

HURST PARK ESTATE RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION

Minutes from meeting held on Wednesday 6th January 2016, 7 pm
The Church of the Good Shepherd, Mansel Way, Cambridge

Meeting led by Michael Page and John Beasley
Guest speaker – Edward Leigh

1. Welcome from the Vicar of the Church of the Good Shepherd and Highworth Avenue resident, David Maher who introduced Michael Page (acting Chair) and John Beasley (acting vice-Chair).
Michael thanked David for the use of the church for the meeting and also introduced acting committee members Mary Pountain – Leys Road, and Richard Cushing – Highworth Avenue. He also thanked Luke Tunmer – Highworth Avenue (who established a website for the association in 24 hours) and Louisa Kelly – Leys Avenue for their valuable assistance. Michael paid tribute to Barbara Taylor of Milton Road whose dogged determination in forming the MRRA had inspired him and others to move ahead in the formation of this association.
2. The purpose of the meeting was:
 - a. To establish a forum for discussion by local residents with a view to maintaining and looking after the area for now and for future residents.
 - b. To raise awareness of the City Deal.
 - c. To formulate and collect views to produce a written response.
 - d. To provide residents with a toolkit for producing individual responses.
 - e. To seek assent to form a constitution.
3. The Greater Cambridge City Deal – Edward Leigh, Leader of the Smarter Cambridge Transport
Edward Leigh gave a presentation outlining:
 - a. The value of the City Deal.
 - b. The consultation process with key dates.
 - c. The challenge the proposed changes hope to address.
 - d. An overview of the current proposals.
 - e. Issues with the current proposals.
 - f. Smarter Cambridge Transport's alternative proposals.
4. Critical issues facing residents of the Hurst Park Estate – John Beasley presented an overview of the critical issues including:
 - a. An overview of the proposed lay out of Milton Road.
 - b. A view of the potential rat runs issue faced by the Hurst Park Avenue estate and the implications.
 - c. Details of a proposed Arbury Road cycle route that would impact Leys Avenue and adjoining roads.
5. Open Forum – suggestions and concerns were raised from residents from the Hurst Park Avenue estate
 - a. Mulberry Close - How many buses currently use Milton Road? The proposal would cause considerable disruption for not many buses.

Congestions in to the city is linked to rush hour traffic. A suggestion was made for a tidal lane to address traffic.

- b. Highfield Avenue - Also suggested a tidal lane with buses using the middle lane at rush hour times and traffic lights to be installed at bus stops. Suggested putting bollards in Leys Road or Orchard Avenue and Highfield Avenue to divide the estate and prevent rat runs.
- c. Highworth Avenue - A tidal approach could be considered with buses using an outer lane at rush hour times with lights indicating traffic flow. Access to Highworth Avenue would be extremely difficult with the suggested bollards and therefore this would not work if access to Highworth Avenue was closed from Milton Road as per the proposed changes. Also mention potential congestion with two sets of traffic lights close together on Milton Road. It was also noted that traffic historically improves when the existing traffic lights on Milton Road are broken.
- d. Mulberry Close - We need a proper and cohesive transport approach for whole city. Traffic lights use energy and cause pollution. Roundabouts keep traffic moving. We need buses that stop and bus stops, believes tidal route is a good idea. We should take inspiration from Milton Keynes, Peterborough, free buses in Athens and registered cars only in Bologna. Concerned that stand up concrete separation for cyclists will affect drive access for residents of Milton Road.
- e. Milton Road - Believes plans have not been properly considered by Councillors prior to going to consultation. Focus should be on ensuring that the new station and Northstowe have correct links and facilities and businesses are encouraged to locate close to those areas rather than city centre. Should be lobbying existing Councillors and make them aware that this will be an issue in the forthcoming May elections.
- f. Mulberry Close - Concerned regarding the legal access to route cyclists down Mulberry Road if the road has not been adopted. This could be a hazard to the children playing on the green when they cross the road. A recent Mitcham's corner meeting did not consider the possible impact from the new station. Milton Road park and ride will need to be increased to handle the new station traffic. Would dispute the number of buses using Milton Road, believes this is a higher number than earlier mentioned. The Northstowe house building has not currently commenced.
- g. Dalegarth flats - Concerned regarding the rat run issues. Invites Councillors to meet at the bottom of Hurst Park Avenue to view the existing congestion caused by commuter parking. The exit from Dalegarth driveway can be a death trap. Currently very dangerous and there isn't space for more rat running.
- h. Leys Avenue - The implications of the rat run issue have not been considered by the proposers of the current plans. Suggestion to have volunteers with clip boards on the streets working out the current rat run usage or perform this by more technical means to be able to provide key usage figures to present to the Council regarding traffic on the estate. Does anyone know of an automatic way of collecting this data?

- i. Highfield Avenue - Raised the safety issue of parking and rat run usage on Hurst Park Avenue and believes this is due to a parking charge being levied at the park and ride. Previously requested information from the traffic count that was carried out several years ago on the estate and received no response. Could we obtain these statistics and replicate the count again to see if traffic has increased?
 - j. Leys Road - Concerned that the new station should have a new bus station at the same location (a hub). Would like evidence on where people will be travelling to from the new station.
 - k. Ascham Road - We should be informing our Councillors our thoughts regarding the proposal. Could we get some experiments done? Create a temporary rat run and look at the impact.
 - l. Councillor Damien Tunnacliffe - The proposed plans are initial options, most of which need to be revised. The ideas from the associations are genuinely welcome and it is a collective effort to find ways to move people through Cambridge. We need to have better bus access but not to sacrifice the well-being of the environment.
 - m. Michael Page - Proposers of plans have not considered the community effect.
 - n. A congestion charge was suggested.
 - o. MRRRA will have details of the city Councillors and Council meetings and residents were urged to lobby their Councillors and attend the Council meetings.
6. The view from Smarter Cambridge Transport - a presentation was given by Edward Leigh on Smarter Cambridge Transport's response to the proposed plans.
- a. The challenge is the growing demand to access the city.
 - b. The desire is to incentivise more people to use an alternative to driving, we need to make driving less attractive.
 - c. There is a need to reduce pollution. The centre of the city is currently experiencing pollution above the European Standard level. An application for a grant by Stagecoach could mean that all buses will be hybrid and therefore greener.
 - d. The plan should preserve and enhance the streetscape and provide an environment for all in Cambridge.
 - e. The number 1 priority of the proposed plan is to build bus lanes and bus ways on radial routes. The proposed width of Milton Road is too large. There will be an expected number of 45 buses an hour at peak time (currently slightly less).
 - f. Research has shown that bus lanes only marginally improve journey times. This is usually due to a bus lane only being used for a small part of the journey. Bus lanes are very expensive to create and build (cost of purchase of the land).
 - g. We should be promoting a world class cycling infrastructure. We should create segregated cycling, not mix with pedestrians, including through the junctions. Current cycling in Cambridge is very disconnected and existing junctions are very dangerous.

- h. Building more bus lanes creates more capacity for more vehicles which will create more congestion in the centre of Cambridge where routes cannot be widened. This will also worsen pollution levels.
- i. Greenery and trees will be lost by the creation of bus lanes.
- j. The community will be divided by a 6 lane highway.
- k. By leaving things as they are congestion may cause people to find their own alternative modes of transport.
- l. Congestion charging is a possible way of dealing with congestion; this would mean residents would also pay a congestion charge.
- m. An option is to enlarge the core traffic scheme i.e. increase the pedestrian area in the centre.
- n. Look at the parking issue on residential streets in Cambridge. To impose residents parking schemes a majority of residents must need to agree. The Council needs to consider expanding residents parking schemes and consider timed options.
- o. If we can solve congestion then we don't need bus lanes, which will allow space to create pedestrian and cycle paths and increase the greenery. We will need to cap the traffic at 20% below the current rate. Smart traffic management could assist in the control of flow of traffic through the city. Gating of traffic could prevent queuing on key routes.
- p. Phase out free commuter parking.
- q. Cut traffic in residential areas and for the inner ring road and make sustainable alternatives more appealing.
- r. Increase the ability for safe cycling in the city.
- s. Reorganise bus routes, run express services and serve more destinations.
- t. Build transport hubs around Cambridge rather than bringing all traffic into the centre of Cambridge to then route to other destinations.
- u. Make journey planning easier.
- v. Co-ordinate and support home delivery services by the use of local hubs.

7. What next?

- a. Attend the drop-in events
- b. Attend HPERA and MRRRA meetings
- c. read the available literature, web-sites, reports
- d. Write to your Councillors
- e. Write to Council officials
- f. Complete the feedback form (on paper or on-line)
- g. Help us collect evidence for a submission in the name of HPERA.

8. Formalities to establish the HPERA

- a. There are currently 4 residents on the committee acting as Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary and Treasurer and we would like to have all roads on the estate represented and therefore ask for additional committee members from Leys Avenue and Highfield Avenue to volunteer.
- b. The current HPERA committee requested that the meeting attendees granted their assent to continue the committee in the current format until after the close of the consultation period on 15th February 2016. This was passed by a majority show of hands.

- c. Volunteers were requested from the group with local government/city development/law/finance/traffic systems and cycling route expertise.
- d. A small collection was taken to cover the committee expenses.
- e. A request was made by Barbara Taylor for residents to attend the executive board meetings:

Meeting	Date	Time
Executive Board	15 Jan 2016	2 pm
Joint Assembly	12 Feb 2016	2 pm
Executive Board	3 Mar 2016	2 pm
Joint Assembly	24 Mar 2016	2 pm

- f. The video and presentations from the meeting would be uploaded to the HPERA website and a social media presence would be considered.
 - g. Jocelyn Scutt – County Councillor for West Chesterton a member of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee at the Council.
 - i. Emphasised that it is essential for the assembly meetings to be attended and to make the residents voices count.
 - ii. Residents will need to advise the meetings beforehand if you wish to ask a question or make a statement.
 - iii. Feels that humans need to be at the heart of economic growth and that this should be emphasised.
 - iv. We need to focus on our ideas that can make the City Deal work for our area and facilities within the principles of the City Deal.
9. Meeting closed with Michael thanking all the people who have helped with the HPERA launch.