

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**



**South Area Committee  
(City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen  
Edith's , Trumpington Wards)  
22 January 2004 7:30 – 9.57pm  
Minutes & Actions**

**Present:** Councillors: Philppa Slatter (Trumpington and Chair), Rob Dryden (Cherry Hinton), Alan Baker, Richard Stebbings, Amanda Taylor (Queen Edith's), Edrich Adigun-Harris & Judith Pinnington (Trumpington)

**Also Present:** County Councillor Anne Kent (Trumpington)

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 Area Committee South is [gary.clift@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:gary.clift@cambridge.gov.uk)

**Action by  
(see  
action  
sheet  
attached  
also)**

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

**04/01 MINUTES OF THE MEETING 20/11/03**

The minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**04/02 MATTERS ARISING**

Open Forum

a) Council Housing – the individual case mentioned by the

questioner would be investigated following further details being provided to the Council.

b) Nightingale Avenue - The Chair would follow up with County Councillor Heathcock whether the issue had been resolved.

Cllr Slatter

c) The Chair would pursue the concern that the police have not been able to provide numbers of prosecutions.

Cllr Slatter

**04/03 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Howell (Cherry Hinton), Graham Stuart (Cherry Hinton) & County Councillor Heathcock.

**04/04 OPEN FORUM**

The following topics were raised by members of the public present:

a) Free school transport/cost of travel for children to school living in Trumpington.

County Councillor Anne Kent responded as school transport is a County Council responsibility.

Children who live more than 3 miles from their designated secondary school (2 mls for primary) are entitled to free school transport. Trumpington ward is divided into three catchment areas but I assume you are talking of the area south of Long Rd which is in the catchment of Netherhall. There is a detailed map of distances and the three mile line comes about the middle of the estate and along Shelford Rd. These children receive free bus passes on the bus to Netherhall.

Having Netherhall as the designated school was debated in the late 90's and parents decided they would rather have one school where they knew they would have a place, rather than being at the end of the distance criteria for all the city schools. At that time most children went to Netherhall. Before and since, there has been a drift to Sawston as parents have a right to express a preference for any school and will be accepted so long as there is space after the children in their own designated area, e.g. Great Shelford, have been accommodated. However, there is no right to free transport.

The council does encourage all children to walk, cycle or take the bus so it will try to negotiate reasonable rates on the buses. You may know that there was a problem this term when the bus company changed the fare on the Sawston bus and stopped accepting money on the bus. The school stepped in and arranged to issue tickets themselves. County Cllr Kent was trying to get the Megarider area extended to cover Sawston as that would make the fare much lower. So far Stagecoach were resisting.

b) Improving the planning process -

Paper circulated on behalf of five residents associations (Bentley Rd and Newton Rd, Brooklands Ave Area, Cherry Hinton and Rathmore Rd, South Acre, Latham Rd and Chaucer Rd and Trumpington Environmental Action Group.

Councillor Baker reported that the paper had been raised during public question time at the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 20 January (by Prof. Chisolm from Brooklands Avenue Area RA). The Executive Councillor for Environment (Councillor Nichola Harrison) being responsible for the development control service (which deals with planning applications) gave a response. Area Committees could not 'go their own way' when it came to the proposals being put in the Residents Associations' paper.

The Chair referred to the Council's Considerate Applicant Leaflet and suggested that any further comments on the paper could be sent to the Executive Councillor and or members of the Environment Scrutiny Committee.

c) Why has the Council sold Whitlocks – it could have been used as a surgery?

Councillor Taylor stated that the decision had been taken following scrutiny from two committees of the Council (see Commercial & Human Resources 13 January or Housing & Health 14 January) considering 6 options one of which was to dispose on the open market. The capital receipt will be used to assist the Council in meeting its statutory obligations to house homeless families.

d) Garages at the rear of Wulfstan Way shops. What is going to happen in light of the re-development?

Councillor Stebbings would investigate and contact the member of the public and report back to the March meeting.

Cllr  
Stebbing

e) How are area committees publicised?

The Council had placed posters on its local noticeboards at sites across the city and had written to various interest groups across the city when area committees were launched in September 2003. The Chair acknowledged that the publicity of area committees needed to be improved upon. She asked for people to send in their suggestions, and/or if they wanted to receive notification of future meetings by email to the Committee Manager (listed at the top of these minutes).

Comment sent in from Mr Boddy 23 January

All Chairs of registered Residents associations should receive ,by e-mail,all documentation arising from the future S.A.C.'s. By their very existence these groups have demonstrated their interest and commitment to such matters.

## DRAFT UNTIL 25 MARCH 2004

Dates of meetings should be included in the regular issues of newsletters issued by all political parties, as well as the Parish Mag. -The Trumpet. This should include the pertinent contact data for residents to use as required.

The Cambridge Evening News and the the Weekly News should be used on a monthly basis to advertise ALL Area meetings -time,location,contact info(for agendas etc.).

These should be used in addition to all the usual "local" sites -church halls etc. I am convinced that the meetings are a useful initiative IF public attendance is encouraged by adequate communication. Without this, they will become a talking shop for minor issues better dealt with at local "surgeries", an opportunity for local councillors to "legitimise" their actions without adequate input from the public and a lost opportunity for public accountability of our elected representatives.

