

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 24th July 2018

Time: 4.30pm – 6:45pm

Place: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: County Councillors Jones, Kavanagh, Manning, A Taylor and Whitehead
City Councillors Bird, Blencowe, Gehring, Holt, Robertson and Sargeant

Apologies: County Councillor Meschini

28. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/19

It was proposed by Councillor Whitehead and seconded by Councillor Sargeant that Cllr Jones be elected Chairwoman for the municipal year 2018/19. Councillor Holt, proposed, seconded by Councillor Gehring that Councillor Taylor be elected Chairwoman for the municipal year 2018/19. On being put to the vote it was resolved by 7 votes to 3 to elect Councillor Jones as Chairwoman for the municipal year 2018/19.

29. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/19

It was proposed by Councillor Roberts and seconded by Councillor Whitehead that Councillor Blencowe be elected Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2018/19. Councillor Taylor proposed, seconded by Councillor Gehring that Councillor Holt be elected as Vice-Chairwoman for the municipal year. On being put to the vote it was resolved to elect Councillor Blencowe by 7 votes to 3 as Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2018/19

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Robertson declared an interest in agenda item 7, Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Waiting Restrictions for Anstey Way, Cambridge and would take no part in the decision.

Councillor M Gehring declared an interest as the Local Member in agenda item 9, Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Newnham and Coleridge West Areas of Cambridge.

31. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 17th APRIL 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th April 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

The Chairwoman informed the Committee that there had been a number of late requests to speak at the Committee from Members of the public. The Chairwoman

advised that due to the large numbers of people already registered she would not exercise her discretion and allow the late requests.

32. PETITIONS

A petition was received from Mr Greene regarding Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic and noise on Huntingdon Road during the A14 closure periods. In presenting the petition, Mr Greene made five specific requests.

Firstly, to request that multiple Variable Message Signs (VMS) be installed on the eastbound carriageway of the A14, beginning at junction 24 that clearly alerted HGV drivers to the closure and the alternative route to take.

Secondly, to install a speed camera on Huntingdon Road facing the inbound carriageway. Mr Greene highlighted a stretch of the road where HGVs tended to accelerate that contributed to excessive noise and shaking of houses.

Thirdly, that a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) be placed on Huntingdon Road with a clear exception for local deliveries.

Fourthly, that automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) cameras be placed on Huntingdon Road after junction 31 in order that the haulage companies be alerted to the TTRO imposed on Huntingdon Road.

Lastly that a HGV counter be installed on Huntingdon Road.

In conclusion, Mr Greene emphasised that the time difference when following the diversion that avoided Huntingdon Road was negligible and that the designs for major infrastructure projects should carefully consider the amenity of local residents and where possible, diversion for HGVs should be designed to avoid cities and towns.

The Chairwoman thanked Mr Greene for the petition and advised that as there was no relevant agenda item, the petition would be noted and a written response would be issued within 10 working days of the meeting.

The Committee received a second petition regarding agenda item 9, Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Newnham and Coleridge West Areas of Cambridge. The petition requested that if a Traffic Regulation Order was approved for Newnham it should be implemented by making the Newnham Croft Conservation Area and all Newnham cul-de-sacs into Parking Permit Areas with the minimum signage required by the Department of Transport.

Introducing the petition, Mr Terry Macalister noted the benefits of a residents parking scheme for the area but emphasised the unsuitability of the proposed scheme, given the level of signage required for the neighbourhood which was a conservation area. Mr Macalister informed the Committee that a Parking Permit Area (PPA) would provide the solution if implemented correctly. A PPA scheme would be cheaper and the savings could be utilised for electric vehicle charging points which would assist the Greater Cambridge Partnership's aim of achieving a modal shift in travel within the city. PPAs had been successfully implemented in several areas across the country that were similar in nature to the Newnham area and requested that officers consider the proposals further.

33. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS FOR ANSTEY WAY CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in Anstey Way, Cambridge to support a new housing development during construction and after.

Following the declaration of interest made at the start of the meeting, Councillor Robertson abstained from the item.

In the course of discussing proposals,

- There was discussion need for these for site permission at Anstey Way and preparation for eventual building of houses. Few objections 1 in support. Points have been responded to. Should be supported and
- Queried the objection received from local member Cambridge City Councillor O'Connell. Officers explained that the objection related to concerns for deliveries made to local shops and businesses. There were measures in place for deliveries to take place and there was no loading ban and therefore deliveries could still occur outside business premises.
- Attention was drawn to the final consultation response that welcomed the measures proposed which should improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
- A Member urged caution with regard to the scheme and requested members note the objection of the local member.
- It was questioned how the scheme would benefit the residents of the area as some did not have dedicated car parking spaces.

