



**West/Central Area Committee  
(City Councillors representing Castle, Market  
and Newnham Wards)  
20 October 2005 7:30pm – 9.35pm  
Minutes & Actions**

**Present:** Councillors: John Hipkin, Marie-Louise Holland, Simon Kightley (Castle Ward), Mike Dixon, Colin Rosenstiel, Joye Rosenstiel (Market Ward), Rod Cantrill, Sian Reid and Julie Smith (Newnham Ward)

**Also Present:** County Councillors Alex Reid (Newnham Ward) and David White (Castle Ward)

Additional information for public: City Council officers can also be emailed [firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk)  
The Committee Manager for West/Central Area Committee is [liz.whitcher@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:liz.whitcher@cambridge.gov.uk)

Members of the City Council have individual email addresses which are listed on the City Council website:  
[www.cambridge.gov.uk/councillors/members.htm](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/councillors/members.htm)  
Members of the County Council can be emailed:  
Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

**05/37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from and County Councillor Gaynor Griffiths. Councillor Holland sent apologies for a late arrival.

**05/38 OPEN FORUM**

This was an Open Forum with a special theme – minor cycle schemes in the area and issues to do with cycling. The Chair introduced Dave Bradford, Cycling & Walking Promotion Officer, Clare Rankin, Cycling & Walking Development Officer and James Woodburn of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

Dave Bradford gave a brief introduction referring to a sheet giving information about minor cycleway schemes and a leaflet about changes to cycling in the historic city centre pedestrian zone which he had handed out. There was also a map pinned up to help identify cycle routes.

The focus was on small local schemes (in contrast to large strategic schemes) that could have a significant effect on cycling in the area. The City Council has a budget of £15,000 to spend on these. Residents and councillors were invited to make suggestions.

Dave Bradford explained that all suggestions would be assessed against one of four criteria and then prioritised by the Cambridge Cycle Liaison Group (consisting of County and City Council Officer and representatives from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and pedestrian and disability groups) which meets on a quarterly basis.

Members of the public and councillors asked questions and raised issues – please see the attached Summary Sheet for details of these and the responses given.

#### **05/39 MINUTES AND ACTION SHEETS**

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 August 2005 were agreed as a correct record.

#### **05/40 MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

#### **05/41 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Code of Conduct personal interests in Planning Applications were declared as follows:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Nature of interest</b>
Hipkin	05/0862/FUL	Knows the applicant as a constituent.
Kightley	05/0862/FUL	Had made the request for the application to be considered at committee but had not fettered his discretion.

Code of Conduct (personal and prejudicial) interests in Planning Applications were declared as follows. The Councillor indicated left the room, took no part in the discussion and did not vote on the item.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Nature of interest</b>
Dixon	05/0862/FUL	The wife of the applicant is a close personal friend of his family.

**05/42 UPDATE ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME (EIP)**

The Landscape Architect introduced the report. She explained that the total cost of the Elizabeth Way project was £16,000, half of which would come out of this Committee's budget and the rest from East Area Committee. She gave more information about recommendation 2.3, the Windsor Road proposal. As the period of consultation with local residents did not close until 28 October, so the results would be presented at the meeting in December. The picture so far was that residents were broadly in favour of what was proposed but had different priorities. She explained that this was a complicated scheme.

She then responded to questions from councillors who were concerned that at the proposal that the EIP budget be used as some elements of the proposal did not conform with the criteria for EIP budgets. There were other highways and safety budgets, particularly in the County Council as the highway authority.

The Landscape Architect explained that County Council budgets were prioritised by the County and the prioritisation system was based on accident ratings. It would thus be extremely unlikely for these ideas to get high priority from the County Council.

The Landscape Architect explained that there was a modest City Council budget for traffic calming projects under the City's Environmental Traffic Calming Programme. [After the meeting it was confirmed that this programme had the Kendal Way Area as its current priority and the proposals for this were currently being formally advertised].

She added that, although some elements were entirely about traffic management, and for which she would be looking for other funding sources, there was a balance between improvements to the environment and traffic calming. She gave Akeman Street as an example of vegetated 'build outs' which greatly improved the amenity of the street as well as calmed the traffic, and therefore thought that, although there was a balance, that certain parts of the proposed scheme did meet with the criteria for Environmental Improvements.

Councillor C Rosenstiel explained further that the City Council's budget for traffic calming schemes was there to improve the environmental aspects while the County Council put the emphasis on safety. He said he would support using some of the City Council budget for a modest scheme and would support further exploration

as outlined in the recommendation.

