CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 14th March 2017

Time: 4.30pm – 6.15pm

Place: Council Chamber, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: County Councillors, Kavanagh, Manning, Nethsingha (substituting for Cllr Cearns) Scutt (Chairwoman) Taylor and Walsh
City Councillors Adey, Baigent, Bird, Blencowe (Vice-Chairman), Cantrill (substituting for Cllr Tunnacliffe) and Robertson.

Apologies: **County** Councillor Cearns; District Councillor Tunnacliffe

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

63. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 24th JANUARY 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 24th January 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

In relation to minute 52, on the Residents' Parking Policy, the Chairwoman reported that the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, meeting on the morning of 14 March, had approved the Policy, but had decided to defer consideration of the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan until after the Cambridge City Deal Board had considered the work it had commissioned on joining up parking policy options.

64. PETITIONS

The Committee was advised that one petition had been received related to Tenison Road – Zebra Crossing Provision; it would be considered at the start of that agenda item [minute 66 refers].

65. MORLEY AREA RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME

The Committee received a report setting out the background to the proposed residents' parking scheme in the Morley area of the Queen Edith's division and a small part of the Coleridge division. The report also set out the representations and objections received in response to the formal advertisement of parking controls.

Two local residents, Terry Horsnell of Blinco Grove and Rachel Calder of Rock Road, spoke in support of the residents' parking scheme.

Mr Horsnell, speaking on behalf of a number of his neighbours and himself, drew attention to the large numbers of schools and employers in or near the area bounded by Hills Road, Blinco Grove and Cherry Hinton Road, and the great difficulty residents experienced in finding a place to park because of the large number of commuters parking in the local streets. He disputed the claims of some other residents that there would be insufficient parking for residents because of the cars

displaced from Marshall Road, and urged that the parking scheme be introduced immediately, to avoid the Morley area becoming an island of free on-street parking surrounded by other residential parking schemes.

Ms Calder spoke on behalf of the Morley Area Residents' Parking Group, which had been formed to support the introduction of a residents' parking scheme. She reported that the Group had conducted an informal survey that had suggested that there would be enough room for residents' cars under the scheme. Ms Calder said that it would not be worth waiting for a scheme to be implemented under the City Deal, as the set up costs were not high and there were already severe problems on the roads; she gave examples of specific situations where residents had experienced difficulty in parking. She urged the Committee to support the scheme.

Dr Philip Pickford of Rock Road spoke representing those who had signed a petition submitted as part of the consultation response, saying that the petitioners believed that there had been inadequate consultation. He said that more households had expressed dissatisfaction with the scheme than the number that had voted for its introduction, and efforts by the dissatisfied to influence the final design had been unsuccessful. It was clear that parking was an issue for parts of the area, but the petitions showed that 77% of houses polled had indicated the scheme needed wider consultation. He therefore asked the Council to stop the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process and start again, with genuine collaboration with residents.

Speaking as the local County member for Queen Edith's, Councillor Amanda Taylor spoke about the consultation process, saying that residents' parking had been a long-running issue in the Morley area. An informal survey of the area in 2015 to gauge whether there was in-principle support for a residents' parking scheme had shown 62% in favour of controls and had led to the current proposals. The survey had been followed by a letter to everybody in the area notifying them of a public meeting, at which information had been given about residents' permits, and such issues as costs, and carers. A council survey in November 2016 had shown 59% supporting the scheme. Leaflets had circulated for and against the proposals, there had been a display in the local library, and information in the local newsletter and political leaflets. The TRO had been advertised, and had attracted objections; a TRO advertisement sought objections, not indications of support.

Councillor Noel Kavanagh spoke as the local County member for Coleridge. He said that he had registered an objection some months ago, together with the three City members for Coleridge, on the basis of the obvious displacement that would affect Coleridge if the parking scheme were implemented. The division was saturated with commuter parking in the week, giving rise to stress and complaints; his objection had been made not because he was opposed to residents' parking schemes, but out of concern for Coleridge residents. Following that morning's decision of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, he would welcome the postponement of the Morley scheme, which would give Coleridge and Romsey a chance to catch up and develop a scheme for implementation at the same time as the Morley scheme.

