

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

**Date:** Tuesday 4th June 2019

**Time:** 4:30pm – 5:40pm

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

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

City Councillors: R Robertson (Chairman), P Lord, N Massey, C Payne, M Sargeant and M Smart

**Apologies:** Councillors N Kavanagh and A Martinelli

### **47. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/20**

It was proposed by Councillor Sargeant, seconded by Councillor Whitehead and resolved by majority that Councillor Robertson be elected Chairman for the municipal year 2019/20.

### **48. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/20**

It was proposed by Councillor Massey, seconded by Councillor Meschini and resolved by majority that Councillor Jones be elected Vice-Chairwoman for the municipal year 2019/20.

### **49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were received from Councillor Kavanagh (substituted by Councillor Whitehead) and Councillor Martinelli (substituted by Councillor Lord).

There were no declarations of interest.

### **50. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no petitions submitted.

One public question was received from Mrs Hilary Conlan, who was unable to attend the meeting. Her question was read out to the Committee, along with the Council's response. A written response was sent to Mrs Conlan and attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**.

### **51. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5TH MARCH 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on 5th March 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman read out the following statement regarding an agenda item from a previous meeting, 'Kings Parade, Cambridge – Vehicular Access Management' (Minute 46):

Since the CJAC decision on 5th March 2019, there have been some changes to legislation and we have investigated the legal process further. The Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984 (as amended in 2005 and 2019) allows us to make Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs), for public safety and security purposes.

The RTRA does not have the provision to allow us to use an Experimental Order for this anti-terrorism purpose, therefore we can only use a TTRO to implement the proposed measures. We can monitor the TTRO effect prior to progressing the permanent TRO. Representations will be requested upon commencement of any planning for a permanent Order, to be determined by CJAC in due course.

## **52. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSAL TO PERMIT TWO WAY TRAFFIC IN SEDGWICK STREET, CAMBRIDGE AND TO REMOVE A DISABLED PERSONS PARKING BAY**

The Committee received a report inviting it to determine the objections received in response to the consultation on the proposal to permit two way traffic on a section of Sedgwick Street and to remove a disabled persons parking bay in that same section. In presenting the report, the Committee was told that it was further proposed to place 'No Through Road' signs at the end of Sedgwick Street on the Mill Road junction.

Mr Martin Lucas-Smith, a local resident, was invited by the Chairman to speak on issues related to the proposals. Mr Lucas-Smith informed the Committee that a proposal for such a scheme that had been submitted by Tesco was rejected in 2009 on the basis that regulations should not be changed for the benefit of a private company. He argued that reversing that decision on the condition that the private company paid for the scheme would set a bad precedent and observed that the use of smaller delivery vehicles would alleviate the problems without the need for any changes. Mr Lucas-Smith criticised the layout of the scheme, suggesting that it would result in vehicles backing out on to Mill Road, one of the highest blackspots for traffic accidents in the city, and that vehicles would inevitably continue to drive past the no entry signs further up Sedgwick Street, or be forced to complete three point turns in limited space. He also expressed concerns over the lack of a safety report or path analysis.

The Chairman invited Mr Tom Yates, resident of Sedgwick Street, to address the Committee on his objections to the proposed scheme. Mr Yates noted that Sedgwick street was one metre narrower than its neighbouring streets, which exaggerated the problems even further. He drew Members' attention to the alleyway that ran from Cavendish Road to Sedgwick Street which was currently used by cars as a shortcut to the car park behind Tesco, noting that the Highway Authority had not been able to control such practice, nor had it been able to prevent cars from driving through the current 'No Entry' signs to access the car park. Mr Yates also expressed concern that a safety analysis had not been conducted and alleged that Tesco had repeatedly violated regulations on delivery times, so should not be rewarded with further concessions.

The Committee received a written statement from Mrs Bev Nicholson objecting to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), which was circulated to Members and attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

Speaking as the local Member for Romsey, Councillor Dave Baigent spoke in support of the scheme, acknowledging that the problems that were being addressed had been ongoing for over ten years. He informed Members that the current route taken by delivery lorries had caused numerous instances of damage to parked vehicles, including one car being completely written off. A policy had since been introduced whereby after any kind of collision, delivery lorries were required to stop and wait for the police and owner to move the damaged vehicle before moving the lorry, a practice which often led to the road being completely blocked for over four hours. Councillor Baigent informed the Committee that a survey held two years ago had indicated that residents in the area wanted a change to the current system, with 35 of 41 responses supporting the scheme, although he acknowledged that there was no solution that pleased everyone. Councillor Baigent emphasised that Tesco had been approached to pay for the scheme and that the company had not proposed the scheme, while noting that the issue of Tesco's presence on Mill Road was not a question to be considered during the debate.

