

MEETING OF HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 14th March 2017

Time: 10:00am- 12.40pm

Present: Councillors Ashwood, Butcher, Chapman, Connor, Criswell, Gillick, Hickford (substituting for Councillor McGuire), Hipkin (substituting for Councillor Chapman), Hunt, Reeve (Acting Chairman), Rouse, Scutt and Williams

In attendance: Councillors Dupre, Kavanagh and Nethsingha

Apologies: Councillors Chapman (Councillor Hipkin substituting) and McGuire (Councillor Hickford substituting)

245. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

246. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st February 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Action Log was noted.

247. PETITIONS

There were no petitions not covered by items on the agenda.

248. RESIDENT PARKING POLICY

The Committee received a report about the proposed Residents' Parking Policy and the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan.

In relation to the item, the Committee received a petition of over 1,100 signatures, suggesting changes that could be made to the proposed parking policy in Cambridge.

Mr Leigh presented the petition. His presentation covered the following points:

- he referred to Oxford, a city which has many similar issues to Cambridge, and measures included in Oxfordshire County Council's parking policy, which states "*The management of parking is one of the most effective means of tackling congestion and its worst effects, such as air pollution, delay and unreliability of journeys. However, the ease with which visitors and shoppers*

can gain access to a place by car can influence its overall attractiveness and success. A balance therefore has to be struck between managing parking for transport purposes, offering attractive and viable alternatives”;

- the Mott McDonald Survey commissioned by the City Deal identified that 8.5% of all morning traffic comprised commuter parking in residential streets, although that Survey did not include all streets – the real figure was probably more like 10%. Eliminating that inward traffic would generate the ‘half term effect’;
- the proposed policy stated that *“a scheme will be considered only where ... there is insufficient space to accommodate residents’ and non-residents’ needs simultaneously”* Mr Leigh had tabled paperwork, setting out seven recommendations that he believed would go some way to address this objective. He stressed that consultation with residents was essential before a scheme was imposed.

Members asked the following questions:

- queried how the distinction was made in the Survey quoted between residents’ and non-residents’ vehicles parking in residential streets. Mr Leigh advised that Mott McDonald used number plate surveys, and assumed that cars parked at 5am were residents, whilst those parked later in the day were non-residents;
- asked why it was assumed that all non-residents were commuters. Mr Leigh acknowledged that cars driving in to the city at peak times and parking in residential streets could be travelling in to the city for other purposes e.g. medical appointments or shopping, but the key point was that those vehicles still contributed to peak time traffic;
- noting Mr Leigh’s recommendation to engage with “local residents, businesses and other stakeholders”, asked if this included the residents of outlying villages, who had to commute to Cambridge to undertake essential jobs, but were poorly served by public transport. Mr Leigh commented that they would not be included as ‘stakeholders’, but as part of a joined-up strategy, other options needed to be provided for those commuters;
- asked if the petitioners had submitted their recommendation to the Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (CJAC) which had developed the Parking Policy through a Member Working Group. Mr Leigh confirmed that a detailed paper, including many of the Smarter Cambridge Transport recommendations had been submitted to CJAC, but the Parking Policy had been endorsed by that Committee, largely unamended;
- a Member pointed out that there were many roads in Cambridge where there was sufficient off-road parking for residents e.g. Storeys Way. Mr Leigh acknowledged this, but pointed out that there were similarly other roads, e.g. Rustat Road, where residents had their own parking on their properties, but parking on road by commuters caused congestion. Whilst there were

questions on funding, from a strategic point of view, Mr Leigh suggested that those sort of streets should be included in Residents' Parking Schemes;

- noting the recommendation for limited-wait bays (1-3 hours), pointed out that the proposed Parking Policy already included this flexibility in para 10.18: *"Times of operation for individual Residents' Parking Schemes will be designed to reflect local parking needs and road use; local consultation will help to inform this decision"*. It was also noted that any change to the standard operating period would not reduce costs. There was a discussion on whether it was fair that the permits for parking restrictions for shorter periods should cost the same as those for the standard period;
- a Member asked what the take-up rate was of Residents' parking schemes in Oxford, and whether enough permits were purchased to make the schemes financially viable. Mr Leigh confirmed that the Residents' parking schemes were very popular in Oxford.

A Member of the public, Lynne Hieatt, spoke on this item, and raised the following points in relation to the proposed parking policy:

- highlighted the congestion, pollution, inconvenience and safety implications for Cambridge of traffic congestion;
- welcomed the work undertaken by officers and Councillors to develop a proposed policy, but suggested that it was too restrictive. However, she suggested that with a number of minor amendments, it could work well;
- supported parking restrictions for shorter periods (i.e. a few hours per day), as proposed by the petitioners;
- supported limited waiting e.g. to not discourage those using shops and businesses for limited periods of time;
- suggested that although the proposed Policy's approach appeared to be democratic, the criterion that a majority (over 50%) of households responding to the survey support the introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme was not, as it depended on 50% of *respondents* supporting a Residents' Parking Scheme. She suggested that the most democratic approach would be to involve local people in pre-consultation workshops prior to discussions with Councillors, and that trials should be undertaken before making schemes permanent: residents needed to see what a scheme looked like on the ground before committing to changes that were too complicated or theoretical for them to imagine in advance.

In response to Member questions, Ms Hieatt:

- confirmed that Residents' Associations and other stakeholders had been invited by CJAC to contribute to the process of developing the policy at an early stage, and some of those proposals were included in the draft policy presented;

- a Member observed that roads were for the use of all, not just residents. Ms Hieatt agreed that roads were a resource to be shared by everyone, and the desired approach should be about using this shared resource in the most intelligent way. If there was free parking for two hours, this would enable carers, cleaners, and trades people to visit;
- a Member commented that many of the points raised by both Ms Hieatt and Mr Leigh were permissible under the flexible nature of the Policy as proposed e.g. the potential for variation in hours of operation, and the scope for extensive consultation.

Officers presented the report. It was highlighted that the Residents' Parking Policy (Appendix A to the report) and the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan (Appendix B to the report) were two separate documents, and the former could be approved without the latter being approved. However, it was noted that the City Deal Executive Board had been consulted and given its in principle support to the Delivery Plan, and had committed to making funding available to cover the implementation costs associated with the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan. The Committee was reminded that the Policy had been developed by officers in conjunction with CJAC and a Member Working Group, and any significant changes would need to be discussed with CJAC.

A3 colour copies of the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes map were tabled: this was included in the published papers at Appendix 1 to Appendix B.

Members debated the report:

- a Member suggested that communities should be allowed to make decisions within a specified framework, but it was important that there was flexibility and transparency for neighbourhoods to accept the outcome. However, the policy as presented did have that flexibility, e.g. in terms of hours of operation, and Residents' Parking Schemes could be adapted to local parking needs, as they emerged from consultations with residents. Officers agreed, stressing that the required flexibility was already in the policy, and it was for each area to determine what works best for their individual circumstances;
- a Member commented that he had concerns about the Extension Delivery Plan, especially given that the Park & Ride sites did not have sufficient capacity to accommodate displaced commuters, and could not adequately serve everyone's needs. There were also issues around displacement outside the zones covered by the policy. Whilst other mitigation had been mentioned, no detail was given on the nature of this mitigation, and it was vital that the mitigation needed to be in place prior to the Delivery Plan being implemented. He asked what the City Deal Board had specified regarding mitigation measures. Officers advised that the issue of mitigation had been raised by the City Deal Assembly, and picked up by the City Deal Board when it considered funding at its recent meeting. At that meeting, the City Deal Board had asked for a short piece of work to be commissioned, investigating how various pieces of parking policy around the city could be joined up. However, there was no intention that that piece of work should slow up the whole process. Currently, Park & Rides sites were achieving

an occupancy rate of 55-60% of capacity, so there were still several thousand spaces available, in addition to local bus services;

