

## **CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 17th April 2018

**Time:** 4.30pm – 5.45pm

**Place:** Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** County Councillors Harrison (substituting for Cllr Adey), Jones (Vice-Chairwoman), Kavanagh, Meschini and A Taylor  
City Councillors Baigent, Blencowe (Chairman), Holt, T Moore (substituting for Cllr Tunnacliffe) and Robertson

**Apologies:** County Councillor Adey, and City Councillors Bird and Tunnacliffe

### **22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor A Taylor declared a personal interest in agenda item 5 (minute 25 refers) as an employee of Cambridge University Press; she did however cycle to work so did not park in the streets around the Press. Councillors Baigent, Kavanagh, T Moore and A Taylor expressed a personal interest in agenda item 7 (minute 27 refers) as members of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

### **23. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 30th JANUARY 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30th January 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **24. PETITIONS**

None.

### **25. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS FOR THE ACCORDIA AND STAFFORDSHIRE STREET AREAS OF CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in the Accordia and Staffordshire Street areas of Cambridge. Members noted that since publication of the report, the parking plan proposed for the Accordia scheme had been reviewed with regard to two areas of double yellow lines, and a revised report appendix 1B (Plan F) had been published on the Council's website and circulated to Committee members.

Members were advised that Plan D, which had been included in the statutory consultation documents, had shown the double yellow lines to the south end of Henslow Mews incorrectly outside 17 and 19 Henslow Mews. Plan E, the plan originally published with the present Committee report, showed these double yellow lines correctly as they appeared on the highway; there was no proposal to change the double yellow lines at the south end of Henslow Mews.

The double yellow lines running alongside no 51 Aberdeen Ave on Henslow Mews had been revised on Plan E to be shorter than on Plan D, but after further review, it had been decided to recommend the longer length of double yellow lines. Plan F had therefore been prepared, published, and circulated to the Committee as a revised report appendix 1B. This showed the recommended lengths of double yellow lines throughout Henslow Mews. The Committee was therefore now being invited to approve parking controls as set out on Plan F.

Ms Ingela Bjork Loch, a resident of Accordia, spoke, saying that she was positive about the scheme, but was asking that the double yellow lines on the angled section between numbers 13 and 14 Henslow Mews be reduced in length to avoid removing space in which to park two cars. In answer to members' questions, she said that residents were parking on a small part of the kerb, because there would otherwise be little room for cars and vans to pass safely on the narrow road. She had raised this objection in December, but had not raised it at the formal consultation stage.

In the course of discussing proposals for Accordia, members

- noted that it was difficult to apply lasting road markings to the block paving which was widely used in the area. The scheme being proposed for Accordia, a parking permit area, would not require individual parking bays to be marked on the road; there would be signs at zone entrance and exit points, and repeater signs within the zone. Generally speaking, permit holders could park anywhere in the zone unless there were double yellow lines
- welcomed the proposed scheme, commenting that it was something which the previous local County member, Councillor Ashwood, had wanted for a long time
- commented that parking on pavements would not be desirable, and noted that, as in other residents' parking schemes, this would not be permitted in the zone
- sought assurance that concerns raised in the course of consultation had been addressed, and noted that operation of the scheme would be kept under review.

Turning to the proposals for the Staffordshire Street area, members noted that there had been few objections or challenges to the TRO as advertised. Two City Councillors spoke as local members. Councillor Blencowe said that the informal consultation had been well attended and comments had been made then; some residents had long supported the introduction of parking controls in the area. Councillor Robertson said that residents had been wanting the scheme for the last five years. The local County member, Councillor Jones, warmly welcomed the scheme and thanked officers for their work; several older residents had told her that parking controls would never happen.

It was reported that, although parking on the pavement behind double yellow lines was usually prohibited, County civil enforcement officers had said that the pavement down Staffordshire Street was not part of the highway and were not enforcing prohibition of parking on the pavement behind the double yellow lines. Officers undertook to check that this was public highway, and if it was, would follow the matter up as a training issue for civil enforcement officers.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) approve the parking controls in the Accordia area of Cambridge shown in the revised Plan B of Appendix 1 of the report before Committee (marked Rev F)
- b) approve the parking controls in the Staffordshire Street area of Cambridge shown in Plan A of Appendix 1 of the report before Committee
- c) authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to these parking controls as are necessary in response to the formalisation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- d) Inform the objectors accordingly.

**26. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS ON LOVELL ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine objections received in response to the publication of waiting restrictions in Lovell Road. Members noted that implementing the proposed prohibition of waiting at any time on both sides of the road would help to prevent damage to the verges.

City Councillor Martin Smart, local member for King's Hedges, spoke to report that Lovell Road residents were in favour of measures to help resolve problems of parking and access. Properties had space for two or three cars to park off the road; it was assumed that many of the cars parked on the road belonged to people working nearby. Speaking as the local County member, Councillor Meschini also expressed her support, saying that she had reviewed the objections, and in her experience it was rare for cars to be parked directly opposite each other.

Other members expressed support for the proposals, welcoming measures to protect the verges and make the pavements safer for pedestrians.

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) implement the restrictions as advertised
- b) inform the objectors of the accordingly.

**27. DOCKLESS BIKESHARE CODE OF CONDUCT**

The Committee received a report presenting a draft code of conduct for the operators of dockless bikeshare schemes in Cambridge. Members noted that there was currently no legislative framework for the management of such schemes, and no such legislation was expected in the near future. Ofo already had about 550 bikes in Cambridge, and at least three other operators had expressed an interest in operating in the city. Other local authorities were adopting different approaches to regulation; a code of conduct had been developed for dockless bikeshare operators in Oxford.

Members noted that the operators had requested a modification to the draft code, to increase the time allowed for retrieving a cycle reported as causing a nuisance from 24 to 48 hours. Officers were proposing a modification, to require that the safety information for users include advice to check the brakes before using the bike.

Speaking at the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Martin Smart, the City Council's Lead Member for Cycling, expressed support for the draft code as a means of organising dockless bikeshare operators in the city. He described Cambridge as the lead cycling city in the UK, and reported that he had met a senior Ofo officer in Cambridge recently. The officer had acknowledged that the scheme had not performed well initially in Cambridge, but said that Ofo intended to do better in future. Councillor Smart pointed out that Ofo bikes were currently hired for no longer than a day, so were not in direct competition with local providers, though the operator was considering the introduction of longer hire periods in future.

In relation to abandoned bikes, Councillor Smart said that bikes had been dumped before Ofo had started; although there were cases of Ofo bikes being abandoned, usually only single or a few bikes were involved. He queried whether the code of conduct should, in addition to limiting the number of bikes in a trial phase, also specify a minimum number.

Speaking as the local member for Market, County Councillor Harrison expressed support for Councillor Smart's remarks. Market had a large number of Ofo bikes; some were not left in ideal places, but she had not heard any objections from residents. She commended efforts to encourage operators to act responsibly, and suggested that there should be no change to the requirement to remove a bike within 24 hours a report that it was causing a nuisance. The Chairman and officers confirmed that there was no proposal to amend paragraph 3.4 of the draft code.

In the course of discussing the draft code of conduct, members

- pointed out that there could be a delay before an obstructive bike was reported; it would be reasonable to maintain the 24-hour removal deadline
- noted that it was possible simply to pick up a single bike to move it out of the way; a large group of bikes blocking the pavement (as had been observed at some bus stops) might constitute an offence of obstructing the highway, which the Police would then deal with
- commented that dockless schemes differed from the docked bike schemes operated for example in London in that bikes did get left where they should not be
- suggested that riders should be asked not to leave dockless bikes in bike racks intended for general use; officers advised that this was covered in the Code of Conduct
- expressed concern at the standard of maintenance of the dockless bikes
- welcomed the inclusion of safety guidelines on a bike operator's app, and commented that those riding the bikes would often be inexperienced and unused to riding in Cambridge; helmets were not supplied with the bikes
- asked whether there was any means of the operator obtaining information on accidents involving their bikes, and including such information in the operator's annual report to Council. Members noted that this was not being proposed for inclusion in the code of conduct

- noted that meetings had been held between City Council officers and Ofo; the Council's City Rangers worked with Ofo to remove bikes causing an obstruction
- said that some retailers were reporting a decrease in the number of people hiring their bikes, and commented that competition with retailers would increase as more dockless schemes began to operate in the city
- commented that operators were unlikely to want to run a trial with a very small number of bikes, as it would yield neither useful information nor an good profit
- in relation to the provision that operators pay at least the living wage, noted that Ofo did pay this, but could not be required to do so. The code would be kept under review, and could be updated as necessary, but it was voluntary and unenforceable.

It was resolved unanimously to

support the Code of Conduct to encourage best practice from the operators of dockless bikeshare schemes in the city, subject to including in the Safety information for users advice to check the brakes before use.

Chairman