One of the City members for Romsey, Councillor Dave Baigent, said that the proposed scheme would lead to increased parking in Coleridge and Romsey by cars displaced from the Morley area.

Members of the Committee considered the proposed residents' parking scheme in the light of the written report and oral representations. In the course of discussion, individual members

- speaking from experience of trying to develop a similar scheme in another part of Cambridge, commented that there were considerable constraints on what was permissible in the design of residents' parking schemes, which meant it was likely to be difficult to devise a better scheme for Morley later

- said that there would be little to be gained by waiting for City Deal funding to support start-up costs, and given the extent of the parking problem in Morley, delaying the scheme would be unfair to residents suffering as a result of being unable to park near their houses

- commented that the TRO process had been properly conducted, though there were clearly concerns among some residents about what would happen following the introduction of the scheme

- expressed concern at the decision of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee to defer consideration of the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan, because the decision would delay the introduction of a city-wide approach to residents' parking and the associated reduction in on-street parking by commuters. Officers confirmed that, despite this decision, it would still be possible to proceed with a residents' parking scheme in part of Cambridge

- reported on what had been seen when looking at Marshall Road. The road was little over 6m wide, with cars parked on the pavements on both sides, restricting access to the pavements; these had been further obstructed by refuse bins

- queried whether there would be adequate space in the area for residents' cars displaced by reducing parking capacity in Marshall Road; Councillor Taylor advised that the Mott McDonald survey of on-street parking suggested that there would be sufficient space

- drew attention to the air pollution caused by cars driving round in search of a place to park.

Councillor Taylor drew attention to the effect of parking problems on people's daily life, and the hazards posed by cars circling the area looking for a parking space, as well as the danger to pedestrians and wheel-chair users in Marshall Road. People had been asking for a residents' parking scheme since 2001, and the large number of planning consents within Queen Edith's, as well as the move by Papworth Hospital and by AstraZeneca to the biomedical campus nearby meant that the parking situation would only continue to deteriorate. She urged that the scheme proceed without delay.

It was resolved by a majority to

i. Note and determine the representations and objections received;
ii. Approve the area wide parking controls shown in Plan A-C as advertised, and
iii. Authorise the Head of Highways, in consultation with local members, to make such minor amendments to these parking controls as were necessary in response to the formalisation of the Traffic Regulation Order.

The Chairwoman expressed the Committee's thanks to the residents who had spoken and assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

66. TENISON ROAD – ZEBRA CROSSING PROVISION

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine whether the zebra crossing proposed for Tenison Road as part of the approved traffic calming scheme should be implemented as approved by the Committee on 25th March 2015.

Richard Calverley of Tenison Road presented a petition with a total of 97 signatures:

> We the undersigned residents of Tenison Road, together with parents and teachers associated with the local Montessori School, call upon Cambridgeshire County Council to complete the traffic calming scheme in Tenison Road by installing the agreed zebra crossing just north of Cannons Green.
>
> We are of the view this is an essential element of the democratically agreed plans which will both slow traffic and increase pedestrian safety.

Mr Calverley reported that he had encountered a high level of support for the petition; 12 of the signatories, including himself, lived in the 22 houses near the crossing, and the Montessori nursery school had opened recently close to it. He said that footfall on Tenison Road had increased considerably since March 2015, following the opening of student accommodation in the CB1 development. Students tended to walk down the Station Road side of Tenison Road, crossing at the site of the proposed crossing. In acknowledgement of some residents' concerns about light pollution from the Belisha beacons, details of alternative forms of beacon had been circulated to objectors and to members of the Committee. In the view of many residents, only an official zebra crossing would deal with the problem of the large number of speeding taxis in Tenison Road, because drivers knew that they were legally required to stop at a zebra crossing; this was not the case at speed tables. He urged the Committee to uphold its original decision.

In answer to members' questions, Mr Calverley said that the students in question were in their late teens and early 20s, heading in the direction of Anglia Ruskin University. Asked about possible causes for the split in opinion in the road, he replied that several of the key people opposed to the zebra crossing had only started to contribute at the end of the process, after the decision had been made.

Three other residents of Tenison Road, Alistair Morfey, Mark Gearing and Anita Bunyan, spoke. Working as a group with others living close to the crossing, they opposed installation of the zebra crossing.

