

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 25th March 2015

Time: 4.30pm – 6.25pm

Present: County Councillors Ashwood (substituting for Cllr Cearns), Kavanagh, Manning, Scutt, Taylor (Chairwoman) and Walsh; City Councillors Blencowe, O'Reilly, Ratcliffe, Robertson, Smart and Tunnacliffe

Apologies: County Councillor Cearns

Also in attendance: City Councillor Bick

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

17. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20th JANUARY 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th January 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

The Chairwoman advised members, as a point of clarification, that, following the refusal of Café Milano's application for a pavement licence (minute 14(A)), it had come to light that there had been no requirement for a pavement licence because the land in question was not public highway but within the café owners' curtilage. Café Milano could therefore legitimately place tables and chairs on this land without the need for a pavement licence.

18. PROPOSED TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SCHEME FOR TENISON ROAD – APPROVAL TO IMPLEMENT

The Committee considered a report setting out proposals for a traffic management scheme for Tenison Road and seeking agreement to proceed with statutory consultation on the scheme. The Chairwoman advised that it had not been possible to accommodate all those members of the public who had asked to speak, but she had used her discretion to allow five speakers rather than the usual three.

Margaret Cranmerspoke, introducing herself as a non-car owning resident of Tenison Road for over 40 years representing pedestrians and cyclists. She said that the County Council had failed to supply information about consultation submissions which she had requested under the Freedom of Information Act. Ms Cranmer described traffic violations she had witnessed, including vehicles cornering over the pavement at the Mill Road end of Tenison Road and the destruction of bollards on Tenison Road. She supported the inclusion of masterplan features 3 and 5, said that a zebra crossing at the Tenison Road/Mill Road junction would provide a cost-effective resolution to the pedestrian crossing, and suggested that installing bollards at that junction would address the tendency of vehicles to overrun the pavement.

Frank Gawthrop, secretary of the South Petersfield Residents Association (SOPRA), addressed the Committee, outlining the history of development in the area since the CB1 scheme had been agreed in 2008, which had led to increased traffic and larger numbers of people working round the railway station. The present

proposals represented only half a scheme; lack of money had seriously diluted critical elements of the scheme. He pointed out that 28 of 144 respondents had asked for one-way system, potentially a very divisive proposal, but not part of the present proposals.

Richard Wood spoke, introducing himself as a nearby resident who used Tenison Road as a cyclist and driver, and crossed the Tenison Road/Mill Road junction as a pedestrian. He expressed support for the scheme as a first step in reducing vehicular traffic in the area. He supported the proposed improvements at masterplan feature 6, and the buildouts at masterplan features 2 and 4 (option A). He did not support option B of feature 4, because it would give drivers a clear sight line, which would give a sense of de facto southbound vehicle priority, whereas the option A buildout would remove this clear sight line. Mr Wood expressed support for the raised table at feature 1 – the equivalent arrangement at the Tenison Road/Station Road junction had enhanced pedestrian priority. He urged caution in considering any proposal for a one-way system; there was evidence of the potential for one-way streets to increase vehicle speeds.

Richard Calverley, a member of the Tenison Road steering group and a resident of the road for 20 years, spoke, saying that, like most Tenison Road residents, he welcomed the scheme. However, despite making requests, he had not been able to view the detailed plans. He described the Tenison Road/Mill Road junction as one of the most dangerous on Mill Road, and asked the Committee to consider the strategic placing of bollards to curtail kerb mounting there, and to install a zebra crossing at the Mill Road end of Tenison Road. Mr Calverley said that Tenison Road was dominated by taxis rat-running at speeds of 30 and 40 miles per hour in what was a 20mph zone; the present scheme features would not be enough to deter taxi drivers; residents were concerned about the design and road materials of scheme. He added that a substantial number of residents supported the use of speed cameras and the introduction of a one-way system, and urged that this be considered in the next phase of the work.

Richard O'Connor, a resident of Tenison Road for 30 years, spoke in support of the current proposals and urged that they be implemented without further delay, pointing out that proposals had first been discussed 28 years ago, when residents had put together a comprehensive scheme for the area bounded by Gonville Road, Mill Road and the railway station. It would be possible to use restrictions on weight and hours to discourage speeding by through traffic and heavy lorries (with exceptions if necessary). Mr O'Connor said that recent developments in the area had made the traffic situation worse and urged that a start be made on the work.

The Chairwoman thanked the speakers and others for their contributions and correspondence.

It was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Ashwood that report recommendation b) be amended as follows [deletions in strikethrough and new text in bold]:

- a) Note the response to the public consultation;
- b) ~~Approve the implementation of features numbered 1,2,4,6 and 9 as shown on the scheme master plan appended to this report;~~ **Approve the advertisement by (experimental) TRO of all features, to be trialled**

using experimental techniques, as per the motion on New York style Highways schemes, passed by the County Council in 2014

- c) Agree to proceed with the statutory consultation.

Councillor Manning explained that the County Council had in the previous year unanimously passed a motion to test features by actually using them live in the road. By testing them in use, it would be possible to establish whether features had been put in the wrong location.

Discussing this proposed amendment, members

- were advised that
 - officers had been working with Councillor Manning on the identification of suitable schemes to trial (for example using cones or barriers), but nothing on the scale of the present scheme had been trialled
 - the present scheme was intended as a place-making scheme, and as such would involve the use of permanent materials, so any trial would incur considerable cost even as an experimental scheme
 - it would be possible to trial features 2 and 4, which would involve using cones to restrict width, but other features required a raised carriageway and a change in the visual appearance of the carriageway
- commented that, in the light of this information, trialling parts of the scheme would not work when the aim was to make the whole street look different
- pointed out that, following the grant of planning permission in 2008, most of the building work round the railway station had already been completed, and said that it was inappropriate to suggest that an experimental approach could be applied at this late stage
- drew attention to the amount of work and consultation already done to develop the scheme, and the level of local support for implementing the current proposals
- suggested that there would be opportunities in future to improve and enhance the scheme.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was rejected.

The Committee then discussed the substantive proposal. In the course of discussion, members

- expressed support for the scheme, describing it as essential to try and deal with through traffic on Tenison Road, and to change the atmosphere on the street and make people realise the importance of observing the 20mph speed limit
- suggested that the effect of the proposed changes to the Tenison Road/Mill Road junction be observed before considering the installation of a zebra crossing there. Officers advised that it would be a difficult location for a zebra crossing because vehicles would be turning into it blind from Mill Road
- expressed surprise at the lack of bollards either side of the Tenison Road/Mill Road junction. Officers undertook to examine this possibility, but advised that

bollards could create difficulties for larger vehicles (which were not allowed to turn right into Devonshire Road) turning into Tenison Road from Mill Road

- enquired how an accountable decision would be made on whether to implement option A or option B of masterplan feature 4. Officers advised that the Committee could express a preference between A and B, both of which were intended to break up the appearance of the street. There would be no further consultation on the design of the scheme coming to the Committee before any Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was brought for determination
- commented that drivers would probably become used to any change in appearance of the road very quickly
- commented that most drivers slowed for the speed hump near the Carter Bridge (feature 8), which made it a useful safety feature for cyclists; members noted that there was no current proposal to undertake works in the Carter Bridge area
- noted that possible difficulties associated with the introduction of a one-way system included the impact on the local road network and an increase in traffic speeds, because of there would no longer be any risk from oncoming traffic, but commented that speed in one-way streets depended on a variety of factors, including for example the presence of road humps
- noted that a wider East area access review was being undertaken, which would include the South Petersfield area.

The Committee considered which it preferred of the options for masterplan feature 4 (Tenison Road outside King's Church). On a show of hands, there was unanimous support for option A, carriageway build out.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) Note the response to the public consultation;
- b) Approve the implementation of features numbered 1,2,4,6 and 9 as shown on the scheme master plan appended to this report;
- c) Agree to proceed with the statutory consultation.

19. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH:

(A) THE VIE ESTATE

The Committee received a report on objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) associated with a proposed prohibition of parking on the whole estate, with the exception of some limited waiting bays and a car club bay in the central area of the estate. Members noted that the estate had been established as a Home Zone, where the intention was that cars took second place to pedestrians, but the lack of parking restrictions was leading to difficulties.

James Carruthers spoke as a local resident, urging the Committee to reject the TRO because of the lack of alternative parking provision for residents on the estate. Allowing only one parking bay per household would create difficulties for those who necessarily had two cars, and for any visitors. Implementing the TRO in its current

form would create problems for nearby streets and would make a visitor permit scheme necessary. Mr Carruthers said that the objectors had raised a number of stronger and more varied arguments than the supporters of the scheme; there had been no analysis of claims quoted for greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Access difficulties for emergency vehicles were created by tight corners on the estate, not by parked cars. He suggested that the TRO would not help to fulfil the aims of a Home Zone, as traffic speeds were higher in clear areas.

Councillor Manning declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a resident of the Vie estate and a non-remunerated director of the estate management company. He would therefore speak and answer questions as Local Member, but would not remain in the meeting whilst the matter was being debated or participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

Speaking as Local Member, Councillor Manning recalled that when the whole estate had first been occupied in around 2010/11, the roads had not been adopted, and the management company had had to bring in a private clamping firm, which had been largely supported by residents. Then the roads were adopted and the use of private clamping became illegal; since then, the parking problem on the estate had got worse. Councillor Manning expressed sympathy with Mr Carruthers' position; estate agents misled potential residents by telling them that cars could be parked anywhere on the estate when they could not. The TRO supported the concept of a shared space where pedestrians and cyclists could feel safe. Councillor Manning said that he would try again to instigate parking space sharing schemes on the estate.

Councillor Manning left the room for the remainder of this item.

In the course of discussion, members

- pointed out that there had been parking restrictions in place before the estate's roads were adopted, and the TRO represented a return to the pre-adoption position
- recalled that there had been support across the city for similar Home Zone developments, and that measures such as placing all parking underground had been taken elsewhere
- commented that the present proposals represented a compromise, and would result in parking being displaced from the estate to other roads nearby
- suggested that more consideration should have been given to developing a residents' parking scheme, but commented that a scheme was of little help when there were more residents' cars than spaces available
- noted that any change to the proposals in the TRO such as increasing the number of visitor spaces above four would require the TRO to be re-advertised; as far as officers were aware, work to arrive at the appropriate number of such spaces had already been undertaken
- commented that plans for recent new developments, such as Northstowe and Trumpington Meadow, had allowed for fewer than two spaces per household, e.g. 1.5 spaces for 3-4 bedroom house, and limited visitor parking.

The Committee resolved, one member abstaining, to:

- a) Approve and make the order as advertised;
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Councillor Manning rejoined the meeting.

(B) ADAM & EVE STREET

The Committee received a report on objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) associated with Adam & Eve Street. Members noted that the existing Prohibition of Driving Order restricting motor vehicle access to Burleigh Street via Adam and Eve Street was being increasingly flouted; it was therefore proposed to install a lockable bollard to restrict access to businesses and premises requiring access for loading and unloading.

Colin Rosenstiel, speaking as a resident of Grafton Street until August 2013, and as a former City Councillor who had been involved in initiating the present scheme, urged acceptance of the TRO. He recalled that this was a long-standing area of concern over more than 30 years; when Burleigh Street had been pedestrianised in 1983, it had reluctantly been accepted that the stretch between Adam & Eve Street and East Road could not be fully closed because of the range of shops on the south side with no other access for deliveries. As part of work on the current scheme, he had called on all the affected businesses about two or three years ago; they were all satisfied that a key to a lockable bollard would enable their access needs to be met. All the other businesses confirmed that they did not need servicing by vehicles larger than those that could use Burleigh Place.

Local Member City Councillor Bick spoke; he was present at the request of Local Member Councillor Cearns to commend the scheme. They were convinced that what was proposed offered the best compromise for a difficult stretch of roadway, where the prohibition of traffic had proved insufficient to stop inappropriate use and the proposed measure would be self-policing. Councillor Bick reported that many of the businesses approached would like Burleigh Street to be for pedestrians and cyclists only; vehicle movements were a source of danger to the large numbers of cyclists and pedestrians in the area. The proposal represented a fair, balanced and cheap solution to a long-standing difficulty.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Ratcliffe expressed support for Councillor Bick's remarks. He added that taxis often waited in Adam & Eve Street, and that there was a danger of vehicles colliding with a cyclist entering the road because of the blind corner.

Other members supported the proposed TRO as helping to reinforce the message to drivers that rat running would not be tolerated; it was dangerous to pedestrians, cyclists and other motorists.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve and make the order as advertised
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Chairman/woman