

Notes of Milton Road LLF Meeting Monday 18th February 2019

Date: Monday 18th February 2019

Time: 18.00 – 20.00

Venue: Garden Wing, Meadows Community Centre, Cambridge

Present - GCP Officers

Paul van de Bulk (PB) – Project Manager

Debbie Goodland – Communications Manager

Present – WSP

Neil Poulton (NP)

Artur Malecki

Present LLF Members

Michael Bond – Old Chesterton Residents Association

Ian Manning (IM) - Cambridge County Council (Chesterton)

Elisa Meschini - Cambridgeshire County Council (Kings Hedges)

Michael Page – Hurst Park Estate Residents Association

Claire Richards – Cambridgeshire County Council (Castle)

Mike Sargeant – Cambridge City Council (West Chesterton)

Jocelynne Scutt (Chair) – Cambridgeshire County Council (Arbury)

Martin Smart – Cambridgeshire County Council (Kings Hedges)

Damien Tunnacliffe – Cambridge City Council (West Chesterton)

Baiju Thittala – Cambridge City Council (East Chesterton)

Jamie Dalzell – Cambridge City Council (West Chesterton)

Apologies:

Anna Bradnam - South Cambridgeshire District Council (Milton)

Carla McQueen - Cambridge City Council (East Chesterton)

Charles Nesbit – Milton Road Residents Association (representative sent)

Geri Bird - Cambridge City Council (East Chesterton)

Kevin Price – Cambridge City Council (Kings Hedges)

Present: Cambridgeshire County Council

Nathalie Watkins - (note taker)

Meeting commenced 7.10pm

1. Welcome and Chair's update

The Chair opened the meeting and introduced herself. The Chair summarised that tonight's meeting would be looking at the design changes made to the scheme as consequences of the public consultation and that it provided an opportunity for the LLF to review these changes and raise any concerns prior to submission to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Executive Board. Chair informed members that a workshop had taken place in January regarding some of the proposed changes, that a walk along Milton Road from Arbury Road with officers (including landscape architect and offsider), chairs of Milton Road and Hurst Park Estate residents associations and herself had taken place to consider the terrain from a landscaping perspective, and that a landscaping plan had also been designed for the route for review later in the meeting.

2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The Chair explained that it was necessary to hold an election for Chair and Vice Chair and asked GCP Project Officer, Paul van de Bulk (PB) to take the role of Chair for the purpose of this election.

PB requested nominations for the role of Chair. Both the current Chair County Councillor Jocelyne Scutt (JS) and County Councillor Ian Manning (IM) were proposed and seconded. Members of LLF were asked to vote and JS was elected by a clear majority. **DECISION: Jocelyne Scutt to remain as Chair for the Milton Road LLF**

JS accepted the role and thanked Cllr Ian Manning for his continued contributions to the forum.

Mike Sargeant was the only candidate proposed and seconded for Vice Chair and as no objections were raised was given the role. **DECISION: Mike Sargeant to be the Vice Chair for the Milton Road LLF.**

3. Minutes of previous meeting

DECISION: The minutes from the LLF meeting that took place on Tuesday 5th June 2018 were agreed as accurate.

4. Scheme's Design Changes presentation

The GCP Project Manager Paul van de Bulk (PB) introduced himself and apologised for the size of the room explaining that as it was half term a larger hall had not been available.

PB introduced Neil Poulton (NP) from WSP and Artur Malecki, one of the senior scheme designers.

It was noted that the meeting was being filmed. A query was raised regarding the children present and the filming. The parent of the three children was happy for his children to be on film. The Chair thanked Richard Taylor for filming.

PB proceeded to run through a brief presentation which explained the changes incorporated into the scheme as a consequence of the consultation.