It was resolved by majority to

- a) implement the restriction in Anstey Way as originally published
- b) inform the objectors accordingly

34. CROSS CITY CYCLING – RAISED TABLES, SPEED CUSHIONS AND RAISED ZEBRA

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine an objection to a raised table junction and a raised zebra crossing. Officers informed the Committee that mini roundabouts were being replaced by raised tables that had received considerable support from the public. There had been one objection received from Stagecoach whom appeared to have a policy to object to anything but speed cushions.

During discussion Members

- Clarified the scheme of delegation to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) from the County Council's Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, noting that the scheme was not related to a GCP infrastructure project.

- Expressed concern regarding the location of the zebra crossing located on Green End Road, questioning whether it was Scarsdale Close that exited on to it. Officers explained that that the crossing would be located no closer than 5 metres to the entrance to Brownsfield and the drawing was not quite accurate.
- Advised that where the crossing was located was a passage way for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Proposed with the unanimous agreement of the Committee that the recommendation be amended to implement the works subject to confirmation that the crossing was sufficient distance from the entrance to Scarsdale Close.

It was resolved unanimously to implement works subject to confirmation that the crossing was sufficient distance from the entrance to Scarsdale Close, to allow the raised junction and raised zebra crossing on the streets listed below as advertised

- 1) Mere Way – Arbury Road
- 2) Green End Road

35. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS FOR THE NEWNHAM AND COLERIDGE WEST AREAS OF CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report that requested members consider the objections received in response to the formal advertisement of parking controls in Newnham and Coleridge West areas.

The Chairwoman proposed with the agreement of the Committee that in order to manage the meeting effectively, recommendations b, c and e relating to Coleridge would be discussed first.

Speaking in objection to the proposal Lynne Martin, secretary of Coleridge Club and speaking on their behalf and behalf of Romsey Bowling Club addressed the Committee. Mrs Martin informed the Committee that over the course of a season 52 bowling clubs from across the country attended the club to play matches and tournaments. The parking restrictions proposed would have a detrimental impact on the club and could force it to close. Mrs Martin advised that limited time zones would be preferential to address commuter parking. In conclusion Mrs Martin emphasised the health benefits of bowling and drew attention to the investment the City Council had made in the park.

Councillor Kavanagh, local member for Coleridge informed the Committee that following comments and representations made by local residents and non-residents the hours the restrictions would apply had been reduced and there was an increase in limited time waiting bays nearby on Davy Road. Councillor Kavanagh was confident that the proposed scheme would enhance the area and would not impact upon the bowls club.

In the course of discussing the report, members

- Welcomed the scheme and the benefits to residents it would bring, noting the positive comments from residents.

- Noted that mixed use bays should also be 10am – 6pm.
- Sought clarification that the scheme was not defined as a Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) infrastructure scheme. It was confirmed that it was not considered such a scheme and that it was a Cambridge City and County Council scheme that the GCP was contributing to the funding of.

It was unanimously resolved to

- b) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the areas shown in Appendix 2 of the report (Coleridge West plans 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3)
- c) Authorise officers, in consultation with the Chairwoman of CJAC local Members and, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders
- e) Inform the objectors accordingly

The Committee went on to consider the recommendations that related to the proposed scheme for Newnham.

Officers informed Members that 211 written representations had been received with a number of common concerns that had been addressed within the report. In acknowledging the strength of local opinion regarding signage, road marking and the appropriateness of a Parking Permit Area (PPA) officers drew attention to recommendation (d) of the officer report that sought to agree the scheme designs outside of the meeting with local members. Officers informed the Committee that further correspondence had been received immediately prior to the meeting that requested the operational hours of the scheme be amended to apply 7 days a week rather than 5. Operating hours were originally planned to be for 7 days a week but following consultation with the local member they were reduced to 5.

The Chairwoman invited Mr Stefano Pozzi to address the Committee. Mr Pozzi began by welcoming the caveat made by officers regarding the scheme design. Mr Pozzi drew attention to perceived factual inaccuracies within the officer report. The stated suitability of PPA schemes for small isolated cul-de-sacs within the report was in contradiction to government advice which indicated it was suited to conservation areas. The number and size of the proposed signs for the scheme was also in contradiction to guidance.