Mr Morfey, a resident of the road since 1999, expressed the hope that members had been able to read the document the group had drawn up setting out the history of the crossing proposal and their reasons for opposing it; this had been circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. He said that the process had been poor and misleading. A controlled crossing could only be installed where a survey had shown an evidential case, whereas the objectors' informal PV^2 survey had shown no pedestrian-vehicle conflict.

The masterplan document diagrams had been exhibited at King's Church in 2014, showing a ghost roundabout and speed table crossing at Cannon's Green, but no zebra crossing markings, beacons, or tactile paving. When the document was circulated to residents later, it showed a zebra crossing, but the diagram still lacked beacons. Mr Morfey said that the public could not be expected to know that a zebra

crossing would include 24/7 flashing beacons. Just before the new pelican crossing had opened nearby, they had been asked to vote for five of the nine scheme features; it had been impossible to choose the ghost roundabout without the crossing, as they were presented as a single feature (feature 6).

CJAC in March 2015 had approved the five features preferred by residents, but with no recorded discussion of feature 6. As a further example of poor process, the engineering drawings presented at King's Church early in 2016 had shown a speed table at feature 6. When one of the houses near the site had changed hands in 2016, the legal search had not found any mention of a zebra crossing nearby. Only in November 2016 had residents learnt that one was to be installed; had they known about the zebra crossing sooner, they would have complained earlier.

Mr Morfey went on to say that residents had then met with an officer and Councillor Ashley Walsh, their local member. Councillor Walsh had been unhappy with the process and had halted the work. At a subsequent meeting with Andrew Preston and Councillor Walsh, eight points had been agreed, including that any new consultation could only include a zebra crossing if a formal survey, conducted after Chesterton railway station had opened, had demonstrated a need. The group was then informed by email that the matter would be referred to CJAC in March instead. Mr Morfey said that all agreed that the process had been bad, and asked the Committee to agree the installation of a speed table, as shown on the masterplan diagram and engineering drawings.

In answer to a member's question as to why there had been no consensus between Tenison Road residents, Mr Morfey said that he had attended the presentation in July 2014. He had seen the proposal for a raised speed table; he had not been keen on it, but had accepted it, not knowing that it would be a zebra crossing with flashing lights. The scheme as implemented had been a great success, with fewer cars in the road, travelling at slower speeds. There was no need for the zebra crossing, which should not be used as a means of calming traffic.

Mr Gearing said that it was not a good idea to have a zebra crossing at this location. He pointed out that there was a light-controlled crossing nearby, which had not been mentioned at CJAC in March 2015. In general, blind people preferred signalised crossing, and there was a national move away from installing zebra crossings. The Council had provided no justification for siting a crossing at Cannon's Green; the group's own research had shown a level of pedestrian/vehicle conflict 100 times lower than the average required for a crossing to be installed, and the level should be even less once the new Cambridge North station had opened in May 2017.

The build-out to be installed just north of the crossing would force drivers travelling north out of the path pedestrians would expect them to take, which was potentially unsafe. It was generally agreed that the traffic calming scheme in Tenison Road had been a success, but a zebra crossing should not be viewed as a speed reduction measure, and such a crossing would permanently spoil the residential appearance of the road, making it look like an urban highway. Mr Gearing urged the Committee to approve the speed table as shown in the masterplan diagrams and website engineering drawings.

Ms Anita Simms described how the scheme had affected and would affect them personally. She said that the crossing would be immediately in front of her home, but she was speaking for a larger group of residents living on or near the bend and strongly opposed to the zebra crossing. They believed that the light of the Belisha

beacons, flashing day and night, would will cause light pollution. The residents were not reassured by the offer of cowls, though they would help to shield houses directly opposite the crossing. The section of the road where they lived was narrow, and they objected to the obtrusive street furniture which would be installed outside their homes. Additionally, a zebra crossing would force traffic to brake and accelerate, increasing pollution levels.

Ms Simms went on to say that the group had tried to work constructively with officers. Councillor Walsh had confirmed that greater account should be taken of the views of the residents most directly affected. The Residents' Association had no official view, so none of those speaking could claim to represent a local consensus. Given the lack of consensus, the poor process followed, the lack of any objective justification of the crossing, and the existence of a safe pelican crossing nearby, the group of residents asked the Committee to approve the speed table as shown in the masterplan and engineering drawings.

Councillor Manning asked all three speakers whether their position would be different if the process had been followed correctly. Mr Morfey said that if a formal survey were to be done, it would show there was no pedestrian/vehicle conflict. Their informal survey had found that people were walking one side of the road or the other, without crossing the road. Ms Simms said that they would accept the outcome of due process. Councillor Manning then asked officers if there was funding available to conduct a survey. He was advised that there was some section 106 money which could be carried forward to the next financial year, but the Council had no policy whereby a PV^2 survey had to be carried out and show a specific figure; local desire for a crossing was the reason for installing one.

Richard O'Connor, a resident of Tenison Road for over 30 years, addressed the Committee, saying that zebra crossings, traffic lights and signage were a consequence of the volume of traffic in residential streets, and were required to reduce the danger posed to vulnerable road users. He suggested that the term 'zebra crossing' should have been understood as including Belisha beacons, and that not objecting to a consultation proposal did not constitute a response to the consultation. The illustrative drawing had omitted not only the beacons but also such other features as street lighting columns and traffic signage, but that did not mean that they were to be removed. Mr O'Connor said that pedestrians approaching from Lyndewode Road did not use the light-controlled crossing. He therefore requested the Committee to implement the zebra crossing proposal without delay.

Councillor Manning suggested that an amendment to request a PV^2 survey would supply numerical evidence rather than opinion on the need of the crossing; Mr O'Connor said that the consultation had been carried out, and the petition showed that a large number of people had understood what a zebra crossing was.

Officers said that the cowls proposed in response to residents' concerns would shield the light from the beacons, which were not bright and would have little effect in an area which already had street lighting. The value of the crossing to the local community and those passing through had been established in the consultation.

Speaking as the local member, County Councillor Ashley Walsh said that it was regrettable that there had been such difficulties as the description and the illustration of the crossing not matching, and that images had changed during the course of the consultation. As local member, he could pause a scheme approved by the Committee, but any change to a scheme had to be approved by the Committee.

During the three-month pause in implementation of the zebra crossing, no consensus had emerged, so the question had been brought back to Committee; the supporters of the crossing had gathered a petition, and everybody in the road would now know what was meant by a zebra crossing.

In discussion, members of the Committee

- noted that PV² surveys were set and calculated very differently across the country; a survey would not necessarily give a simple result

- commented that there had been a longstanding problem with the speed and volume of traffic in Tenison Road; this particular crossing had been included in the package of measures developed as a consequence of the CB1 scheme. There had been insufficient money to fund all the measures identified, but this had been the most-wanted feature, and while not everybody had followed the process of developing the scheme to the same extent, it had been followed

- expressed some sympathy with residents who did not want Belisha beacons flashing outside their windows, and asked whether there could be any flexibility on the height of the beacons. Officers advised that there was little scope for variation in height. Without any cowl, a Belisha beacon was basically an orange circular dome which did not emit much light in a street-lit area; with a cowl, only the sides facing vehicles were exposed

- regretted flaws in the process such as the unauthorised deletion of some features of the scheme which had subsequently been restored, including trees and the build-out

- commented that Tenison Road was an important route from the station to the town centre and Anglia Ruskin University. It was important to encourage walking and to make walking in the area safer; a zebra crossing provided more safety for pedestrians than a speed table.

Councillor Manning repeated his suggestion of asking for a PV2 survey, but finding no seconder, did not propose a formal motion to amend the recommendation before Committee.

It was resolved by a majority

a) To approve implementation of the zebra crossing as identified in feature option 6 and in accordance with the original scheme approval on 25th March 2015.

The Chairwoman thanked all those who had come to speak, and to hear the debate. Their attendance had been appreciated.

67. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION ASSOCIATED WITH LANSDOWNE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine objections to the installation of No Waiting at Any Time on Lansdowne Road. Members noted that the matter had been considered at the previous meeting, but the objection set out in appendix 4 had been omitted from the committee report in error. The Committee was therefore being asked to review this objection.

Members welcomed the information that the concerns about the location of signing raised by a local resident at the previous meeting had been resolved to the resident's satisfaction.

It was resolved to

a) implement the restriction as advertised
b) inform the objectors accordingly.

Chairwoman