To summarise:

- The consultation brochure was sent to 20k local households and 870 questionnaires were returned.
- Various events were held with good attendance
- The project team have also talked in depth with Road Safety Officers, Signals Team and Cycling Officers.
- As a result of the above activities a number of design considerations were outlined and discussed at an LLF workshop in January 2019. The workshop also looked at landscaping for the project and the outcome of the discussions has helped to inform the outline landscape proposals that are being recommended by officers today.
- The presentation also contained a modifications summary and the timescales of the project.

The full presentation can be seen here:

<https://citydeal-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/Milton%20Rd%20LLF%20Presentation%2018-02-2019.pdf>

PB advised that the final report regarding the consultation was nearly complete and then it would be uploaded to the GCP website.

5. Discussion around design changes

A Questions and Answers session commenced with both PB and NP answering questions from those present at the meeting. The Milton Road Scheme design layouts were put up sequentially so that questions were aimed at the segment of the scheme on screen at the time.

Segment 1: Mitcham's Corner to Gilbert Road

Q – Has the bus stop moved so that there is more space for the crossing?

A – Yes

Q – There looks like there are fewer parking spaces in the lay-by next to the shops than there are at present?

A – There is one less and this is due to landscaping.

Q – It looks like cyclists going down Gilbert Road will have to cross the pedestrian path to access the cycle path on Milton Road?

A – The red traffic light will halt cyclists on Gilbert Road while pedestrians cross, pedestrians will then be held with a red crossing light while the cyclist and road traffic are released.

Q – This means that cyclists will be passing in front of waiting pedestrians?

A – From the Gilbert Road direction, cyclist should pass through the junction on the carriageway, and then join the cycle lanes on Milton Road. Therefore there should be no conflict with pedestrians.

A discussion between members of the LLF and others present at the meeting followed that covered the following points:

- school children on bicycles cutting the corner and using the pedestrian path to avoid the traffic lights.
- shared use across the corner as an option with a painted white line separating the cyclists from pedestrians.
- taking cyclists onto Milton Road before they access the cycle path.
- the sharpness of the turn from Gilbert Road to the cycle path on Milton Road for those with a trailer/tandem/tricycle and the need therefore for these to be dragged around the corner.
- the opinion that the proposal does not remove conflict.
- the possibility of cutting off some of the corner to make it a gentler turn.

Q – Does the GCP have peak cycling flow for this junction? This is very relevant to the discussion.

A – Not to hand but surveys at key junctions and crossing have been undertaken to help inform the design..

Comment – Most cyclists go down Gurney Way anyway so would fully cut this junction.

The GCP project team explained that there is plenty of space for cyclists and if a shared pathway was put in behind the signals it would be hard to use tactile paving for the crossing. PB also reminded the LLF that throughout the scheme they have been keen to avoid shared use. The Chair drew the discussion to a close and proposed that as this issue would not be resolved at the meeting and that **the GCP project team would investigate alternative options for cyclists at this junction as an action.** The GCP project team noted that there were some constraints to the possible options available when car traffic was taken into account. The point was made that the plan as per the current design would improve the present situation

Despite the Chair aiming to draw the discussion to a close to enable questions to be responded to in regard to the next section of Milton Road, so that all could be addressed during the meeting, several further comments and questions were raised

Comment by an LLF member - The answer to what should be done, should be the option that causes least conflict and the only way to establish this, is for part of the scheme to include trialling options and measuring conflict for each.

Q – Are the GCP sure that the path of an articulated lorry would not result in pedestrians waiting at the crossing being at risk of ‘having their toes run over’?

A – The full tracking has been undertaken for the junction and the GCP project team are happy that this is not an issue. The plans are currently with the safety audit team so if there is felt to be any concerns in this regard it will be flagged.

Q – For cyclist turning left from Milton Road to Gilbert Road, how is this action undertaken.

A – There were four options looked at and the one selected is the one that the GCP project team feels is the simplest and works the best. All 4 options require an element of compromise.

Q – Have the GCP taken into account the potential risk of cyclists taking advantage of the left turn to simply cross to the cycle path on the other side of Milton Road?

A – There is a possibility cyclists will do this but all traffic has a red light at the time when pedestrians and cyclists have a green light so cyclists can choose to turn or simply cross without any further risk.

