

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 5th March 2019

Time: 4:30pm – 6:15pm

Venue: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: County Councillors: L Jones (Chairwoman), N Kavanagh, I Manning, E Meschini, A Taylor and J Whitehead

City Councillors: K Blencowe (Vice-Chairman), G Bird, V Holt, C Payne, R Robertson and M Sargeant

Apologies: City Councillor M Gehring

44. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from City Councillor M Gehring, who was substituted by City Councillor C Payne.

Councillor A Taylor declared an interest in agenda item 3, Kings Parade Cambridge – Vehicular Access Management, as she was an employee of a business located on the street in question.

45. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27TH NOVEMBER 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 24th July 2018, with the following amendments, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

- i) Removal of “North Area Committee” in the third paragraph on page 5 of the minutes and the addition of “2017 elections” in the same place.
- ii) Removal of “A procedural motion was proposed to the Committee” in the ninth paragraph on page 6 of the minutes and the addition of “It was proposed by a Member” in the same place.
- iii) Removal of “the local Member” in the eleventh paragraph on page 6 of the minutes and the addition of “Cllr Manning” in the same place.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th November 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

The Chairwoman provided the Committee with an update on the steer that was agreed at the Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (CJAC) meeting held on 27th November 2018, regarding the Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) in Ascham and Elizabeth. It was acknowledged that local Councillors had made progress and that the Ascham scheme would be implemented as planned. Once the Elizabeth scheme decided whether or not

it wished to join the Ascham scheme, consultations would be undertaken to see whether the Ascham scheme would be willing to incorporate the Elizabeth area. The Committee was informed that officers were undertaking an interim review of the RPS across Cambridge and Members were thanked for their participation and contributions to the process.

46. KINGS PARADE, CAMBRIDGE – VEHICULAR ACCESS MANAGEMENT

The Committee received a report on the development and implementation of urgent short-term measures to restrict traffic movement on Kings Parade. In presenting the report, the City Council Strategic Director informed Members that the police had been requested to undertake a safety review on the need to install preventative measures, noting that any decisions would be made by the local authorities as opposed to the police service. It was acknowledged that although some concerns had been expressed, the public and businesses were generally in support of the measures and that many of the details were still being finalised in consultation with other people and groups.

It was demonstrated to the Committee that the current controls were insufficient and were of a lower standard to those employed by other large towns and cities across the country. In presenting the proposed scheme, the officer indicated that it included a 1.2 metre opening on one of the pavements to allow bicycles to pass through the barrier in each direction, noting that this was the maximum width recommended by the police. An alternative to placing barriers on the pavements would be to place smaller bollards along the edge of the pavements. It was suggested that some of the 11 disabled parking bays that would be made inaccessible by the barrier might be replaced in the future reshaping of Trumpington Street, while others might need to be considered elsewhere.

The Committee was informed that the Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) was made under sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and that it could stay in force for a maximum of 18 months before being made permanent or removed. Formal objections could be submitted during the first six months after installation and these would be considered by the Committee at the end of the six month period in order to decide whether the order would become permanent. If any changes were made during the first six months, objections would be then be received for a further six months following the new date. Although there was no legal requirement for the Committee to consider the issue at this stage, it had been considered an opportunity for Councillors from both Councils to express their views at an early stage. It was noted that having accepted the need to implement for this summer, as well as the desire to not raise alarm or awareness until there were assurances that a scheme could be introduced, there was now a tight schedule for consultation.

Three members of the public exercised their right to speak at the meeting and the Chairwoman invited them to speak to the Committee in turn.

Ms Bev Nicholson was invited to speak on behalf of Camcycle and she requested the opportunity for the organisation to be consulted prior to any changes being implemented to the current road layout. Despite being in favour of restricting vehicular access, she objected to a shared space for bicycles and pedestrians on the grounds of safety. She suggested that some bicycles would not fit through a 1.2 metre gap and noted that there were dangers of heavy congestion when students were travelling to and from lectures in the nearby colleges. She also informed Members that similar barriers had caused

serious problems when installed in London and that it was undesirable for Cambridge to be faced with the same issues. Ms Nicholson noted that the scheme offered an opportunity to help alleviate the lack of bicycle parking spaces.

Mr Richard Summers was invited to speak to the Committee as the Operations Manager of Great St Mary's Church, situated on Kings Parade. Mr Summers expressed concern over the process in which the ETO was being planned and implemented, suggesting that the Committee was being asked to support something on which they had not been fully informed. He noted that elderly or disabled members of the congregation would no longer be able to attend services in the church. Mr Summers informed Members that hearses would not be able to access the church for funerals and contractors would be unable to carry out works on the building.

