view of the suggested approach and that the experience of individuals would provide useful information for the final report

Members stated that that they were unable to give a view on the proposal without being presented with more data. It was agreed that this issue would be brought back to the meeting on 8 April for further discussion.

10/08 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME 2009/10

The Environmental Projects Manager gave an update on the following approved schemes as highlighted in the report:

- Manor Street/King Street cycle parking
- Lammas Land pavilion
- Tree planting on Midsummer Common, Jesus Green and New Square
- Mud Lane lighting
- Grantchester Road traffic calming features

Mud Lane: Safer City funding may have been identified by the Leader of the Council to help progress this scheme. The issue of land ownership was however still a potential problem.

County Councillor Whitebread agreed to discuss the issue further with the relevant Cabinet Member.

The Environmental Projects Manager introduced the following schemes requiring decision as highlighted in the report:

<u>Gough Way – Cranmer Road Footpath: Fencing Renewal</u>

Members questioned whether the EIP budget was the correct funding source for this project. It was agreed that the Environmental Improvements Manager would investigate alternative funding sources and report his findings back to the Chair and the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth.

Decision: AGREED (unanimously) to implement the works at an estimated cost of £8,300 - subject to the investigation of alternative funding sources and further discussion with the Chair and the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth.

Fitzroy/Burleigh Street Refurbishment

The Environmental Improvements Manager confirmed that the repairing of street surfaces (noted on page 5 of the report) would be funded by the County Council and not the City Council.

Decision: AGREED (unanimously) to consultation costs of up to £2,000

Mount Pleasant Mobility Crossing

The Environmental Improvements Manager distributed diagrams of the previously approved crossing and the proposed crossing.

Decision: AGREED (by 8 votes to 0) to abandon the proposals on safety grounds

10/09 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next Meeting was confirmed for 8 April 2010

Meeting finished at 10.01pm

Chair

Additional information for public:

City Council officers can also be emailed firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk

Information (including contact details) of the Members of the City Council can be found from this page:
http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/about-the-council/councillors/

Members of the County Council can be emailed:
Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk