



**West/Central Area Committee
(City Councillors representing Castle, Market
and Newnham Wards)
18 January 2007 7:30pm – 10.30pm
Minutes & Actions**

Present: Councillors: John Hipkin, Marie-Louise Holland, Simon Kightley (Castle Ward), Mike Dixon and Joye Rosenstiel (Market Ward), Rod Cantrill, Sian Reid and Julie Smith (Newnham Ward)
County Councillors: David White (Castle), Gaynor Griffiths (Market) and Alex Reid (Newnham)

Additional information for public: City Council officers can also be emailed firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk
The Committee Manager for West/Central Area Committee is 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
Members of the County Council can be emailed:
Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

07/01 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Colin Rosenstiel.

07/02 OPEN FORUM

Action by

The Chair apologised that County Councillor Reynolds, portfolio holder at the County Council for Environment and Community Services was not able to be present. He then introduced Graham Lowe, Cambridge Project Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council who was present to answer questions from residents some of which had been raised at the previous meeting and others which had been submitted in advance of this meeting. It was agreed at the end of the Forum that questions submitted by residents for which there was not time to reply in the meeting would be responded to by email or letter after the meeting. These are also included below for completeness.

Redundant Street Signage Raised at the meeting on 23

November 2006:

From Resident 1:

1. Promote discussion about redundant and new signage in the Newnham area.

She circulated some photographs to show how there seemed to have been an increase in the number of signs and that some were not appropriate to the environment in which they stood eg those on the Coton footpath.

Graham Lowe (GL): Redundant signage is a large problem for which there is an on-going programme of removal. So far Barton Road and Fen Causeway have been completed. As regards new signs, most are required by law. However, it would be good to consult residents about those which are discretionary.

Footpaths and the DDA Raised at the meeting on 23 November 2006

Resident 2. Were there any plans to widen the footpaths or bridges such as the two on the fen to the north of Fen Causeway which would lead cyclists to take advantage to the detriment of pedestrians. It was time to think of protecting pedestrians. She was in favour of the use of cycles over cars but the shared use of pavements and paths by cyclists and pedestrians did cause problems. Many cyclists disregarded the dismount signs.

GL: On footpaths where part of the route is shared by both pedestrians and cyclists, there is clearly a conflict of interest. The council is tasked with encouraging cycling where possible and sometimes this means shared use as is the case on Parker's Piece.

Highway surface and drainage

From Resident 3 (Market Ward) and also raised last time under the Environmental Improvements item:

Following the subsidence of the stone block paving at Magdalene Bridge, it took many months for remedial work to be carried out. Similar problems have arisen elsewhere in the city where granite setts (cobble) and brick paving have been laid (often on a sand

bed) - for instance: at Four Lamps roundabout and in Sidney Street. It appears that this type of surfacing is EITHER intrinsically inadequate to stand up to the density and weight of Cambridge traffic OR that the specification, construction and/or supervision of the work was faulty.

What action is the county council taking to remedy such matters and to prevent their recurrence?

GL: The street leading to Magdalene Bridge is very busy and so there are limited periods of time when it can be closed to effect repairs. Modern materials recommended for this situation had been used but had been unsuccessful. Consideration was still being given to how to do the necessary remedial work.

From Resident 4, Newnham

Drainage in Eltisley Avenue: because the road drains are never cleaned, many are blocked up; in consequence the road and footpath floods during and after heavy rain because the rainwater cannot escape. Whose responsibility is it to clean these drains and why aren't they kept clear? (I can provide a photograph if this would help).

GL: This had been forwarded to the relevant officer at the County Council but no reply received yet.

Lighting

From Resident 3, Market

In Lower Park Street a lighting column was partially knocked over and damaged by a lorry some twelve months ago. A warning notice DANGER - ELECTRIC SHOCK RISK was affixed. After a number of requests, a replacement column was erected about five months ago but has not been connected. The damaged column, which is located about 10 metres from the main gate of Park Street Primary School, is still 'live'. Officers blame the delay on the County Council's contractors, Messrs EDF.

What action can be taken to rectify this long standing problem?

GL: The relevant officer at the County Council had not yet replied. However, EDF were not the County Council's contractor; they are the main electricity supplier and the work has to be carried out by them.

From Resident 3, Market

In Jesus Lane near Wesley Theological College an illuminated bollard was knocked over and the light no longer functions. This, too, is a long standing problem.

Does any mechanism exist for getting this type of urgent repair carried out?

From Resident 3, Market

Do the city rangers make reports of such defects and, if so, does the county council highways department take any notice of them?

Enforcement of traffic regulations

From Resident 5, Newnham, and also raised at the 23 November meeting

Had there been any progress in stopping speeding motorists entering/ leaving the city on the A603? She had talked to the ward councillors about this some time ago including the possibility of a flashing 30mph sign being installed.

GL: This is a matter for the police to enforce. The effect on speeding motorists of flashing 30mph signs is limited. A better approach is to contact the police with a formal request for additional enforcement to be carried out in the area.

Councillor Smith: Thought the 30mph flashing sign was more positive than speed cameras and was more likely to make people act responsibly.

Police Community Support Officer: Yes, people are stopped and given £30 fixed penalty notices.

From Resident 3, Market

According to the road signs, traffic in St John's Street/Trinity Street, Market Street and Sidney Street is supposed to be 'one-way'.

Many cyclists appear to ignore these signs and cycle against the flow of motor vehicles, weaving on and off the pavements to the danger and alarm of pedestrians.

Does the county council have any policy regarding the enforcement of this one-way system?

Councillor Dixon: The no entry sign is very small.

GL: Cyclists contravening the traffic signs is a matter for the police.

Bus services

From Resident 6 on behalf of the Windsor Road Working Group (WIRE) Castle

If buses in Huntingdon Road are to be re-routed through the new University Site in NW Cambridge, what effect will that have on bus services in Huntingdon Road itself?

GL: There will be substantial growth in bus provision and use when the new developments come on stream.

From Resident 7, Newnham, via Cllr Julie Smith

What steps are being taken to provide a genuine 'bus SERVICE for those of us who live in this part of Cambridge (Barton Road, Gough Way and Newnham Croft). It is galling to hear from residents along the Huntingdon Road what an excellent service they have to get them into and out of town. The same goes for residents on the East and South sides of the city. Why are we - heavily taxed citizens - so discriminated against?

From Resident 5 on behalf of the Windsor Road Working Group (WIRE) Castle

When the guided bus starts entering Cambridge via Histon Road, how will it cope with the congestion at the Victoria Road end during

the busy time of the morning? and what will be the effect of the guided bus on the present Citi 7 service in Histon Road?

GL: Electronic means are used to give buses priority already and the guided bus will become part of that system.

Parking

From Resident 4 (Newnham)

Parking in Newnham: Barton Road must be the only major radial road into Cambridge that has no parking restrictions on it. This results in nose to tail parking on both sides of the road every day (except Sunday). As a consequence it is dangerously narrowed to the extent where 2 buses cannot pass one another. Why are there no restrictions?

GL: If there were residents' parking on Barton Road this would displace cars elsewhere. Would be reluctant to consider this separately.

Resident: Thought the policy was to keep private cars out as far as possible or even keep them out of the city altogether. There was consultation less than a year ago.

Councillor Cantrill: In 2005, Ward Councillors became concerned about the Croft and Barton Road. For example, there was one occasion when an ambulance could not get through to reach a patient. They approached Graham Lowe then and residents were asked to comment about changes to the existing arrangements. The majority wanted the current arrangements to continue and especially to be able to park for the shops. However, sympathise with the problems of Barton Road due to the volume of parked vehicles.

Resident: The on-street parking makes the road dangerous and then cyclists cycle on the pavements for their safety. Have to have room for cyclists on the road.

Resident: There were 20 spaces available this evening. So people park here to go into town. If there were double yellow lines, people would simply park illegally. Why can the issue of parking for the shops not be adequately addressed.

GL: It is not policy to exclude community parking. The County Council is currently reviewing the parking policy for the whole city. Parking for the shops was part of the consultation originally.

From Resident 4, Newnham

Parking in Newnham, south from Barton Road to Grantchester Meadows: Why is this not subject to Residents' Parking Restrictions? I understand that in the past this has been objected to because of the problems that would be caused to local traders but surely this could be overcome by a small degree of "waiting limited" areas? My family has lived in Eltisley Avenue since 1926, but for the last 6 months I have been living in Brunswick whilst our

house has been refurbished. In Brunswick we have Residents Parking which seems to work admirably - £50 - £60 for a year's permit is not unreasonable, nor is £1 per day for visitors. If the problem is not tackled then the whole area will become more grid locked than it is. There have already been problems with emergency vehicles getting through - how long will it be before this happens again with the likely consequence of a fatality?

GL: There was a consultation with residents 7 years ago which those involved on both sides still remember! Would need a clear mandate to re-consult.

From Resident 8 of Millington Road Residents Association
Newnham

I would like to ask a question about the parking of mini vans (workers on the Grand Arcade) on Barton Road as I feel that alternative provision should be made for these vans. I would also like to ask about the length of double yellow lines in Millington Road as it appears that before resurfacing the double yellows were longer.

GL: The main contractor for the Grand Arcade development has made arrangements for workers to use Park and Ride. There are other developments in the city centre. These vans are not parked illegally.

Traffic congestion

From Resident 9: Newnham

Is there ever going to be the possibility of a Park & Ride provision to relieve the pressure on the Barton Road which is getting worse and worse, especially during school term time.

**Cllr A
Reid**

GL: No answer received yet from the appropriate officer.
County Councillor A Reid: Would be glad to look into that issue. The Park and Ride buses need to get to the city centre more quickly than the car otherwise people will not use them.

Resident: The congestion is worse at rush hour in term time. Would it not be possible to arrange for school buses which would also lead to less pollution.

Environmental/green Issues

From Resident 9, Newnham

What plans, if any, there are to make LPG available in Cambridge garages and to switch public transport to using LPG.

Councillor S Reid: The City Council's own vehicles run on LPG. There are also plans to provide power points in the Queen Anne car park to power up electric cars and in Park Street car park to power up electric bikes.

Councillor J Rosenstiel: People are parking on Sundays on the double yellow lines near the junction of Paradise Street and City

Road which could cause problems for emergency vehicle access.

GL: The Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee on Monday 22 January will have a report considering the review of parking policies and some of these issues will be considered there.

Additional questions received that there was no time to deal with in the meeting and the answers sent by email/letter in reply from County Council and City Council officers:

From Resident 10

Big problem at St John's College School with parents parking on the cycle lanes. Can the Councils make it possible for the Local Authority Parking Enforcement attendants to enforce the traffic rules.

GL: At present parking attendants are not able to enforce parking in cycle lanes although this is likely to change in the future. Currently only the Police are able to enforce cycle lane offences. We could install double yellow lines within the lane as these still legally exist which would enable parking attendants to enforce, however the Cambridge Cycle Campaign have consistently objected to us doing this.

In the meantime I have forwarded this to the Police asking them if they could give this area some attention if resources permit.

From Resident 11

- 1) Does the County Council pay any attention to the negative visual impact of all the signs it puts up in the city centre – or does it just clutter up the streetscape without thinking?
- 2) Last April the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee decided that the blue signs showing 'Quayside' 'Queens' and other zones should be removed. Why are they still there?

GL: The County Council is particularly concerned at the impact that signing can have on the visual impact of the streetscape, but also finds that it is under intense pressure to erect signs on a regular basis.

In resolving to remove the blue panel signs the Area Joint Committee also recognised that there was no source of funding to do so.

Questions from Resident 12

1. Buses in Sidgwick Avenue: I understand that the Council has no authority to determine routes for public service buses. However, this does not change the fact that Sidgwick Avenue is just too narrow for double deck buses, even without the current width restriction due to the building work at Newnham. Alongside the parked cars and the building work, there is not even enough

room for a cyclist to safely pass any of the tourist buses. Can the Council therefore not make Sidgwick Avenue a one way route?

2. The traffic lights in Cambridge are, by and large, set to give priority to vehicular traffic over pedestrians and cyclists. If the Councils are serious about getting people out of their cars, the situation should be reversed. I have been told that traffic gets priority to reduce atmospheric pollution. The situation at Queens Road-Burrell's Walk demonstrates the absurdity of the argument. Even when Queens Road is full of near stationary traffic, pedestrians are still kept waiting for minutes at a time - in rain, wind, and the occasional shine. At quiet times, even when there is negligible traffic, pedestrians and cyclists are still kept waiting for much the same time following the activation of the pedestrian sensor, even if the lights have been in favour of motor vehicles for five minutes or more.

What are the statutory requirements (timing, regulation numbers, etc.)?

3. During the work on the gas mains at the north end of Grange Road, the traffic lights at the junction with Adams Road were switched off. Since they have been reactivated, the priorities and timing are completely different from those prevailing before "the switch-off". Pedestrian and foot traffic using Adams Road and Burrell's walk have become third class citizens. Yesterday, from the time that I pressed the relevant button, I had to wait for 75 seconds for the pedestrian "green man" to appear. During that time, two vehicles and one cyclist went along Grange Road and one car drove out of Adams Road.

Questions:

1. Why are the priorities of these lights now different?
2. When can the old priorities be reinstated?

Drew Wallace, Traffic Signal Team Leader, County Council:
Many traffic signals in Cambridge are installed to provide both cyclist and pedestrian facilities and to reduce accidents to all road users including those aforementioned.

They are generally set to try and provide balanced timings to all users of the facility. Vehicles, like pedestrians have to wait for their 'turn' in the signal sequence. Sensors detecting vehicles and push buttons for pedestrians detect the requirements and absences of each and the signals can respond accordingly. It is difficult to find a balance that satisfies all road users.

At Grange Road/Adams Road one of the sensors was damaged by the works and did lead to the signals not responding as efficiently as they should. This has now been repaired. I apologise for the inconvenience this caused.

4. When will the posted revised double yellow lines on Adams Road at its junction with Grange Road be "painted"?

GL: The funding we have for these measures has been frozen and fully committed for this financial year. It is not clear if funding will be available next financial year.

5. Why is so much money being spent on unnecessary signing around Cambridge?

1. The signs on the upgraded cycle path from the end of Adams Road to the Cavendish site, including the utterly absurd one at the western end that states "End" where the path meets Wilberforce Road, the repeated advice that pedestrians walk along pavements and cyclists ride along the cycle path - except at the junctions/entrances where pedestrians and cyclists share the tarmac.

2. Signing of cycle routes around the city, particularly those that would send a cyclist on unnecessarily long and less safe routes (eg from the junction of Adams Road and Grange Road, go down Grange Road to get to the railway station).

John Isherwood, Engineering Client Officer, City Council:
The signing referred to in 5 (1) is that required by national legislation for a route which is partially segregated and partially unsegregated.

The direction signing to which you refer in 5 (2) is part of a City-wide network which was developed after consultation with many stakeholders and which represents, as far as is practicable, the optimum routes for all categories of cyclists.

From Resident 13

Residents' Parking: Is there a regulation which indicates whether "visitors permits" can be used by residents for parking their own car? As a Park Street resident I am concerned that residents in a new, supposedly "car-free" development may be able to park their cars (at a cost of £365pa) by using visitors' permits.

GL: Visitors Parking permits are for the use of residents to provide a facility for their personal visitors. Hence use by the resident for their own vehicle would contravene the Traffic Regulation Order. You will appreciate that enforcement of this is difficult but should you suspect that this is occurring you should report this to the City Council as the County Council's agents for permit issue and on street enforcement.

From Resident 14

I am concerned about the threat to the 199 bus service, and I would like to know why this service has been potentially targeted for reduction and also to understand the criteria to be used for assessment of this service when it comes to decision making.

Paul Nelson, Public Transport Manager at the County Council:
We have approached the selection of services to review on the

following basis

- * Services that contribute less towards ensuring rural access to public transport will be targeted before those that do more.
- * Services that provide poorer value for money (measured by cost per passenger journey) will be targeted before those that provide better value.
- * Services used by fewer people will be targeted before those used by many.
- * Where possible, economies by adjusting timetables or routes will be sought before deciding to completely remove a service.

The above assessment criteria have already led to a ranking of services under consideration. This ranking will be reviewed following analysis of responses received during the consultation period. The final decision about how many services are changed will depend on available resources when the budget is finalised.

From Resident 3

Why have no provisions been made for a temporary City Library (eg in the Old Library area behind the Guildhall) as access to the remaining libraries for Newnham residents is difficult in the extreme.

From Michael Wyatt, Service Manager, Central Library: We did, in fact, look closely at the possibility of occupying alternative premises in the centre of the city, including space in the Guildhall. We also had discussions with Property colleagues as to the availability and cost of retail units. However, as you know, the County Council has to contend with particularly low levels of funding to cope with providing services in an expensive part of the country - and it was hard pressed to identify the capital required for the new building. With no extra funds, therefore, and in a place like Cambridge, where space is at a premium and rents are prohibitive, we did not expect to be able to provide a substantial central interim library service, and this proved to be the case. In the end we abandoned our attempt to secure an alternative central location, in favour of the more realistic option of providing services from the branch libraries in Cambridge.

By extending the opening hours in these libraries we have ensured that services are available at least as many hours in the week as they have been at the Central Library, and indeed, Sunday opening at Milton Road Library will extend them. We also have a small amount of spare capacity in our mobile library fleet, which we plan to use to augment this provision. We have been negotiating with the traffic management authorities with a view to parking a mobile library in the Market Place on one or two days a week, and adjustment in mobile library routes around the city may enable us to meet some of the demand from parts of Cambridge that are most distant from existing library service points. We should be able to confirm these arrangements within a few weeks.