Mrs Jean Glasberg was invited by the Chairwoman to address the Committee. Mrs Glasberg described the area as a network of small streets and commented that limited road markings was positive for the area, maintaining its character. Commuter parking was a problem for the area but signage for any residents parking must be minimised. Department for Transport guidance stated that officers must work closely with residents and the City Council conservation team to ensure that the scheme implemented was appropriate to the conservation area. A PPA scheme would address concerns regarding signage and would require limited road markings. Mrs Glasberg relayed the shock of residents when the plans were released as part of the consultation and expressed concern that in the absence of cycle parking in the area the sign posts would be used by people to lock their bicycles to. Mrs Glasberg concluded by emphasising that a PPA scheme was better suited to the area.

The Chairwoman invited Mr Boz Kempski to speak to the Committee. Mr Kempski questioned and expressed concern regarding the car parking capacity analysis for the area that ignored motorcycles or vans. He highlighted that the proposed 5 metre parking bay length was too short and drew attention to the analysis he had undertaken of parking space capacity versus demand that showed for 274 spaces would be 99% full overnight which would result in central Newnham Croft being blocked. If capacity for car parking spaces was to be 85% overnight then the number of spaces required would be 320.

Mr John Drew, invited by the Chairwoman addressed the Committee. Mr Drew noted that parking was a city-wide issue and wished to echo his support to neighbours that had addressed the Committee. Mr Drew explained that residents were not opposed to double yellow lines placed in specific areas. In drawing attention to proposed passing places on Newnham Croft he suggested they were not necessary as visibility was good however, he agreed they were necessary in Fulbrooke Road as visibility was poor. In conclusion Mr Drew emphasised that it was time for everyone to work together to solve the problems.

Mr Alan Baldwin, speaking on behalf of Newnham Croft Social and Sports Club at the invitation of the Chairwoman addressed the Committee. Mr Baldwin informed the Committee that he had only become aware of the proposals in March or April 2018 and there had been no consultation from officers regarding the proposals. Mr Baldwin expressed concern regarding the impact the proposals would have upon the Social Club and commented that the consultation process was flawed as it failed to assess the impact the scheme would have upon disabled people and those visiting the social club. In conclusion, Mr Baldwin requested that the decision on the scheme be deferred in order for the implications to be discussed more fully.

Mr Hugh Clough addressed the Committee. Mr Clough welcomed the principle of a scheme for the area but criticised the process that had been undertaken with little engagement from officers. Mr Clough criticised the quality of responses to Freedom of Information (FOI) requests. He expressed concern that the views of residents had not been reflected within the report. Mr Clough concluded by requesting that the Committee consider the proposals further and that local residents had little confidence in the process and if the scheme was agreed he would seek publicity for the failings of the process and Committee.

Local member, Cambridge City Councillor Rod Cantrill addressed the Committee. Councillor Cantrill highlighted this had been a controversial subject over 10 years. Pressure had increased on parking driven by commuter parking and young families. A residents parking scheme represented the only step that could be taken that could ensure people could park close to where they live, use local shops and ensure carers could attend clients in the area. Councillor Cantrill supported the scheme in principle but requested that it operated for 7 days a week rather than 5. Councillor Cantrill highlighted the issues surrounding the signage for the scheme, the possibility of a PPA scheme and the need to ensure that the street scene was maintained or enhanced.

County Councillor Lucy Nethsingha, local member for Newnham addressed the Committee. Councillor Nethsingha drew attention to the majority support for a scheme from local residents. Further delays to a scheme would not resolve the issues faced by residents. Councillor Nethsingha informed the Committee that since the publication of the report she had received a large volume of correspondence that requested the scheme be extended to 7 days and supported those requests.

Signage for the scheme was an issue of great concern to residents and challenged residents that said there had been little engagement during the process. Councillor Nethsingha commented that she would welcome the alteration of the recommendation to agree approval of the designs of the scheme with all county and ward Councillors. In conclusion, Councillor Nethsingha supported approval of the scheme that included a delegation for agreement regarding signage to be achieved following the meeting.

The Chairwoman confirmed with officers that as the TRO was originally advertised as applying for 7 days a week then changing it back to 7 days was possible and that the signage could be reviewed in consultation with the Chairwoman and local members.

Prior to moving to the debate officers explained the difference between a PPA and a more traditional residents parking scheme.

