Agenda Item No: 2

CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (CJAC): MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 27th November 2018

Time: 4.30pm – 6:40pm

Place: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

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

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

Apologies: None received

38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor R Robertson declared an interest as a resident in agenda item 5, Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Ascham Area of Cambridge.

Councillor M Sargeant declared an interest as a resident and the Local Member in agenda item 5, Traffic Regulation Order Objections Associated with the Proposed Implementation of Parking Controls for the Ascham Area of Cambridge.

39. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 24TH JULY 2018

Following concerns raised by a Member regarding the accuracy of July meeting's minutes, the Chair proposed with the agreement of the Committee to defer the item to the next meeting of the Committee. This was to allow for the minutes to be reviewed and any necessary amendments be made.

40. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Committee received a question from a member of the public, Ms Victoria Johnstone, which related to Resident Parking Schemes (RPSs). In presenting her question to the Committee, Ms Johnstone criticised the consultation processes for failing to include members of the rural communities. Public transport services in to Cambridge were often expensive, inadequate and inaccessible, leaving commuters with no alternative to driving and parking in the city centre. While calling for a new scheme that was not to the detriment of rural communities, Ms Johnstone commented to the Committee that the Council website encouraged only Cambridge residents to participate in the consultation process, excluding everyone that lived outside the city. Ms Johnstone noted that there were also no Members of the Committee that represented rural areas and that although funded by the Greater Cambridge Partnership, it did not serve anyone living outside Cambridge.

The Chairwoman thanked Ms Johnstone for her question and advised that a written response would be issued within 10 working days of the meeting. The Chairwoman also confirmed that Ms Johnstone could respond to the Council's reply at the following Committee meeting.

The Committee was advised that one petition had been received relating to the Ascham and Victoria Residents' Parking Schemes and that it would be considered at the start of the relevant agenda item [minute 42 refers].

41. CAMBRIDGE CITY LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT MEMBER PANEL MEMBERSHIP

The Chairwoman had requested an update from the Assistant Director of Highways, Richard Lumley, on Local Highway Improvement (LHI) progress, out of concern that funding would be lost as a result of a financial adjustments made by the Council. The Assistant Director's response was tabled at the meeting and is attached as Appendix A to these minutes. An update on the Cambridge City Works Programme was also tabled and is attached as Appendix B.

In discussing the update, Members:

- Expressed concern that officers had not yet carried out scoping and other preparations for the January assessment regarding local highways bidding. It was noted that little time remained and residents were concerned. Members were provided assurance by a Project Manager from Highway Projects and Road Safety that despite resourcing challenges the work would be completed within the deadline.

- Emphasised the importance of effective communication between officers and Councillors and for all parties to remain updated regarding the progress of projects , as councillors worked closely with residents, which was made difficult when information was hard to find or not up-to-date.

The Committee received a report asking it to agree membership of the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) Member Assessment Panel for the 2019/20 programme year.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) Agree membership of the Cambridge City Local Highways Improvement Panel, consisting of County Councillors L Jones, N Kavanagh and A Taylor, and City Councillors K Blencowe, V Holt and M Sargeant.

b) Agree that a member of the panel who is unable to attend a panel meeting be authorised to nominate another member of the same Council to attend as a substitute or alternate.

42. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS FOR THE ASCHAM AREA OF CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objections received in response to the formal advertisement of parking controls in the Ascham Road Area.

Before presenting the report, the Parking Policy Manager updated the Committee on the status of Resident Parking Schemes (RPSs) across the city, drawing Members' attention to the indicative map on page 26 of the agenda. It was noted that 4 schemes had been installed (Morley, Accordia, Staffordshire and Coleridge West), 1 was still pending installation (Newnham), 2 were at the statutory consultation stage (Ascham and Victoria), 3 at the public consultation stage (Stretten, York and Stourbridge) and 1 was at the design stage (Benson North), while discussions were being held with local County Councillors over the next phase of schemes. Members were informed that the indicative map and implementation programme were a work in progress and therefore changed throughout the consultation processes.

In discussing the update, Members were informed that:

- Coleridge East, Romsey East and Romsey West schemes would be the next three schemes under consideration.

- A number of schemes had not progressed as planned because informal consultations were to be undertaken by local County Councillors.

- There was a limit to how many RPSs could be prepared at one time, but in general the overall plan was continuing as intended.

Given the large number of public speakers present to speak on the proposed implementation of parking controls in the Ascham area, as well as the Victoria area and other neighbouring areas, the Chairwoman exercised her discretion to hear all the public speakers together at the beginning of this item.