The coming year will pose real challenges in providing a library service for the city. There is no point in pretending the arrangements we have made can fully replace the provision of a large Central Library, but they will go a some way to doing so, and we do believe the services and facilities that the new Central Library will offer will more than justify the current inconveniences.

The Chair thanked Graham Lowe.

The Committee agreed to ask County Councillor Reynolds to come to a future meeting.

07/03 HISTORIC CORE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL – DEFERRED

07/04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Prejudicial Code of Conduct interests in Planning Applications were declared as follows. The Councillors indicated left the room, took no part in the discussion and did not vote on the application referred to.

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest
Hipkin	06/1214/FUL	Home is within statutory consultation area
Holland	06/1214/FUL	Home is within statutory consultation area

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

Councillor	Application	Nature of interest
Cantrill	06/0882/FUL	Approached for information about previous decisions
Dixon	06/0882/FUL 06/1214/FUL 06/1318/FUL	Visited all three sites and spoke to objectors
Reid	06/0882/FUL 06/1318/FUL	Has friends and acquaintances among the objectors
J Rosenstiel	06/0882/FUL	Knows 2 residents in Hedgerley Close
Smith	06/1214/FUL	Acquainted with residents

07/05 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2006 were amended as follows (amendments in bold and strikethrough): On page 3 “ Councillor Smith added that one **had already been could be** put in the open space of Jesus Green as the area did belong to the council” and then agreed as a correct record.

07/06 MATTERS ARISING

None

07/07 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those which the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up.

These minutes should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown in the minutes.

- 1 **APPLICATION NO:** 06/0882/FUL
SITE: 1 Hedgerley Close (Newnham)
PROPOSAL: Erection of three storey apartment building with 9no units and creation of new site access
RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions and satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 15 February 2007
APPLICANT: Hill Residential Ltd, The Mill Building, Harston Mill
PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Mr R Bamber (for local residents); Mr C Brown (for the applicant)
REASONS FOR REFUSAL RAISED IN DEBATE:
In discussion some members said they were minded to vote against approving the application on the grounds that it did not fit the character of Hedgerley Close, that it was too close to number 2 Hedgerley Close and would have an adverse impact on these neighbours, that it was overdevelopment and would dominate because of its height and bulk and did not respect the site by being too close to the eastern edge of the site. Relevant policies were 3/ 4, 3/12a, 3/10, 3/7 and 3/8.
DECISION: Refused against officer recommendation (by 8 votes to 0) for reasons to be drawn up by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Chair based on the above reasons for refusal raised during debate of the application.
In the event that an appeal is lodged against this decision to refuse this application, to authorise the Head of Development Services to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.

2 APPLICATION NO: 06/1318/FUL
SITE: 27 Madingley Road (Newnham)
PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey dwelling, and alteration to existing dwelling.
RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions and satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 January 2007
APPLICANT: Ian Collins, 27 Madingley Road
PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Ms S Bishop and Mr Hillman (residents objecting); Mr M Bowles (for the applicant).
DECISION: **Approved** (by 7 votes to 0) subject to the conditions and the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 January 2007.

3 APPLICATION NO: 06/1214/FUL
SITE: 25 Oxford Road (Castle)
PROPOSAL: Conversion of offices to 3 dwellings and retention of 1 dwelling.
RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions and satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 28 February 2007
APPLICANT: Cambridge Commercial Supplies Ltd, Fao Mr A Eccles, 16 Tollhouse Way, Wombourne, Staffordshire
PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Dr C Cockcroft (for local residents objecting)
REASONS FOR REFUSAL RAISED IN DEBATE:
In discussion some members said they were minded to vote against approving the application on the grounds that there would be lack of amenity for both existing and prospective residents, that it was an over-development of the site and there were problems with providing off road parking spaces for the number of residential units proposed. This would increase pressures on existing on street parking already exacerbated by displacement from the nearby resident's parking scheme. Relevant policies were 3/ 4, 3/10a, 3/10b and 3/7a.
DECISION: Refused against officer recommendation (by 5 votes to 0) for reasons to be drawn up by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Chair based on the above reasons for refusal raised during debate of the application.
In the event that an appeal is lodged against this decision to refuse this application, to authorise the Head of Development Services to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.

The meeting ended at 10.30pm.

Chair