- a Member asked about displacement, noting the officers' comments that further Park & Ride capacity was planned through the City Deal. It was confirmed that there was currently insufficient Park & Ride capacity to accommodate all of the commuter parking displaced if Residents' Parking Schemes were introduced across the city, but there were other options e.g. local bus services, cycling and walking. It was also noted that all of the new zones would not be introduced at the same time and there was no guarantee that all of the 26 proposed new zones would vote in favour of introduction;
- Members noted that the key issues that would be scoped by the City Deal's consultants were (i) how many drivers would actually be displaced – depending on the nature of the restrictions introduced, this could be less than the headline numbers cited, (ii) how far the controlled parking zones would meet the City Deal's objectives and (iii) how the various elements of parking enforcement and mitigation would be joined up. Whilst figures of 6,000-8,000 commuters being displaced had been quoted, that was on the basis of all parking zones being introduced at the same time. In practice, Residents' Parking Schemes would be introduced in phases;
- a Member commented that identifying the number of drivers displaced should have been done first, then the mitigation measures identified and introduced, prior to rolling out the Residents' Parking Schemes. He also suggested that the principle of staged roll-out of Residents' Parking Schemes was flawed, because if a Scheme was introduced in one zone, the adjacent zones would introduce Schemes, because otherwise commuter parking would be displaced in to those zones. Schemes needed to be introduced citywide simultaneously to avoid conflict and displacement. Officers responded that it would take time to introduce Residents' Parking Schemes, and the City Deal intended to increase Park & Ride capacity by several thousand spaces, including new sites;
- a Member (i) suggested using the term "Neighbourhood Parking" rather than "Residents Parking", as the former was broader and less proprietorial, (ii) queried the approach for very narrow streets: officers confirmed that this would be discussed as part of any consultation, (iii) stressed that the policy had to include provision for Pay & Display bays in some locations to support local shops and businesses, (iv) suggested there should be capacity to review and amend Schemes in the early stage – it was confirmed that the proposed Policy included the capacity to amend schemes at any time, (v) observed that Zones 22 and 23 were around the new railway station: any schemes in those zones would inevitably cause displacement by commuters using the railway station to adjacent areas which were not included within the boundary. Officers responded that the map was indicative, and could be amended, (vi) suggested that there needed to be more clarity on timescales, especially for the mitigation measures such as increasing Park & Ride capacity;

- noting the suggestion by another Member to introduce a city wide scheme, a Member commented that the urgency of parking issues was not uniform, although in some areas it was critical;
- a Member asked if it was reasonable that 50% of respondents had to support the scheme, and whether it was reasonable that those unaffected by proposals should be included. Officers advised that the system of voting had been debated at great length, and the outcome of those discussions was as set out in the proposed Policy;
- a Member queried the imposition of a flat rate charge to residents, regardless of whether there was short period or all day enforcement. Officers advised that the costs of enforcing the scheme was the same to the authority, irrespective of the number of hours of parking enforcement i.e. management and enforcement costs. The costs and price of permits would be regularly reviewed and would reflect the cost of running schemes. The Member commented that it was regrettable that this approach was being taken, as the short period parking restrictions helped shoppers and visitors, whilst discouraging all day commuter parking, and there should therefore be an incentive for choosing that option;
- a Member asked if a tiered pricing policy was possible, depending on the number of vehicles using the street, or reflecting those households with more than one vehicle, and the size and weight of vehicles. Officers confirmed that a tiered approach was considered but ruled out in the development of the policy;
- a Member observed that the indicative boundary would inevitably lead to displacement to areas just outside the boundary, and asked if there would be any consultation with those residents just outside the boundaries when a Residents' Parking Scheme was being developed. Officers confirmed that there was no reason why those living just outside the boundaries could not be involved, and when a scheme reached the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) stage, anyone could respond;
- a Member thanked all officers involved in assisting CJAC and the Working Party, for their help in developing the policy, particularly Nicola Gardner and Sonia Hansen, and also to the residents who had taken part in the consultation: the three sessions which residents had attended had been extremely helpful. Many of the ideas had from the consultation had been incorporated into the policy. The Member suggested that the City Deal Board be asked to extend its funding to the whole of Cambridge, and officers suggested that this could be taken back to the City Deal Board;
- a Member acknowledged the issues around displacement and introducing Parking Schemes at the same time, but commented that a gradual approach was necessary to accommodate the needs of differing communities;
- some Members observed that many Cambridgeshire residents who worked in Cambridge could not afford to live in the city, especially those doing less well paid but essential jobs. They felt that not involving those individuals was unfair, given that it was the public highway that was under discussion. Displacement would

cause bigger problems and consultation with everyone affected needed to be carried out. Another Member supported these comments;

- a Member commented that in her City division, many residents were facing numerous problems from on street parking, and officers had worked closely with residents to design bespoke parking schemes that residents were happy with;
- a Member commented that whilst the question on who 'owned' Cambridge was controversial, it was dangerous to say that Cambridge residents should not have more say than other Cambridgeshire residents about what happens in their neighbourhoods;
- a Member commented that no-one opposed Resident Parking zones, as long as they were done properly, but the timing was not right as the mitigation measures outlined were insufficient and it was clear that the mitigation measures would not be in place in time.

Members noted that if approval was given for the Delivery Plan, the statutory processes for the first Residents' Parking Schemes would take about six months, and a lot of informal work had already been carried out for some schemes.

In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that if the Committee voted against the Extension Plan but supported the Countywide parking policy, Cambridge would still be covered by that overall parking policy, but the City Deal funding for the Delivery Plan in Cambridge would be at risk. Officers confirmed that there was a specific request to update the Cambridge policy as it had proved very difficult to introduce Residents' Parking Schemes in the city: the current policy makes it very difficult to achieve satisfactory Residents' Parking Schemes. The City Deal funding was dependent on the Delivery Plan being fast-tracked. The Delivery Plan would move forward in several tranches, so that substantial areas of the city could benefit from parking zones relatively quickly. The City Deal Board had agreed to fund the consultation and implementation of zones, and would pay the £60-80 implementation charge which residents normally had to pay for themselves.

Councillor Hickford proposed an amendment to recommendation (b), seconded by Councillor Connor:

(b) defer consideration of the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan (included as Appendix B to the report) until after the Cambridge City Deal Board has considered the work it has commissioned on joining up parking policy options.

In terms of timescales, it was noted that the work commissioned would be considered at the City Deal Board meeting in June or July at the earliest. In terms of mitigation measures such as new Park & Ride sites, these would come forward in 2-3 years' time, but officers stressed that significant capacity and other alternatives were already available and was unlikely to be an issue.

Councillor Scutt proposed an amendment:

That this committee approves Recommendation (b) as set out in the report, subject to confirmation by the Cambridge City Deal Board that (i) provision would be made

available for alternative parking for commuters in the instance of implementation to such a capacity to cover zones 1-6 to be implemented; (ii) implementation and mitigation measures such as additional Park & Ride capacity consistent with the implementation of other parking zone measures are in place.

There was no seconder for Councillor Scutt's amendment, so Councillor Scutt withdrew her amendment. On being put to the vote, the majority of Members supported Councillor Hickford's amendment (Councillor Scutt asked for her abstention to that amendment be recorded).

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

- a) approve the Residents' Parking Policy (attached to the report at Appendix A);
- b) defer consideration of the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan (included as Appendix B to the report) until after the Cambridge City Deal Board has considered the work it has commissioned on joining up parking policy options;
- c) delegate to the Executive Director – Economy Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, to make minor amendments to the Residents' Parking Policy, prior to final implementation.

249. LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT (LHI) SCHEME 2017-18

The Committee considered a report on the outcome of the prioritisation of 2017-18 Local Highway Improvement (LHI) applications by the Member Panels in each District area.

In relation to the item, the Committee received a petition of approximately 200 signatures, regarding an unsuccessful LHI application for a street light to be reinstated in Derby Road, Cambridge.

Mrs Jane Singleton presented her petition. She explained why it was essential the light was reinstated. The shop was a lifeline that was much loved and supported by the community. The street light opposite the store was removed, as it was deemed unnecessary, but this had resulted in increased risks for the shop owners, shoppers and residents, owing to the quality of the pavement and security issues connected with the shop, etc. As the street was narrow, the light from the next two nearest lights did not reach the store, and since the light had been removed, there had been at least one serious accident. There had also been two armed raids on the store, and staff were frightened when opening and closing-up. The restoration of the light was supported by all four local Residents' Associations. The LHI application had only just failed, and it had been suggested that some of the other successful schemes could be financed by other means.

Officers clarified that the LHI schemes were scored by panels of Members from the relevant City/District, and those members scored schemes based on the presentation of case by applications. It was confirmed that there was no precedent

for the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee to overturn the scorings or rankings of those panels.

A number of Members commented that they had similar experiences of the street light programme, and the background to the removal of this particular streetlight was noted. It was confirmed that if the LHI bid had been successful, the match-funding would have been from Cambridge City Council. It was clarified that there was no complaint regarding the process that had been undertaken in terms of the Scoring Panel. It was also noted that the light could be reinstated through a third party funded scheme, and also that the LHI bid could be repeated.

Presenting the report, officers explained that if successful schemes came in under cost, or were found not to be viable, those schemes listed next on the list would then be developed, based on their score. In previous years, the cost of officer time had not been attributed to the programme, so the LHI programme had effectively been subsidised by the rest of the capital programme. This year the proposal was to include £100K to cover officer costs. Members noted that the LHI scheme would be reviewed, and brought back to the Committee before it was implemented. The appendix showed the prioritised list of schemes with a line showing ones currently forwarded. If schemes came in at less cost then schemes 'below the line' can come forward.

In response to a Member question, officers confirmed that the figures quoted in bids for street lights were different as they were the figures suggested by the applicant: realisation of the schemes would not necessarily be achieved within the budgets quoted.

Councillor Scutt commented that since the applications had been submitted, there had been an accident on the junction of Carlyle Road/Chesterton Road (unsuccessful application no. 2324399), which should be taken into account. Officers advised that the scoring was based on the situation at the time of scoring the applications. Councillor Scutt asked for her concerns to be recorded in the minutes.

In terms of points to be considered when the LHI scheme was reviewed, Members raised the following points; (i) applicants had been asked not to be specific when presenting schemes, but then had been given a low mark for not being specific (ii) safety should be given a much higher priority in the scoring process.

A Member observed that outside Cambridge, Parishes could raise precepts, so they had freedom to contribute significantly. This point was noted, but other Members commented that the City Council does contribute, and it was within the gift of the City Council to parish if it wanted to.

A Member commented favourably on the LHI scheme as a whole, but expressed concern over the apparently arbitrary £100K allocated to cover resources and officer time, suggesting that a more accurate assessment of costs should be made.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) approve the prioritised list of schemes for each District area, included in appendix A of this report;

- b) approve the allocation of £100k from the £607k total approved LHI budget to partially recover the cost of resources required to deliver the programme.

250. COMMUNITY RESILIENCE UPDATE: LIBRARY SERVICE TRANSFORMATION AND COMMUNITY HUBS

The Committee considered an information report on the development of libraries as Community Hubs. A similar report was going to General Purposes Committee on 21/03/17 with an update on the community resilience programme.

Members were reminded that the Committee had previously agreed a library service strategy, which included maximising the use of assets, and the potential to share buildings between services and public sector organisations, and the concept of the Community Hub. The vision for developing Community Hubs was then integrated into the Council's Community Strategy *Stronger Together*, published in October 2015. The approach was also in line with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport's *Ambition for Libraries* strategy. Officers intended to resume partner engagement in May 2017 so that the potential appetite to share buildings and services could be more fully discussed at local level with members, Parishes, community groups and user groups.

A Member spoke positively on the whole concept of extending the services which libraries provide. He suggested that public transport information should be available at Hubs, including the option of buying bus tickets. Officers advised that bus information was already available at many libraries e.g. timetables on screens at Cambridge Central Library, and there was also a parking desk at the Central Library. The issue of ticket sales would be investigated. **Action required.**

Another Member welcomed the decentralisation aspects and moving the Council in to communities. He was pleased that the report also mentioned the value of libraries to the county's communities.

It was resolved to:

- a. note the report and the work done to date and timescales for future engagement and public consultation.

251. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Committee received a report setting out financial and performance information for Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) as at the end of January 2017. Officers advised an underspend was predicted on the revenue side of £244K. The only material change in forecast since the previous report related to street lighting, which was now projecting an underspend of £229K overall, of which £327K was due to one-off income received as contract penalties. This would be used to contribute towards the hedge break costs to implement the synergy savings and the residual requirement would be funded by the Transformation Fund.

Some Members queried when the decision on how to utilise the underspend had been made, suggesting that Members may have been minded to use it for an alternative purpose e.g. street lighting. Officers advised that this was a one-off benefit that would not be achieved again, and explained how the hedge costs were a financial mechanism, and the change was outside the control of the Council.

A Member observed that the number of item loans from libraries had reduced, and notably there had also been a reduction for the first time in children's loans: she suggested that this was mainly attributable to the reduction in the book fund, and cautioned that this could be a self-perpetuating cycle. Officers commented there was also correlation between loans and opening hours, which had been reduced at some libraries.

A Member commented that he was saddened to see the increase in road accident deaths. He thanked officers for their welcome work on the Branch Bank scheme.

With regard to waste volumes, it was noted that these had increased in line with national trends. Officers advised this was probably due to the close correlation between increased economic activity and increased waste.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- 1) review, note and comment on the report.

252. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Members reviewed the Agenda Plan. It was noted that the deferred item on the Cambridge Residents' Parking Schemes Extension Delivery Plan would probably be scheduled for the July meeting of the Committee.

The Chairman noted that it was very likely to be the last meeting of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee before the May elections. He thanked Committee Members, and also officers for their excellent expertise and support to the Committee.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the Agenda Plan, including the updates provided orally at the meeting.

Chairman