Q – Can a dropped kerb for cyclists be installed to allow cyclists to move onto the carriageway before the junction?

A – At this point the vehicle lane is 3.5m wide which is not wide enough to allow cyclists to safely feed in to the traffic. It has therefore been decided to not have a drop kerb so this movement is not encouraged. Again the plans are with the safety audit that will feedback any concerns.

Segment 2: Ascham Road

Q – The cycleway from Chesterton Hall Crescent does not seem to connect with the Milton Road cycleway, why doesn't it integrate? Pedestrians and cyclists use whichever lane they want.

A – They will have to give way at this point.

It was agreed to focus on this area during the landscaping discussion at the end of the meeting as this area features highly in this discussion.

Segment 3: Elizabeth Way Roundabout

Q – Surely cyclists going from Highworth Avenue to Elizabeth Way would choose to go on the road rather than wait for two sets of signals? Could it not be one continuous crossing?

A – A continuous crossing was looked into but the traffic movement modelling cannot support this, the signals have to be staggered, a staggered crossing was also supported in initial discussions with the Safety team.

Q – What do cyclists coming from Highworth Avenue on to Milton Road headed towards Mitcham's corner (turning right onto Milton Road) do at this junction?

A - They can go counter flow and take a crossing.

Q – What provision is there for the school children?

A – They can make use of the shared use toucan crossing.

Q – This is a cyclist accident black spot (on the roundabout between Elizabeth Way and Milton Rd heading into Cambridge). Do you not think that the two crossings will encourage cyclists on to the road?

A – The aim of the signals is to reduce accidents by better regulating movements around the roundabout and hence will still make it safer for cyclists to be on the roundabout, then the current situation, should they choose to take this route.

Q – Concerns were raised about the narrow area of shared use between Highworth Avenue and Milton Road. Pedestrians will be waiting at the crossing at the narrowest point. It can get very busy here. Please can you look at moving the pedestrian crossing slightly further down Milton Road?

A – The project team can certainly look at this option but will need to also consider the orientation between the crossing and the stop line for vehicles.

Q – Please explain why this crossing is staggered?

A – There is not enough time for the full crossing to take place.

Q – Surely it is dangerous having children waiting on an island in the middle of a busy road, does the safety audit support this?

A – This option was suggested by the safety officer adviser as it was felt that it was safer than giving a limited time for full crossing resulting in running/rushing/not completing the crossing before the lights change.

Q – Surely you could just extend the time for the crossing a little?

A – The sequencing for the signals at the roundabout is complex. In order to maintain flow on the roundabout it is beneficial to stagger the crossings

Q – Have you considered purchasing some of the land from the gardens of residents near the narrow point of crossing?

A – A commitment had been made earlier in the process to not compulsory purchase. PB explained that he has had an informal talk with one of the residents linked to potential to widen the footpath at this location but they were not keen to proceed with such a proposal of land purchase.

An LLF member commented that there had been compulsory purchase here in the past and so highly unlikely residents will be willing to lose more land.

Comment – Histon Road and Huntingdon Road have similar crossings, it is not uncommon.

Q – Has the centre of the roundabout been made smaller?

A – Yes

Q – To make the cycle route from Highworth Avenue to Elizabeth Way more appealing to cyclists with trailers/tandems/tricycles could the two crossings be staggered so that when the first button is pressed a time lag is triggered in the second crossing so they are nearly continuous?

Comment – If cyclists are choosing to use the road rather than the cycleway it can enrage drivers that are then inconsiderate of cyclists.

A – The plan aims at betterment and doing the best to provide segmented access to ease the accident black spot. The design seeks to create a balance for all users.

Q – Will the LLF have the opportunity to review further amendments made to the plans as a result of findings from the safety audit?

A – A Stage 1 safety audit has already been done for the “Final Concept” version of the scheme, and is currently being undertaken again for the current version. An officer from the safety audit team has been involved in discussions around the plans. This has to be a different officer from those conducting the audit but should help to reduce the potential number of concerns raised. The safety audit provides recommendations only and then it is up to Officer to make decision on how to action these recommendations.

There will be a Stage 2 and Stage 3 Safety Audit at a later stage in the process.

Q – If there are substantial changes will the LLF be informed?

A – Yes

Q – Are we sure that this work is improving the flow for buses as this was the criteria for which funding was provided?

A – Some additional flow modelling has been done for certain areas of the route where changes have been made, a full re-modelling of the routes has not been felt to be required as the changes will not have impacted the previously results significantly. The design team will take a decide at the end of the design process if there is a need to rerun a full Paramix model, in relation to supporting the full business case.

PB informed the LLF that the GCP and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) are working on a city wide signalling policy giving buses priority and this will very likely have an added positive impact on this route if implemented.

Q – Why hasn't Hurst Park Avenue junction been covered?

A – No changes have been made since the last iteration of the plan.

Q – It is very hard to get out of Hurst Park Avenue. Is it possible to have a keep clear box marked out on Milton Road at this point? This was raised at the January workshop.

A – Can see no initial reason why this could not be done. **Action: GCP project team will look into this.**

PB suggested that they also look at this option for the Copenhagen crossing junctions.

Comment – Oxfordshire have design specifications for cycle ways but I see no desire in Cambridgeshire for complete segmentation for vulnerable road users despite the deaths that have occurred. This comment received applause.

A – PB informed the LLF that if a design guide was developed for Cambridge, given the direction taken in other parts of the City, one might speculate that such a guide would not recommend cycleway separated from the carriageway by verge. A guide could be helpful in some areas of the design, but in others it might take away the flexibility that has been required in developing (for example) the current Milton Road design. PB has consulted recently with representatives for blind local residents and they are not keen on segregation, they would rather cyclists were on the road.

Comment – Highway design guidance notes can look at this but despite 0208 being updated it still doesn't do enough. Cambridge should lead on cycle way design guides.

Chair asked that the questions return to this scheme, to ensure all could be covered in the meeting.

Q – How are you improving bus times if you are building in lots of traffic lights for crossings? Could part time signals not be used?

A – This has been covered previously, CCC's current policy does not allow for part time lights. Would have to put the request to the Highways department.

Action: Chair agreed to raise the question with the Chair of the Highways Department.

A cont. – Additional signals at the Elizabeth Way roundabout are the only additions and can try to overcome this delay with bus priority. The improvements are not just about journey time but also bus reliability.

Chair noted that it was 7.20pm and asked PB how much time should be allocated for the landscaping discussion. PB advised that not much time was required.

Segment 4: Arbury Road and Union Lane Junction

PB noted that the issues here had been the same as at the Gilbert Road junction.

Comment: Efforts have been made to try and encourage children coming down Arbury Road to cut through Leys Road rather than come in front of the shops.

Q – Where the inbound side of Milton Road goes from two lanes into one, surely a car wanting to go up Arbury Road will stop all traffic especially buses?

A – It has been checked that a large HGV can still pass a single car waiting to turn here.

Q – Could you not just remove the right hand turn to Arbury Road and send traffic up to the roundabout to come back on itself in order to turn?

A – This was looked at but received lots of objections, which is not to say that it could not be looked at again in the future.

Q – If you are on a mobility scooter on Arbury Road the left turn onto the Milton Road cycle way is very sharp.

A – There is a fair amount of space for this.

Comment – An LLF Member alluded to discussions by the residents association of Arbury Road pushing for the road to become one way.

Comment – If this were to happen it would make parking for the shops even more of an issue resulting in even more difficulties for pedestrian using the route.

A – We can make it very clear with tactile surfaces and landscaping that it is not for parking.

Q – Could the road not be made wider to accommodate two cars?

A – Designers have to allow for a straight course for cars continuing along Milton Road.

Comment – the land behind the footpath is the private land of the shops so many cars parked here are shop owners/workers.