During discussion Members

- Noted that correct signage levels were vital to ensure that any scheme was enforceable.
- Confirmed that recommendation (d) would not impact on the TRO and that it would only address the signage for the scheme.
- Noted that no residents parking scheme across the city increased the number of car parking spaces available to residents but a scheme would result in more spaces being made available due to the reduction in non-residents parking.
- Commented that there had been similar concerns raised regarding signage at other schemes across the city and that car parking was a serious issue for communities. There was a balance to be struck between a scheme that was sympathetic to the area but was also enforceable.

It was proposed with the unanimous agreement of the Committee to amend recommendation (a) of the officer report to ensure parking controls applied for 7 days a week. It was also proposed with the unanimous agreement of the Committee that recommendation (d) of the officer report be amended to authorise officers in consultation with the Chairwoman of CJAC and local **ward and County Councillors** to finalise and agree the scheme designs **including signage** prior to implementation.

In continuing discussion of the scheme members

- Requested that officers ensure that the scheme was monitored for its impact upon the social club and that a PPA scheme be considered for Fulbrooke Road. Commenting that, as the statutory powers existed PPA schemes should be used more liberally.
- Welcomed the extension of the scheme to operate 7 days a week and urged the consideration of a PPA scheme for Fulbrooke Road and for signage to be as limited as possible in terms of numbers and size.

- Highlighted that there were lots of schemes that existed within historical conservation areas and residents understood the need to be able to enforce a scheme.

The Chairwoman concluded by emphasising the strong steer to officers provided by the Committee that they should seek a PPA scheme where possible and minimise signage for the scheme when finalising the scheme designs.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) Approve the parking controls **for 7 days a week** in the areas shown in Appendix 1 of the officer report (Newnham plans 1.1, 1.2 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5)
- b) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the areas shown in appendix 2 of the officer report (Coleridge West plans 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3)
- c) Authorise officers, in consultation with chairman of CJAC, local Members and, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)
- d) Authorise officers, in consultation with Chairman of CJAC and local **ward and County Councillors** to finalise and agree the scheme designs **including signage** prior to implementation
- e) Inform the objectors accordingly

36. **TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS, CAMBRIDGE, CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

Members received a report that requested determination of objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in Trumpington, Cambridge.

The Chairwoman invited local resident, Linda Frost to speak to the Committee. Mrs Frost began by drawing attention to the section of the proposals that stated there was no opportunity to increase the number of visitor car parking spaces. Only constructed parking bays could be used for visitors with permits between 8am and 6pm. However, there were two areas marked as restricted parking zones which were currently being used as parking areas and questioned whether those areas would be available for visitor parking during the day or would they form part of the restricted parking zones.

In presenting the report officers explained that the scheme covered both Cambridge City and an area of South Cambridgeshire District Council. Members noted that the Committee could only determine the area that fell within Cambridge City.

Officers informed the Committee that the proposals formed part of the original planning consent for the development that intended to encourage car clubs and dissuade multiple car ownership.

During discussion Members:

- Noted that the signage for the scheme was similar to a PPA. Visitor parking bays would have to be clearly marked and that could be achieved with contrasting block paving.
- Confirmed that there would be no double yellow lines and that the scheme would rely upon entry signs and repeater signs.
- Expressed concern regarding the level of consultation with local residents, highlighting that areas would remain unadopted and a scheme should not be approved unless it was clear if all the area would be adopted.
- Drew attention to the number of objections received, expressed concern regarding the level of public consultation that had taken place and suggested that further consultation work be undertaken in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- Noted that the present restrictions applied all day, 7 days per week and that the proposed scheme was for fewer restrictions.
- Commented that if a scheme was not put in place then there would be severe issues at the development and that the scheme could be amended following review of the scheme in the future.
- Noted that when purchasing a property on the estate the developer was required to inform the vendee of the parking restrictions.

Councillor Taylor proposed an amendment to the recommendation to include a public consultation on the restrictions prior to their implementation. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

It was resolved to

- a) Implement the restrictions in Trumpington Meadows as published
- b) Inform the objectors of the decision

37. CAVENDISH AVENUE AND BALDOCK WAY, CAMBRIDGE, CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Committee was presented a report that requested members determine the objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way, Cambridge.

Local Member, County Councillor Taylor provided the Committee with the background to the scheme and emphasised the support for the scheme from local residents.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Implement the restrictions in Cavendish Avenue, Lady Jane Court and Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Blinco Grove section) as published
- b) Implement the restrictions in Baldock Way (Cavendish Avenue to Hills Avenue section as published)

Chairman