

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 7th June 2016

Time: 4.30pm – 5.10pm

Present: County Councillors Cearns, Kavanagh, Manning, Scutt, Taylor and Walsh;
City Councillors Adey, Baigent, Bird, Blencowe, Cantrill (substituting for
Councillor Tunnacliffe), Robertson.

Apologies: City Councillor D Tunnacliffe

32. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN/CHAIRWOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/17

It was proposed by Councillor Walsh and seconded by Councillor Baigent that Councillor Scutt be elected Chairwoman for the municipal year 2016/17. Councillor Cearns proposed, seconded by Councillor Manning that Councillor Taylor be appointed as Chairwoman. On being put to the vote it was resolved that Councillor Scutt be elected.

33. ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/17

It was proposed by Councillor Baigent and seconded by Councillor Bird that Councillor Blencowe be elected as Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2016/17. Councillor Manning proposed, seconded by Councillor Taylor that Councillor Adey be elected as Vice-Chairman. On being put to the vote it was resolved that Councillor Blencowe be elected.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

35. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 26TH JANUARY 2016

The minutes of the meeting held 26th January 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record by the Chairman/woman.

36. PETITIONS

None.

37. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairwoman exercised her discretion and allowed Mrs Cranmer of Tenison Road, Cambridge to ask three questions that related to the Tenison Road traffic calming scheme.

Mrs Cranmer's questions were:

- Would the Committee be passing a motion expressing its disapproval at the way that County Council officers changed four of the five plans for the £500,000

Tenison Road calming scheme approved by the Joint Area Committee on 25th March 2015. Speed table removed and trees removed.

- The County Council would receive an additional £150,000 towards the calming scheme. Would the Committee take measures to ensure that the money was spent on items excluded from the original scheme on the grounds of cost? Bollards at junction and the features at Wilkin Street.
- In view of the five years delay and maladministration in the implementation of the scheme, would the Committee ask external auditors to complete a detailed examination of the finances?

Cllr Manning proposed, seconded by Councillor Cearns, for the issues raised by Mrs Cranmer to be investigated by the Council's Internal Audit Team. On being put to the vote the proposal was lost.

The Chairwoman proposed with the agreement of the Committee that officers investigate the matter and inform Mrs Cranmer of their findings. The response would be circulated to Members and if necessary further investigation could be undertaken at that point.

A Member suggested that public questions be incorporated into the Committee agenda in the future. It was agreed that advice would be sought from the Council's Monitoring Officer with regard to public speaking rights at the Committee. **ACTION**

38. PARKING POLICY REVIEW

The Committee received a report that updated Members on the progress of the Member Working Group for the resident parking policy review for Cambridge and sought the endorsement of the Members Working Group Scope/Terms of Reference. Members were also requested to consider the membership of the working group for the new municipal year. Members noted the ongoing development of a meeting schedule and that the findings of the working group would be presented to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee in October and then to Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee in November.

In the course of discussion, Members:

- Agreed with Councillor Robertson's proposal that a further objective that reviewed the hours parking restrictions be applied be added to the list contained within Appendix 1 of the report. Members therefore added a further objective that reviewed the sustainability of schemes that restricted parking to a period of 1 hour of the day and hours in the evening and on Sundays.
- Requested that the proposed scheme be flexible, as certain areas of the city had a greater need for parking restrictions than others.
- Noted the links between the parking policy review and the City Deal consultation. Members were informed that discussions were taking place between officers and noted the objective of the review that any scheme complemented the aims and objectives of the City Deal.

- Requested that the objectives of the working group be circulated to residents and resident associations. A Member also requested that disability groups be included within the proposed circulation. **ACTION**

Further:

- Councillor Blencowe proposed, seconded by City Councillor Robertson, that Councillor Baigent be nominated to sit on the working group. On being put to the vote, Councillor Baigent was appointed to the working group.
- Councillor Taylor proposed, seconded by Councillor Cantrill, that Councillor Adey be appointed to the working group. On being put to the vote, Councillor Adey was appointed to the working group.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Endorse Cambridge Resident Parking Policy Working Groups Scope and Terms of Reference contained within appendix 1 and 2 of the report.
- b) Review the membership of the working group for the next municipal year.
- c) Nominate two City Councillors to sit on the working group.

39. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH CHURCH END AND ROSEMARY LANE, CHERRY HINTON, CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report on objections received to the proposed no waiting at any time traffic regulation order (TRO) and speed cushions in Church End and Rosemary Lane, Cherry Hinton. Members were informed that the scheme represented the third iteration of proposals.

In the course of discussion Members:

- Expressed concern that the Local Member had not commented on the proposals. Officers confirmed that the Local Member was in favour of the proposals and her support for the scheme had been confirmed in writing.
- Noted discussions that had taken place at the South Area Committee and the strong support expressed by local people at the meeting.
- Questioned why there were no comments in support of the scheme contained within the report. Officers explained that comments in support of the scheme had been presented to the Local Highways Improvement Panel.
- Questioned what further measures were proposed. Officers advised that a further bid would probably be submitted as the funding was insufficient to carry out alterations to the whole length of the road.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) Determine the objections and approve the installation of the TRO and speed cushions as advertised and make the order.
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Chairwoman