The Chair said that a large part of the scheme was visual improvement and he asked for views on the scheme from several residents from the Windsor Road area who were present.

The residents thought that visual improvement was important and that in winter the road was very muddy at present. They also emphasised that a large number of vehicles used the road especially at peak times such as 8-9am.

Councillors Hipkin and Reid then focused on the elements of the proposed scheme that did not easily fit the criteria for an EIP grant. These were the marked area for parents and children to cross the road and possibly the table top.

The Landscape Architect agreed and was seeking other sources of funding for these.

Councillors J Smith and Dixon were in favour of continuing to investigate funding from other budgets as there were not enough funds in this committee's budget for the whole scheme.

Councillor C Rosenstiel emphasised that if there were insufficient concerns about safety that the appropriate budget was one of the City Councils and not the County Council.

The residents had one other request, which was that consideration be given to making Windsor Road, Richmond Road and Oxford Road 20mph zones.

The Committee voted on the recommendations in the officer report:

**2.1 Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to approve the resurfacing of the cut through between Marlowe Road and Millington Road at a likely cost of £4000.

**2.2 Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to approve the removal of overgrown shrubs in the Elizabeth Way underpass and replacement with low growing varieties if East Area meets 50% of the costs (a cost of £8,000 to each of these two committees).

**2.3 Resolved** (by 9 votes to 0) to approve officers proceeding with the investigation of the Windsor Road proposal, and bring back the results of the initial consultation to committee for decision, which, if any, element of the scheme should be prioritised for funding and worked up in more detail.

**2.4 Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to replace an existing blue bin with a black bin at a cost of £590 at the Newnham Road bus stop.

The Committee then considered progress on various schemes mentioned in the report which had already been approved.

### **Willow Walk**

A question about the grant of £2000 given to the residents of

Willow Walk had been posed by a resident who was not able to be present. The resident was concerned over the probity of using public money to maintain a private asset. He had asked at a previous meeting if the public were securing or had a secured right of way on this private road which might in some way justify the expenditure. He wished to ask again what regulation permitted this expenditure and how do Cambridge taxpayers benefit?

The Committee was confident that the proper authority was in place and it was agreed that the Landscape Architect and the Committee Manager would reply to the resident.

### **Market Square**

The Chair asked the Director of Environment & Planning to explain about the lack of funding for improvement to the Market Square.

The Director explained that a report related to this issue was going to the Leader of the Council for consideration at the November meeting of Strategy Scrutiny Committee. The development of the city centre of which the Market Square was a part was linked to the Grand Arcade development and had considerable budget implications.

### **Grantchester Meadows Fencing**

County Councillor Alex Reid asked whether it were not more appropriate to ask the landlord to contribute half the cost of £4000 for the replacing the fence which was indeed dilapidated and old.

After considerable discussion, the Chair proposed an additional recommendation which the committee voted on as follows:

Action:  
Landscape  
Architect

**Resolved** (by 5 votes to 1) that the Landscape Architect will approach the owner(s) and ask what remedial action they are prepared to undertake and would they be prepared to co-operate with the City Council in any environmental improvement.

### **Signage**

Action:  
Cllr S Reid

Councillor S Reid confirmed that she was continuing to pursue the matter and was in discussions with the Director of Finance as to the best way forward.

### **Lammas Land**

The Landscape Architect explained the context of waiting to see whether funds for tidying up the hut could be linked to the refurbishment of the toilets.

Cllr. Reid thought this was an inappropriate use of the Environment budgets which should be focussed on the toilets, not the hut which is some distance away.

Councillors were concerned at the delay as the hut is rather

dilapidated and has a rather open-sided structure.

Action:  
Landscape  
Architect

The Chair asked that remedial action be taken by the appropriate City Council department.

## **05/43 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Planning Officer introduced the report and gave the Committee updated information which had been circulated on the Amendment Sheet. This included the email from Councillor Kightley which had been omitted from the report. She also said that a late representation had been received on behalf of Honey Hill Mews (1990) Ltd who manage the land to the rear of St Peters Street. They thought that the proposed development was non-essential, that car parking would be reduced, that the development would overhang their property and that drainage from the roof gutter was required.

**Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to approve the development contrary to the officer's recommendation. The reason for approval given; that the development would not harm or detract from the character of the Conservation Area and therefore the proposal is not contrary to Policies BE2, BE4, BE8 or BE32 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996) and Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003). Conditions to be applied for garage and extension to be used in connection with the main house and not as separate residential, and standard time restriction in which to implement permission.

The meeting ended at 9.35pm.

**Chair**