Mrs Caroline Stephens was invited by the Chairwoman to speak on the key issues raised in the petition submitted to the Committee. Mrs Stephens requested Members reconsider the Ascham parking scheme, which she suggested would receive more support if certain flaws were fixed. Arguing that parking in the Elizabeth area was already at capacity, Mrs Stephens stated that the scheme would leave residents of Elizabeth sandwiched between two zones and unable to park in either of them, while it would also leave Elizabeth unable to later implement its own scheme that would slot in to the adjoining schemes. Mrs Stephens proposed the implementation of reciprocal parking between the separate schemes as one way of overcoming the issue and suggested that the various schemes should be implemented together to prevent displacement. Mrs Stephens commented that 52 residents of Elizabeth had submitted written objections during the formal consultation stage and that, contrary to the County policy of consulting those who would be impacted, the objections had been discarded.

The Chairwoman invited a resident of Green's Road, Mrs Joanna Shneerson to speak on problems related to the Victoria scheme. Mrs Shneerson argued to Members that the scheme disadvantaged local residents and that removing parking from two streets would disrupt parking for hundreds of cars, including those used by disabled people, carers, health visitors and people arriving home from work late at night. Mrs Shneerson suggested that the proposed safety benefits were outweighed by the effect on vulnerable people in the area, while disputing the claim that the fire service could not access the road. The consultation process was not valid, Mrs Shneerson argued to the Committee, as it was not advertised and plans were later changed to include fewer parking spaces. Mrs Shneerson suggested that the Council's requirement of 95% of Green's Road's residents to vote against its inclusion in the scheme did not follow recommended protocol and that a new consultation and vote should be held.

Mrs Valerie Sills was invited to speak to the Committee about problems in the Ascham zone. Mrs Sills informed Members that the significant parking problems on Metcalfe Road, mainly caused by teachers and parents and currently exasperated by ongoing building works at Chesterton Community College, were limited to school hours and that a 24-hour scheme that operated seven days a week was excessive. Of the 32 properties on the street that would have double yellow lines outside their property under the proposed scheme, Mrs Sills spoke to 28, 85% of whom were against the scheme. Concerns included traffic passing at a faster speed and the impacts on tradesmen, visitors and residents' carers. Mrs Sills suggested that single yellow lines would be a more suitable solution. Mrs Sills stated that more than half the length of Metcalfe Road was wider than 6.5 metres between the kerbs, the minimum distance required to allow parking on both sides and suggested that the double yellow lines on the corner of Metcalfe Road and Courtney Way would be more effective on the opposite side of the road, improving visibility around the corner.

Mrs Kathie Albarn, invited by the Chairwoman to address the Committee, pointed out that any Residents' Parking Scheme should be designed to fulfil the needs of local residents. The proposed removal of 38 parking spaces on Herbert Street, as well as the parking space currently used by 35 cars on Milton Road, would displace all these vehicles into surrounding areas that were already heavily over-capacitated and therefore would not help residents. Mrs Albarn drew Members' attention to the scheme's acknowledgement that Milton Road residents would be affected and the subsequent mitigation advice that suggested they park on neighbouring side-streets. The residents of these extra streets would be seriously impacted and Mrs Albarn argued that they should have been included in the consultations. Mrs Albarn informed the Committee that the issue had caused three years of stress and suggested that as a community, alternative workable solutions could be found.

A petition was received from Dr Alan Hart regarding the implementation of the Ascham and Victoria RPSs, asking the Council to stop the legal process and reconsider the design of the schemes. In presenting the petition, Dr Hart informed Members that residents were generally in favour of RPSs but some changes were necessary for the proposed schemes to work. Dr Hart suggested that the boundaries between the areas were inappropriate and would push cars into neighbouring areas that were already over-populated. This would be exacerbated by the proposed removal of parking spaces. Dr Hart proposed looking at alternatives, such as changing how emergency services could enter Herbert Street at the Chesterton Road junction. The Committee was informed that over 360 people from the area that would be affected by the proposals had signed the petition, which was asking for the schemes to be amended, not stopped. It was suggested by Dr Hart that the Council opened itself up to charges of maladministration by failing to consult those impacted by the schemes and that it made no sense to propose schemes that did not work for the residents they were intended to help.

The Chairwoman exercised her discretion to allow a late-registered speaker, Mr Davin Yap, a member of the Victoria Park Parking Committee. Mr Yap stated that the proposed scheme would reduce parking spaces for the park by 35-40%, with the major impact being seen at night. It was noted by Mr Yap that of the 16 people sat on the table, 6 would not have a parking space under such conditions.

The Committee received a written statement from Mrs Deborah Latham, Secretary of Garden Walk Residents Association, in support of the RPS, the contents of which is attached as Appendix C to these minutes.

Councillor Scutt spoke on behalf of local Member, County Councillor Richards, who had personally undertaken extensive consultations with residents and was in favour of the scheme. The Committee was informed that the majority of residents had responded in favour of the scheme during the formal consultation stage and that all streets and roads had expressed support, despite various concerns. Councillor Scutt noted there were objections over Double Yellow Lines (DYLs) but informed the Committee that they were necessary to allow access to emergency vehicles. A house had burnt down on Green's Road due to this issue and Councillor Scutt argued that it would be irresponsible not to support the scheme when people's lives were being put at risk.

Moving on to speak as the local Member for Ascham, Councillor Scutt noted that she had previously worked hard to ensure Elizabeth, Ascham and the Hurst Park estate were all included in one zone. After the area borders were changed at the North Area Committee, there was a breakdown in communication between the areas and their councillors, leading to schemes progressing separately. During the following formal consultation over the Ascham scheme, a scheme which was deliberately set between 9am and 3pm to accommodate school hours, there was 60% approval. Councillor Scutt acknowledged the opinions and frustrations of those who opposed the scheme but noted that the democratic process had been duly followed and that the legislative process bound the Committee to approve the scheme. Work had been done to ensure the parking bays on Milton Road were preserved, leading only to the removal of those causing safety concerns around Mitcham's Corner.

Prior to the debate, officers drew attention to paragraphs 2.5 of the report, which noted the recommendation to not proceed with the removal of the unrestricted parking bays on Milton Road as part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Milton Road scheme.

It was proposed by a Member that the Committee provide the following steer towards getting back to a cross Milton Road scheme, giving residents greater flexibility across the areas:

> While supporting the approval and implementation of the Ascham scheme, if Ascham residents agree and the local councillors for Elizabeth work speedily to get residents' backing, we would strongly support the incorporation of Elizabeth in to the Ascham Resident Parking Scheme.

The Chairwoman clarified that the steer supported the approval of the Ascham RPS, followed by a consultation process that could potentially lead to the Elizabeth area being incorporated to the same RPS. It was noted that any such move would require the support of residents in both the Ascham and Elizabeth areas and some Members expressed concern over one group of residents being able to decide on the inclusion of another group of residents in the scheme. Other Members considered that this would allow for the Ascham scheme to progress while also offering an opportunity for Elizabeth residents to participate in consultations.

During discussion, Members:

- Noted that earlier efforts to carry out a cross Milton Road scheme were hampered by boundary changes, as well as the replacement of various local members. Some had wanted to consider the issue further while others had wanted to move ahead to the next stage, which led to a split down Milton Road. Residents of Elizabeth were therefore not included in the consultations that clearly had an impact on them.

- Expressed frustration over the fractured communication and difficult working relationship between councillors in Ascham but also across the city as a whole, noting it was more productive when county councillors and city councillors worked together.

- Commented that 89 out of 97 was an unusually high proportion of representations from outside of the area. It was argued that this demonstrated the need for extensive consultation and the importance of considering how different schemes interacted.

- Considered the inclusion of Hurst Park in any wider scheme, noting that the spill over effect would affect all surrounding areas.

- Debated the benefits of deferring the decision to allow for further consultation and the potential inclusion of Elizabeth in to the RPS. It was argued that including all areas in one scheme would be universally better than separate ones and that it would only require a delay of a few months. Some Members expressed doubts that much could be achieved in such a short space of time and that the revised new scheme would be put at the back of the queue of schemes awaiting implementation, adding a number of years to the timetable. It was noted, however that the deferral did not necessarily imply any delay beyond the time until the next meeting in March 2019, during which period little implementation work would be carried out due to inclement weather.

- Noted that the proposed deferral of removing parking bays on Milton Road was only a deferral and that at some point in the future they were likely to be removed.

- Established an approximate timetable for when Elizabeth would possibly be able to join the Ascham RPS. The Chairwoman noted that following the necessary planning, consultations and TRO, the scheme could potentially be presented to the Committee in October 2019, leading to its implementation in early 2020. It was noted that this would leave a period of up to 12 months during which Elizabeth would suffer serious parking issues.

- Considered it unlikely that residents of Ascham would accept Elizabeth joining in to the Ascham RPS at a later date, which would further exacerbate the problem in the Elizabeth area.

A procedural motion was proposed to the Committee that the recommendations be amended to include a deferral of the implementation of the Ascham scheme until a proper consultation had been carried out with residents of the Elizabeth area. Following discussion, the motion on being put to the vote was lost.

Continuing the discussion, Members:

- Were informed by the local Member that during discussions with residents of the Hurst Park area, it became apparent that they had not been aware of the RPS plans and that they would have objected in force on having been excluded. Other Members suggested that parking was not a problem in the Hurst Park estate and that residents would not be in favour of joining the scheme.

- Noted that as with all the schemes implemented across the city, there would be effects on the neighbouring areas, but this was inevitable and it was important to mitigate rather than abolish plans on its basis.

- Considered that they were there to decide on the Ascham scheme and that the Elizabeth scheme was a separate issue.

As requested by some Members, the recommendations were divided in to two parts.

It was resolved to:

a) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the area shown in Appendix 1 (Ascham plans 1.1 and 1.2)

b) Authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)

c) Inform the objectors accordingly

It was resolved unanimously to:

d) Not proceed with the advertised proposal to remove the unrestricted/limited parking bays on Milton Road, noting that the measure would be considered as part of the delivery of the GCP Milton Road project.

It was further approved unanimously to move the steer put forward during the discussion, which supported the incorporation of Elizabeth in to the Ascham RPS, if the Ascham residents agreed and if the local councillors for Elizabeth worked speedily to get residents' backing.

42. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS FOR THE VICTORIA AREA OF CAMBRIDGE

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objections received in response to the formal advertisement of parking controls in the Victoria Area. Members were reminded of the public speakers and local members who spoke on this item at the beginning of the previous item. In presenting the report, Members were informed that the most significant concerns had been over the impact of double yellow lines (DYLs) on residents but that these were necessary to ensure emergency vehicle access.

In discussing the report, Members:

- Suggested that sections of Green's Road were wide enough for emergency vehicles to pass without having to remove parking spaces. Some members considered that an independent assessment of the emergency vehicle access issue would be of benefit. It was noted that if it was decided at a later stage that there were sections of Green's Road where parking could still be permitted, such adjustments to the plans could be made under the provisions put forward in recommendation c).

- Drew attention to the garages at the end of the road and their potential for extra parking if current practice were improved.

- Noted that written objections from some local councillors had not been represented in the report and also expressed concern over the low response rate during consultation which made it hard to gauge opinions and levels of support.

- Commended the work of officers on these RPSs and other RPSs across the city, noting that the Committee could now understand which kind of schemes could be used according to the characteristics of each location

- Noted that there were many issues over inconsiderate parking but that when this put the lives of people at risk, councillors were obliged to put the safety of residents first.

- Acknowledged the efforts made by local member, Councillor Richards, to ensure that as many parking spaces remained in place as possible. It was noted that preparations had been going on for over a year and that imposing a further delay to try and save a few places was unreasonable.

- Considered that the main issue was based on capacity, as there were not enough parking spaces for the number of residents' cars. Officers were unable to guarantee that there would be enough spaces after implementation of the RPS. It was noted that behavioural changes usually emerged after schemes were introduced, such as increased bike use and decreased commuter presence, which were not taken into account in these calculations and made it difficult for officers to make such judgements.

It was resolved to:

a) Approve the parking controls as advertised in the area shown in Appendix 1 (Victoria plans 1.0, 1.1,1.2 and 1.3)

b) Approve the revocation of the existing Limited Access Order on Victoria Park, Primrose Street, Green's Road and Corona Road as advertised

c) Authorise officers, in consultation with local Members, to make such minor amendments to the published proposals as are necessary prior to the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)

d) Inform the objectors accordingly

43. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING CONTROLS ON GUNHILD CLOSE AND MARMORA ROAD

The Committee received a report that invited Members to determine objections regarding the implementation of Local Highway Improvement schemes on Gunhild Close and Marmora Road.

In the course of discussing the report, Members:

- Noted that the double yellow lines on Marmora Road had been proposed as a matter of safety, with cars that currently parked on the junction blocking drivers' vision and forcing turning vehicles to pull out into the middle of the road, endangering

pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. It was also noted that the length of the double yellow lines had been shortened in response to residents' concerns.

- Acknowledged the parking problems on Gunhild Close due to the proximity of a school and park. It was pointed out that the double yellow lines opposite the junction turning in to Gunhild Close that were removed from the plan during the informal consultation stage were removed as a result of objections.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) Implement the restrictions as advertised.

b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Chairwoman