Reverend Devin McLachlan, Associate Vicar of Great St Mary's Church was invited to address the Committee and he reiterated concerns over accessibility for the community. Noting that the church received 350,000 visitors per year to its 17 weekly services, he informed Members that many were Blue Badge holders or arrived in taxis, and that unless they had access to wheelchairs or mobility scooters they would no longer be able to attend. Revd McLachlan also suggested that the churches work in the community, including helping homeless people, would be adversely affected. He expressed concern that bicycles would end up travelling at a higher speed, placing the congregation, visitors and other pedestrians in higher danger.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Clarified that the ETO was issued by the highway authority on the request of officers and that the advice issued by the police service was confidential. Some Members queried how they could support something if they did not know where it had come from, who had designed it and how it would function when complete.
- Expressed disappointment that the perceived threat of terrorism was leading to the redesign of one of the city's most beautiful streets. While some Members generally supported restrictions on vehicles, they were disconcerted to be doing so out of fear. Some Members displayed a preference for the less intrusive bollards along the side of the pavement, as opposed to the TATA barges.
- Expressed concern that the barriers might actually prove counterproductive by indicating the area as a suitable target for any attack. It was also noted that barriers were only effective against one particular type of attack.
- Acknowledged that the removal of the disabled parking bays was a serious problem and suggested that disability associations should be consulted on ways to resolve the issue. Members agreed to record that they would not expect there to be any reduction in the number of disabled parking bays, noting that any bays that were removed should be replaced in similar locations. Officers committed to try and ensure that there would be no decrease in the number of parking bays but acknowledged that it may not be possible to relocate them to within the same distance of Great St Mary's Church.
- Considered extending the current access of disabled parking bays from certain Blue Badge Holders to all Blue Badge holders. It was acknowledged that ETOs could override current Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) and officers agreed to consider the proposal.

- Requested a second opening for bicycles in the barrier to avoid having two lanes of bicycles passing through a space of 1.2 metres, noting that the widths did not meet the proposals made by Camcycle. Members also argued that to avoid an increase in collisions between bicycles and pedestrians they should not share the same space. It was suggested that cycling organisations should be consulted further over the proposals and this was agreed by officers, although it was noted that the scheme was limited by the size of the pavements, the road and the barrier.
- Asked for clarification over whether the barriers could be removed or opened on an established schedule on the basis that 24-hour restrictions were not necessary. Officers informed the Committee that such details were still under consideration.
- Expressed concern over the lack of consultation carried out so far on the proposals, suggesting that churches, colleges, businesses, museums, pedestrians, cyclists and disabled people should all be involved in the planning stage. It was further noted that ETOs were partly designed to reduce the consultation burden and that the public would be concerned about this lack of participation.
- Suggested that a form of measuring the scheme's success or failure was a fundamental feature of ETOs and that such oversight was currently lacking from the plans. One Member expressed a desire to hold a continuous role in the process, with one Member proposing that a working group be formed to look at the restrictions and involve affected groups in the planning phase.
- Argued that although Kings Parade was perhaps the most susceptible area to a terrorist attack, there were multiple areas across the city that should have been considered, including Sidney Street, Bridge Street.
- Expressed concern that unlike in many other large towns and cities across the UK and despite Cambridge's draw to tourists, such security measures had yet to be considered and implemented in the city.
- Suggested that a temporary order for the peak visitor season would be preferable to a permanent order, although it was acknowledged that the city received large numbers of visitors all year round.
- Checked whether the Committee would be asked to comment on the objections after 6 months or whether it would be asked to make a decision on changing the ETO to a permanent order. Members were informed by officers that the order had still not been drafted and therefore they could not provide confirmation at this point. It was noted that although the Committee would consider the objections at the end of the consultation period, the consultation itself was not under the remit of the Committee.
- Established that any minor changes would not require a further consultation period after the initial 6-month period for submitting objections and that it would only be significant changes that would require further consultations.
- Enquired on the format of the consultation that would take place and whether it would be the same as with a standard TRO. Officers informed the Committee that the format of the consultation had not been decided but that it would be a full consultation that provided the opportunity for the public to submit any objections.

- On the Chair's advice, agreed to amend recommendation c to clarify that the "formal consultation period" was the "initial 6-month formal consultation period and subsequently as required", to ensure that objections to any changes to the order would also be considered by the Committee.

An amendment (attached to these minutes as **Appendix 1**) was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Taylor. Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

It was agreed to vote on each of the recommendations separately.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the investigation and identification of need to introduce further restrictions on motor vehicular access to Kings Parade in Cambridge

It was resolved by a majority to:

- b) support the introduction of further controls and the use of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (lasting between 6 and 18 months) in order to trial potential suitable arrangements from 2019

It was resolved unanimously to:

- c) Consider at a future meeting the outcome of this trial arrangement, determining any objections lodged during the initial 6-month formal consultation period and subsequently as required, and to decide whether to introduce a permanent scheme.

Chairwoman
4th June 2019

Strike recommendations a, b and c. Replace with:

- a) Note the paper presented today, but defer the decision
- b) Form a working group of CJAC Councillors to discuss the options and benefits for an Experimental Traffic Order further restricting access to the historic centre of Cambridge, with a view to bringing back a more detailed proposal for trials to the next CJAC meeting
- c) The working group should invite participation from other stakeholders, including but not limited to, local members for market ward/division, Camcycle and local businesses
- d) If there is evidence of a security threat to Cambridge, and/or specific locations, that the Councillors who are members of CJAC be party to that evidence on the expectation that it will not be shared publicly.