

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE – (25th January 2022)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No.	Question from:	Item	Question
1.	Anthony Carpen		<p>Dr Jon Finney responded on behalf of the Highways Authority on 11 Nov 2021.</p> <p>Dr Finney wrote regarding parking:</p> <p>"The streets in the vicinity of the proposal provide uncontrolled parking, and so, as there is no effective means to prevent residents of the proposed apartments from owning a car this demand is likely to appear on-street in competition with existing residential users. The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking in the surrounding area and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider when assessing this application."</p> <p>On 09 Dec 2021, the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board of which Cambridgeshire County Council is a voting member, voted to proceed with a city-wide residents' parking scheme. The Romsey Labour Club is at the crossroads of four proposed residential parking schemes - Romsey West, Romsey East, Coleridge West, and Coleridge East. (See the map on p32 of the Agenda Pack at https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1572/Committee/26/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx)</p> <p>Note County Officers should have been aware of the proposals when the maps were published as part of the papers for the Greater Cambridge Assembly meeting of 18 November 2021 (see https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1568/Committee/36/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx), so will have been published just after Dr Finney submitted his response.</p> <p>In light of the very clear policy statement from the Greater Cambridge Partnership about a city-wide residents' parking scheme, it is highly likely that by the time the application has been built there will already be a parking scheme in place, meaning no street parking available for users of the proposed serviced apartments. Where will the cars of users go?</p>

			I therefore request the Highways Authority Officers to refresh their advice to Cambridge City Council for this application, take into consideration the clear policy direction of the GCP, and consider whether to submit a formal objection to this application.
			Response:
No.	Question from:	Item	Question:
2.	Jim Chisolm	Parking Enforcement and Permits System	<p>I noted this item and ask if the imminent extension of Civil Enforcement to cover a range of minor moving vehicle offences within these contracts will be included?</p> <p>I believe this Council has already been asked about some issues by DfT, and before Christmas the DfT issued a Q&A about Part 6 Powers. In addition, the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety has also recently issued a briefing note about Moving Vehicle Enforcement written by an officer in Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>I ask that this Committee ensures that any contracts signed do not risk delaying the use of these new powers which should greatly benefit all those who use our roads and streets.</p>
			Response:
			The proposed system is designed to be adaptive to future planned legislative changes including the extension of Civil Enforcement powers through TMA 6.
No.	Question from:	Item	Question:
3.	CamCycle	20mph Schemes	<p>We support the deployment of 20 mph zones to increase safety on the roads. For example, recent evidence from Brussels has shown a 17% drop in road injuries and 50% drop in road deaths after the introduction of a city-wide 30 km/h (20mph) zone last year [1]. It's effective.</p> <p>However, we must criticise the scoring criteria shown in Appendix 1 of agenda item 7. Criteria 1 states: 'Current mean speeds are at or below 24 mph'. This means that the presence of fast-moving motor traffic could cause an area to become disqualified from a 20 mph speed zone safety intervention, a truly perverse arrangement; like letting foxes guard a henhouse. Given that most areas</p>

			<p>under consideration would already have a 30 mph speed limit, it will be quite common for many streets to have a mean motor traffic speed above 24 mph and at the same time for that higher speed specifically to be the problem for other road users such as schoolchildren or older people trying to walk or cycle there.</p> <p>Therefore we ask the committee to change this criteria in one of the following ways:</p> <p>1) Remove the motor traffic speed qualification altogether, or at least raise it so that existing 30 mph zones will qualify.</p> <p>2) Insert a provision stating that the mean speed as measured for criteria 1 must take into account the speed of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, in computing the mean. It's only fair that the people most likely to be injured by fast-moving motor traffic are also given due consideration as road users, instead of being ignored.</p> <p>(footnote [1]: https://www.bruzz.be/mobiliteit/een-jaar-stad-30-trager-verkeer-minder-verkeersslachtoffers-2021-12-24)</p>
			Response:
No.	Question from:	Item	Question:
4.	CamCycle	Finance Monitoring Report	<p>Under 'Emergency Active Fund' in item 8 of the agenda it states that following 'an extended consultation period during Autumn 2021, analysis of the data by Business Intelligence Unit (currently underway), scheme detailed design, road safety audit and traffic management complexities', the simple projects will be delivered by the end of March 2022 and more complex schemes will be delivered between April and August 2022.</p> <p>We ask the committee to please publish the aforementioned consultation report for these Tranche 2 Active Travel Programme schemes, as well as the detailed designs and safety audits. Communities have waited long enough for safe walking and cycling routes in the proposed areas and are keen to know when trials will commence.</p>

			Given the aforementioned delivery dates, how will the more complex active travel programme schemes be able to meet the spending deadline of March 2022 that was imposed by DfT?
			Response: