

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 14th July 2015

Time: 4.30pm –5.55pm

Present: County Councillors Cearns, Kavanagh, Scutt, Taylor and Walsh; City Councillors Blencowe, Ratcliffe, Robertson, C Smart, Smith and Tunnacliffe

Apologies: County Councillor Manning

20. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015-16

It was resolved to elect City Councillor Blencowe Chairman of the Committee for the municipal year 2015-16.

21. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015-16

It was resolved to elect County Councillor Scutt Vice-Chairwoman of the Committee for the municipal year 2015-16.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

23. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25th MARCH 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th March 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Councillor Catherine Smart pointed out that there was also a Cambridge City Councillor Martin Smart, and asked that her initial be used in future to avoid any confusion with the other Councillor Smart.

24. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH:

(A) Godwin Way, Cambridge

The Committee received a report on objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) associated with a proposed double yellow line parking restriction opposite the junction of Godwin Way and Godwin Close. Members noted that the problem was one of inconsiderate parking round junctions.

A local resident spoke, objecting to the proposed new double yellow lines on Godwin Way and explaining the difficulties that the current arrangements caused, which resulted in her frequently contacting the Police about inconsiderately parked cars restricting access to her driveway. It would help her if a white H line could be painted across the driveway entrance. The Committee viewed online images of the junction.

The resident's daughter spoke, also objecting to the proposal. Because of the parked cars, her mother had to help her cross the road to get to school; she had completed her cycling proficiency training but was unable to use her bike because cars were in the way. More people would park outside their house if more yellow lines were added; as it was, they could not see out of their driveway.

Speaking as local member, Councillor Taylor clarified that she did not fully support the proposal as it stood; she would have liked to see yellow lines on both sides. An H marking was not as efficacious as yellow lines, and involved the resident paying for the marking; it was not reasonable to expect residents to pay to cure the problem.

In the course of discussion, members

- noted that the provision of an access protection marking (H marking) had been discussed with the resident; this would be at a reduced cost if it was painted at the same time as other road marking. Such a marking was not subject to a TRO but was there to highlight the fact that parking across a dropped kerb constituted obstruction. Enforcement of access protection markings was a matter for the Police, because it was obstruction, whereas double yellow lines were enforced by local authority parking officers, not the Police
- suggested that the additional yellow lines were unnecessary because the Highway Code already advised that motorists should not park on junctions
- suggested that the proposed double yellow lines should be supported, with the addition of access protection marking across dropped kerbs where requested
- noted that any resident could request a access protection marking, but this would only be at reduced cost if completed when other adjacent road painting was being undertaken at the same time; supplying the marking at reduced cost would be possible in this case if the work was done with the yellow lining.

It was resolved unanimously to:

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

(B) William Smith Close, Cambridge

The Committee received a report on objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) associated with William Smith Close. Members noted that the majority of residents of William Smith Close had access to off-street parking.

Mr Ian Rudy spoke as a resident of William Smith Close. He explained that there were two areas of difficulty about the proposals, the junction with Rustat Road and a bend further down William Smith Close. The bend outside number 14 could benefit from double yellow lines, though none were proposed. His greater concern was the length of the lines proposed for the north side of the road at the junction with Rustat Road. Residents were confident that the junction was not the source of current problems, a view confirmed by talking to the refuse collectors, and they did not expect displacement parking because most houses in William Smith Close had dropped kerbs, and commuters did not currently park there.

Mr Rudy asked that, if there were to be double yellow lines at the entrance to William Smith Close, those on the north side be limited to 10m, corresponding to the Highway Code's prohibition of parking within 10m of a junction. Reducing the length would help him and other residents.

Speaking as a local member, City Councillor C Smart explained that the previous County local member (Councillor Kilian Bourke) had taken up the question of parking in William Smith Close because there was an intermittent problem of fly parking in the Close, and if this coincided with bin collection, it could cause difficulties, either on the junction with Rustat Road or within the Close itself. She herself had received several emails about the matter, and supported the proposal to restrict parking.

City Councillor Smith, also a local member, expressed support for shortening the lines at the junction with Rustat Road to 10m unless officers were aware of a specific reason for the longer length. This was not the area of the Close with the greatest parking problems.

Discussing the proposal, members

- queried the reason for restricting parking on the hammerhead at the end of the Close. Officers advised that the hammerhead was intended for turning vehicles; the proposals had been designed in consultation with the City Council's refuse teams, who had said that any vehicle parked in the hammerhead presented a problem for large vehicles wishing to turn and also made it difficult to access the bin stores for emptying
- noted that it would be possible to reduce the length of the parking restriction at the junction with Rustat Road without a further TRO process; the 12m length ended at a lamp column and just before a dropped kerb
- suggested that it would make more sense to have the same length of yellow lines on both sides of the junction with Rustat Road rather than reduce the length only on the north side.

It was proposed by Councillor Smith and seconded by Councillor Robertson that the length of the proposed double yellow lines at the junction with Rustat Road be reduced from 12m to 10m at the William Smith Close end of the lines on both sides of William Smith Close. On being put to the vote, this amendment to the advertised scheme was agreed by a majority.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve and make the order as advertised, subject to reducing the length of the double yellow lines at the junction with Rustat Road from 12 metres to 10 metres at the William Smith Close end of the lines on both sides of William Smith Close
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

25. LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

The Committee received a report on the outcome of the member review of the Local Highway Improvement Scheme (LHIS), noting that the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee had received a report with the background to the review and subsequent recommendations at its meeting on 7th July 2015. The Joint Area Committee was being invited to create a six-member panel to prioritise LHIS applications in the Cambridge City area, in order to be consistent with the rest of county and to improve the efficiency of the prioritisation process.

Members noted that creating a panel would remove the need for the whole Joint Area Committee to consider individual LHS applications. The City Council had a minor highway works budget that provided matched funding; the sequence would be that

- each area committee would prioritise applications, which would be presented by City officers
- the selected applications would then be appraised by County officers and presented to the proposed LHI member panel to score the four LHI category areas
- the Joint Area Committee would then determine the City Council third party funding contributions for each of the schemes prioritised by the LHI member panel.

Discussing these arrangements, members expressed some concern that being restricted to selecting a maximum of eight applications from each City Council Area Committee area removed the previous link between number of applications and number of wards; different area committees covered different numbers of wards. Members observed that the City Council set up the area committees, but the County Council established the Local Highway Improvement Scheme.

Considering the recommendation to form a panel, members agreed that this was desirable and that it should be made up of equal numbers of City members and County members. A County member said that it would be desirable for County members of area committees to have speaking and voting rights when the area committees were considering the prioritisation of LHS applications. The Chairman undertook to raise this point at the Area Chairs' meeting.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) to agree to the creation of a six-member panel to prioritise LHS applications in the city area
- b) that County Councillors Kavanagh, Taylor and Walsh and City Councillors Blencowe, C Smart and A Smith serve on the panel, with County Councillors Cearns and Scutt as substitutes, and City Councillors Ratcliffe and Tunnacliffe as alternates.

Chairman