Comment – There are overhanging branches that cause cyclists to move into pedestrian zone.

Q – Why is there an advance stop line for bikes on three arms of the junction but not the fourth?

A – On that arm the turn can be done off road. In fact could also look to take out one of the other stop lines where there is the same situation, **PB will look into.**

Comment – Not a wise move to remove these as although there is an alternative to the road, some bikes will still use the road.

Segment 5: Woodhead Drive

Q – There are lots of cyclists coming from Ramsden Square; surely the cycleway should be two way here?

A – **Action GCP project team will look at this as can see no reason why this can't happen.**

Comment – it is really good to see the incorporation of Copenhagen Crossings in the plan – Thank you.

Segment 6: Kings Hedges' Junction

PB explained that swapping the cyclists and pedestrians over reduces the number of times pedestrians have to cross cyclists.

Q – Is that an island in the junction?

A – Yes the crossing arm is long so a refuge for pedestrians is required. It is also required for the traffic light signals head to be located correctly. There were several concerns raised regarding the position of the island. Cars turning right from Milton Road on to King Hedges will be required to pass to the right of the island. This could be confusing to drivers unfamiliar with the junction as it would feel unusual to have the island to the left rather than right, it might seem like driving on the wrong side of the road. Further concerns were raised about pedestrians waiting on the island to cross or on the King Hedges side of Milton Road looking to cross to the island. It was commented that pedestrians would not expect traffic to be coming from both directions so would only look one way.

The GCP project team explained that the signals would prevent this problem but the response from members of the LLF was that if the road seemed clear pedestrians may not wait for the lights and just look one way. PB responded that there would be road markings and signage to indicate the need to look both ways and perhaps some education in the area about the crossing may be needed. Concerns were aired widely that this seemed an unsafe situation. The GCP project team confirmed that this crossing format was used elsewhere and was with the safety audit team at present for comment.

Q – Is the island in that position just so it can be half way across?

A – Yes

ACTION: The GCP team will take this feedback away and talk with the safety audit team.

6. Landscaping Proposals

The main areas of intervention were shown on maps on the screen. The proposals include tree strategy, hard landscaping and green landscaping.

Elizabeth Way Roundabout

PB explained that the design for the roundabout is looking to maintain similar landscaping concepts to the existing design. PB has been in contact with RedGate the current sponsors of the roundabout about continuing their sponsorship.

Q – Will the density in the centre of the roundabout be maintained as it is key for wildlife in the area?

A – That is the intention. It will need to be reviewed to see if it requires some thinning out to encourage new growth but aiming for a similar density.

Chair informed the meeting that she had walked the length of Milton Road with the landscapers and representatives of two local Residents Associations (chairs of Milton and Hurst Park Estate) and she was very impressed with the plans and passion of the landscapers.

Woodhead Drive

Chair expressed her view that Woodhead Drive will be exceptional with rows of trees on either side and trees on each corner and concluded that it would look lovely and be an impressive addition to the area.

Q – What trees are being used?

A – Species have been suggested but open to suggestions.

PB explained that the landscaping proposals may need to be scaled back a little as the costs are currently higher than initially anticipated. The GCP project team will also need to liaise with CCC to look at how the landscaping is maintained.

Arbury Road

Q – What are the plans for the front area of the shops on Milton Rd/Arbury Road?

A – Have spoken with the shop owners and have the basis of a design but need to be able to maintain all access to the front & rear. In mid March PB has a meeting with the owners and lease holders of these shops to run through the draft landscape proposal.

Q – Will the plans go to public consultation?

A – No, it is the private land, owned by the shops.

PB summarised that the aim here is to improve cycle parking, maintain car parking spaces and add in some planting, however owners will need to maintain these so need their buy in.

Ascham Road

Q – What is the area next to the cycle lane and pavement?

A – It is hard standing landscaping.

Q - Why does the cycleway colour stop here? This is an area likely to have school children using it.