While discussing the report and objections to the TRO, Members:

- Alluded to the two polls, one of which largely supported the measure and the other largely opposed it. In considering the surveys, Members:
  - Expressed concern over an informal survey held two years ago being given precedence over the statutory consultation which had been held during the TRO process and which had received an overwhelming proportion of objections;
  - Questioned why the TRO consultation had been held if the results were only to be ignored in favour of an alternative survey;
  - Noted that it was not clear where those who had objected to the TRO lived, while it was evident that widespread support had been received from residents of both Sedgwick Street and Catherine Street in the informal survey;
  - Suggested that there had been problems with the survey website and that some residents had been unable to register their objections; and
  - Clarified that the consultation, as well as the survey, should not be considered as votes and that they were held to gather the opinions of local residents.
- Suggested that if smaller delivery vehicles were used, the TRO would not be necessary, which one Member suggested that Tesco had previously committed to doing. In response to a question by the Committee, officers noted that Tesco had confirmed they did not plan to use larger vehicles once the proposed changes were in place.
- Expressed serious concerns over the additional dangers to an already accident-prone road, noting that it endangered other vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Officers were averse to stating whether the Sedgwick Street and Mill Road junction would be more, less or equally dangerous, as they informed the Committee that it was difficult to make such assessments.
- Acknowledged the concerns over drivers continuing through the 'No Entry' signs but suggested that this did not present a reason to reject the scheme, with fines and penalty points providing a deterrent to drivers. Officers were asked to establish effective means of enforcing the signs.
- Argued that there were multiple reasons for the original rejection of the scheme in 2009, as opposed to those stated by the officer on page 15 of the report. It was

suggested that the advice from the Development Management team at the time, also on page 15, clearly stated that it was “not for the Highway Authority to modify the highway to suit the requirements of a private organisations”, with some Members remarking that nothing had changed in the intervening years, so there was no justification for reversing the decision.

- Noted that Tesco had been aware from the beginning of their planning stages of the potential delivery issues. One Member argued that reversing the original decision would serve to encourage businesses to persevere with rejected planning applications with the expectation of eventually achieving a positive decision.
- Observed that it would have been useful to have been provided with data regarding the frequency of deliveries.
- Sought clarification over whether the intricacies of the scheme would be picked up by satnav technology and it was suggested that this would be done within three to six months.
- Recognised that the Committee regularly received complaints regarding the lack of disabled parking bays and that removing one was therefore undesirable. It was noted that the bay was used by residents and non-residents, although an officer noted that it had been installed for use of a resident and that it was standard practice to remove bays when they were no longer used. The Committee was informed that a sign had been placed on the bay for three weeks announcing its potential removal and no objections had been received. It was drawn to Members’ attention that one of the two supporters of the scheme had voiced an objection to the removal of the disabled parking bay, despite supporting the rest of the scheme, claiming that he believed the space was occupied 90% of the time.

An amendment to recommendation a) was proposed by Councillor Manning, with the addition of “without the removal of the disabled parking bay”. Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

It was resolved to:

- a) Implement the proposals in Sedgwick Street as originally published with the additional signage at the end of Sedgwick Street; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

### **53. CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME AMENDMENTS IN COLERIDGE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report inviting it to consider the objections received in response to proposed amendments to the Residents Parking Scheme (RPS) in Coleridge Road, which was previously approved by the Committee on 24th July 2018. Members were informed that in order to minimise placing pedestrians and cyclists in danger on certain stretches of the road, there was a proposal to remove about 25 of the 75 parking places.

Speaking as the local Member for Coleridge and having declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a resident of a street off Coleridge Road, Councillor Rosy Moore

spoke in support of the changes, having noted that although it had proven to be a positive scheme, certain issues had arisen. Councillor Moore suggested that the “pinch points” mentioned in the report had encouraged reckless driving, endangering other road users, cyclists and pedestrians. Acknowledging that it was unfortunate that there would be less parking available, she stated that safety should be given priority in this case. Councillor Moore also drew the Committee’s attention to the issue of cars parking right up to the junction on side streets coming off Coleridge Road, especially Lichfield Road and Hobart Road, and asked for double yellow lines to be extended around the corners. She also requested that consideration be given to extend the parking periods to four hours before the scheduled review in one year.

In response to Councillor Moore’s comments, officers confirmed that it was not possible to extend the double yellow lines as they were limited to implement what was published. They also noted that other issues would be considered in the scheduled review and that the proposed changes had only been brought to the Committee due to local concerns.

While discussing the proposed changes, Members:

- Established that there would be no extra funding needed for the changes as they were considered a further part of the scheme, although it was noted that the Highways Infrastructure Committee had agreed to create a fund for solving issues that arose as a result of parking schemes, suggesting that it would be able to provide financial support if necessary. One Member noted that the fund was unable to provide financial assistance to equivalent schemes that had been in place for forty years, suggesting that such inconsistencies were unfair and counterintuitive.
- Expressed surprise that the use of chicanes had been recommended, given that they had been avoided in other projects.
- Queried why the problems had not been anticipated in the planning stages and whether similar issues were likely to arise in other schemes. Officers acknowledged the oversight in the design stage and suggested that the road’s role as a thoroughfare, compared to the residential role common to most other streets, had been underestimated.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Introduce the proposed amendments as shown on the drawing shown in Appendix 1 as published; and
- b) Inform the objectors accordingly.

Chairman  
16th July 2019

Dear Mrs Conlon,

**CJAC Public Question Response**

I write to respond to your questions regarding concerns over the Coleridge Road scheme. The response to your questions was relayed to the Committee at the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June and will be included in the minutes.

In relation to your specific points raised at CJAC -

1. *If it is council policy to stop pavement/road parking why are there so many streets in the Mill Road area allowing this? Eg. Argyle St where even a single person struggles to weave between cars parked on the pavement and bins. Pushchair and wheel chair uses are required to use the road.*

The permissive footway parking arrangements in roads, such as Argyle Street, were introduced some years ago and were in response to the extreme parking demands in those roads. The Council's policy is that we will not introduce any new schemes that allow footway parking, except in very exceptional circumstances. There is no justification for special treatment in Coleridge Road.

2. *Coleridge Road used to have cars parked on the pavement/road. Has there ever been a single case of a pedestrian being hindered?*

There is no documented evidence of pedestrians being hindered by cars parked on the footway in Coleridge Road. However, there are widespread concerns about the impact that footway parking has on pedestrians, wheelchair and pushchair users on many roads.

3. *Removing "pinch points" reduces the amount of potential parking but does nothing to address the problem of cyclists having to move out into the middle of the road to go around parked cars. This becomes very dangerous where there are single car parking spaces which require the cyclist to weave in and out.*

There have been reports that the current layout causes anxiety for cyclists where double-sided parking creates pinch-points. The proposed changes will address this and will also result in less single parking bays.

4. *What steps are being taken to allow work men to park near the houses they are working in? Houses which do not have drives will be unable to provide off road parking. Please explain why the council did not anticipate this being a problem.*

The Council recognises that residential parking schemes affect non-residents, such as tradespersons and other visitors. Hence, we provide a range of permits for these people, including a tradesperson permit that can be applied for by either the householder or person undertaking the work. In some cases, a tradesperson might be able to park their vehicle across their client's driveway, in which case no permit would be required

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Richard Robertson  
Chairman of CJAC

Written submission from Mrs Bev Nicolson

The proposed TRO regarding Sedgwick Street is a flawed one. It assumes that it is the responsibility of the Highways authority to provide supermarkets with the road environment to continue their business rather than the business themselves adapting to, and working with, things as they are.

When Tesco first moved into their Mill Road store in 2009, it was made abundantly clear what the constraints were over servicing it. Jon Finney wrote at the time:

"As Tesco's were fully aware of the constraints involved in servicing the existing A1 use of the premises the Highway Authority sees no reason to change any of the existing traffic regulation orders to accommodate the servicing arrangements of a commercial organisation. It is the responsibility of the occupier of the premises to service their operations in manner that is suitable for the existing situation and not for the Highway Authority to modify the highway to suit the requirements of a private organisation.

As you know the Highway Authority considers it perfectly possible for the premises to be serviced from the rear with smaller vehicles."

It is worth noting that there is no indication from the words used by Jon Finney that a different approach would be taken were the applicant themselves to pay for the TRO. Tesco therefore have a responsibility, as any supermarket does, to continue servicing this store in manner that is safe and meets the requirements of the location. Any idea they may have of using larger lorries would be dangerous and unwise on Mill Road, narrow as it is at many points. If this is not Tesco's plan, the applicant will not be alarmed by a suggestion that a weight limit is put in place, should councillors feel unable to refuse this application.

In Sidney Street, Sainsbury's are particularly constrained by the college wall in front of the loading bay entrance, and by the configuration of the loading bay itself so they are unable to use larger lorries. It has not hindered Sainsbury's from successfully servicing this store over many years.