A - Yes it would make sense to have a continuous colour.

Q – Do we have clarification of design aims? Who has priority?

A – Cyclists and pedestrians going straight ahead down Milton Road have priority over side road traffic turning.

Q – Is the library garden preserved?

A – Yes but smaller as a consequence of the dimensions of the new building.

Q – What provision is there for drivers who do not know about Copenhagen Crossings?

A – The GCP project team stated that new ideas have to be introduced at some point and they are used elsewhere, just not as frequently as other types.

Q – Why are the colours different at Hurst Park?

A – Hurst Park is just an engineer's drawing whereas this is the landscaping drawing where colours have been added in to show what could be done. The final design will have consistent, continuous colours.

Q – Will there be public art included in the landscaping?

A – Yes the GCP Board have placed assurances that there will be provision for public art. There could be monitoring posts. PB will be looking at what is possible and the associated costs. The City Council are doing work on developing and encouraging public art so perhaps there is an opportunity to liaise with them.

Q – Has biodiversity been considered in the landscaping? Vegetation with furry leaves discourage insects and hence birds nesting. Was an ecology officer involved?

A – The City Council is developing a biodiversity strategy.

Q- Can a biodiversity strategy for Milton Road be put to the Assembly/Board?

A – PB will be led by the arborist as have to take multiple points of view into account, he gave an example of limes attracting more insects but also dropping sticky sap.

Chair commented that she had had an extensive look at the trees proposed with the landscapers and residents at the workshop, and that residents had been on a tour of trees around Cambridge, together with City Council arborial officers and she believes it is right to have absolute confidence in Kenny McGregor's team (City Tree Officer). PB commented that this team are less likely to look at biodiversity but at trees that will thrive in the environment.

Comment – the Assembly and Board could do with a report from the consultation document.

Q – Will a full through-put modelling be done prior to submission to the Assembly?

A – It is not felt there is a requirement to redo the full modelling but some micro modelling on specific areas of change has been done.

Q – Have we seen this modelling?

Comment – there is an 18 page Stage 1 safety audit already on the website for this project.

Q – Please can you clarify with the timescales listed in the Assembly Papers when the LLF have an opportunity to input?

A – The Assembly meeting is 27th February and the deadline for questions to the assembly is this Friday. In March it will go to the Executive Board and again there will be a deadline for questions the week prior. The Milton Road Communications Strategy going forward will be put together by Neil Poulton (NP) with input from GCP's Communications Team.

Q – Is tonight the last chance the LLF have to make large changes, not a problem if it is, but just want to be clear?

A – Yes

Q – If there is a major problem raised by the safety audit will it come back to the LLF?

A – Yes

LLF Resolutions

Proposed Resolution: The LLF request that a biodiversity strategy for Milton Road be put to the Assembly/Board.

Resolution Passed with no objections made.

Chair addressed the LLF explaining that resident parking schemes are a matter for CCC residents not the LLF but she believes that there is a mitigation required based on this scheme. The mitigation would be implemented for residents who lose parking on Milton Road. Chair therefore proposed the following resolution which she distributed on paper at this point of the meeting.

Proposed Resolution: Consultation with residents on residents parking schemes is imperative and is statutorily required.

Parking for residents is affected by the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership Milton Road Project (Milton Road Project) and mitigation measures must be part of that scheme.

A residents' parking scheme has been approved for Ascham area (off Milton Road and including Westbrooke) and is scheduled to go ahead in 2019.

Residents in the Elizabeth area and Hurst Park Estate area will be impacted by the Milton Road Project and by the Ascham Residents Parking Scheme. All must be part of any consultation.

As a preliminary step and without delay, the Chair of the Milton Road Project LLF, will call a meeting of residents of these areas so that in a workshop setting, together with local City and County Councillors, County Residents Parking Officers and the Officers of the Milton Road Project, residents can be informed and consulted, with the outcome taken into account by the County and the Milton Road Project as to resolving the residents' parking issues and mitigation, and going forward to inform any statutory consultation on residents parking.

A discussion followed where some members felt that the LLF had no jurisdiction on resident parking schemes so this resolution would not be possible. Ian Manning had sent a proposed resolution to the Project Officer and explained that his covered a similar issue but was more specific.

The Chair expressed her view that her resolution is comprehensive and enables all residents to be part of the scheme rather than focusing on a single area.

Comment – an LLF member was concerned that neither resolution had been circulated prior to the meeting and that each was unaware of the others proposal. The LLF member was also concerned about the impact that Arbury Road scheme, which had been alluded to earlier in the meeting, might have.

There was some debate as to what schemes were already in process and how timing is key so as not to miss out on the opportunity to be included in these schemes. Chair informed the LLF that she has already asked for a consultation with the Ascham Scheme as to whether they would include her resolution in what they have already agreed. The Joint Area Committee is responsible for the Ascham Scheme and this scheme does not take into account the GCP's work. Chair said her motion ensures GCP gets to put forward its view.

PB reiterated that resident parking schemes are a County Council process with residents.

Chair responded that this resolution just asks for a meeting to explain mitigation as these residents cannot access this unless they have the information of what can and cannot be done.

Another LLF member complained that as these resolutions had not been sent out in advance of the meeting he had been unable to consult with residents in the area he represents, therefore he would find it hard to vote.

Q – The GCP did an audit of how many houses don't have a driveway on Milton Road?

A – Yes and the information is known. A second report has also been done.

The Chair invited Ian Manning to read his proposed resolution. IM commented that he had followed correct procedure by sending it to the project officer in advance of the meeting

Proposed Resolution: The LLF is aware there is an initiative at the County Council to join up the Ascham parking zone with what is commonly referred to as the Chesterton Triangle (proposed Elizabeth zone) area.

The LLF recognises that the loss of parking spaces on Milton Road caused by the Milton Road project would make the Chesterton Triangle parking scheme not viable and unfair on residents without being joined with the Ascham zone.

Should these areas not be joined for any reason, the LLF asks that properties on the South side of Milton Road be included in the Ascham zone after consultation with those residents.

Chair said that the proposed resolution did not take into account the need for mitigation along the whole of Milton road from the Elizabeth Way roundabout and that this was the responsibility of the Milton Road project. Hence a resolution in the restricted terms was not appropriate.

PB interjected and explained that IM's resolution was something that he could work with within the restraints imposed by the GCPs position, as a backstop in case the resolution that had been proposed by the Chair did not get accepted. The Chair pointed out that nothing was going to be done without the consultation of the residents she represents.

An LLF Member raised the fact that in 2017 this LLF passed several resolutions which officers and the GCP Board accepted. It required a mitigation plan to be created by the GCP for parking. The GCP should have come forward with a plan but they have not. The member suggested that the LLF request that this integrated plan be produced.

Chair read out Resolution 8 to which the member was referring. Chair emphasised that her new proposed resolution takes into account residents in the whole area not just specific locations.

Comment – An LLF member expressed his disappointment to see a continued lack of communication between County Councillors with two resolutions having been drafted independently and not seen in advance. He expressed the view that the two resolutions are not mutually exclusive.

ACTION: Resolution 8 has not been actioned by the GCP. The GCP need to work with the County Councillors on a plan, taking into account the whole of the Hurst Park, Milton Road, the Elizabeth area and Ascham Road and communicate this to the LLF.

PB requested that County Councillors must have a united front and then he can work on their agreed requests. Even though these resolutions were not passed as resolutions, they set out what needs to be done to address the issue of parking in the area.

Comment – thank you for the reassurance that parking is being taken seriously and movement is being made to take action.

Both Chair's and IM's proposed resolutions were not taken to vote so were not passed.

Proposed Resolution: The LLF seeks assurances that any substantial changes to the scheme will be presented to the LLF to review and scrutinise prior to presentation to the GCP Assembly.

Resolution passed

The meeting closed 21.50pm.