The Chair replied:

Although all your proposals have been tried in various areas in different ways, I admit that our system is far from comprehensive or foolproof. We are holding a meeting of the area committee chairmen, and I expect that your suggestions will be well received, together with your final paragraph, which I consider very fair comment! We have also put forward a budget for next year which should enable us to improve our publicity system within reason, especially if we can use email to cut costs.

f) Road signs need to be black on white, white on Cambridge blue is difficult to see.

County Councillor Kent would discuss this with officers and provide an answer to this point for the March meeting.

County Cllr  
Kent

g) Will all trees and shrubs on the embankment of the cutting between Shelford and Hauxton Roads be removed?

County Councillor Kent stated that this was linked to the Guided Bus proposals. There would be several opportunities to make representations during the consultations on this project.

h) How do I know whether a planning application should be determined by an Area Committee or the Council's Planning Committee?

It is set out in the Council's Constitution thus:

### **"12.3 Local Planning Applications**

12.3.1 Area committees shall be responsible for determining all planning applications which fall within their areas **other than**:

- A. those which may be determined by officers under the Council's scheme of delegation; or
- B. those which:
  - Are designated as 'major' applications; or
  - Represent a formal departure from the Development Plan; or
  - Have a site boundary that crosses 2 or more committee areas; or
  - Are submitted privately by any Member of the Council or their

immediate family

Applications falling into Category B will be determined by the Planning Committee.

**NB:** A 'major' application is as described in the Government's quarterly statistical returns on development control performance. At present, a major application is:

- a residential development of 10 or more houses, or where the number of dwellings to be constructed is not given, a residential development with a site area of 0.5ha or more;

- any other development of 1,000 sq m of additional floorspace, or with a site area of 1ha or more.

**04/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest in item 04/07/a as she lived near to the application premises.

**04/06 REVIEW OF PLANNING OBLIGATION STRATEGY:  
PROPOSED PROJECTS FOR FUNDING**

The Committee received a report which listed public open space or community development projects to be funded from Section 106 payments (*note - Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [as amended] provides for financial or other contributions required to enable a development to proceed or to mitigate its effect on the neighbourhood, to be tied to the grant of planning permission in the form of a legal agreement known as a S.106 Agreement or Obligation*). The purpose of the report was to afford the Committee and the public the opportunity to comment on the list of projects and re-focus the priorities if necessary. It was likely that the officers would wish to focus on a top 10 for each Area Committee in the coming year, noting that the current list would require funding over a 5 to 10 year period.

The Chair invited comments on the projects listed from the public to be sent to her or John Roebuck, Head of Parks and Open Spaces.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) –

**In respect of Public Open Space:**

The schedule of projects detailed and prioritised in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 and approved by Community Development and Leisure Committee on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2002 is endorsed.

The summarised position statement (appendix 4) of current projects is noted.

The Head of Parks and Recreation, in consultation with the

John  
Roebuck,  
Head of  
Parks and  
Recreation  
01223

Executive Councillor for Community Development and Leisure, 457531  
Executive Councillor for Environment—and the Chair of the East  
Area Committee, may consider adding new projects if appropriate  
and the changes reported to the relevant Area Committee.

A toilet be built close to the bowling green at Queen Edith's  
Recreation Ground at an estimated cost of £20,000 and included in  
the Schedule of Projects for formal open space.

### **In respect of Community Development**

That retention of the projects listed in paragraph 3.9 is endorsed  
and that the new items in 3.9.2 are added to the list for further  
exploration and feasibility work.

## **04/07 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- A**     **Application No:** C/03/1147  
          **Site:** 277 Hills Road, Queen Ediths  
          **Proposal:** Erection of 1 no4 bedroom bungalow to rear of existing  
                      building  
          **Applicant:** Mr and Mrs Newlands  
          **Public speaker:** Mr Lewis, 83 Holbrook Road

The Planning Officer stated that there has been strong concern  
expressed about inaccuracies in the report. In particular, local  
residents had stressed that the two buildings at the eastern end of  
the garden were not garage buildings but outbuildings to which  
vehicles go on an occasional basis. It was therefore inaccurate to  
suggest that the consequence of the proposal would not change  
the pattern of motor vehicles going to the eastern end of the site.  
The Planning Officer was of the view that at least one of the  
buildings probably was originally a garage, but was not used as  
such now and had not been for a long time. It was clear that there  
was a distinct track down to these buildings, but the number of  
movements resulting from what was proposed probably would be  
greater than currently experienced.

Other concerns raised included anxiety that policy NE8 was not  
referred to in the report; that there was no justification as to why  
this was seen as acceptable when permission for a dwelling to the  
rear of 259 Hills Road was refused and dismissed at appeal; that  
arguments against the proposal had been insufficiently addressed;  
and that the loss of trees in the vicinity was important and needed  
to be considered further.

It was understood that a note from the objectors had been  
circulated to Members of the Committee.

Amendments to the officers report : Planning Policy NE8 had not

been referred to in the report. It should have been as it was relevant and reads:

NE8 "The City Council will exercise strict control over the nature and extent of backland development. The principle of development will be assessed against the following criteria:

- (a) the contribution of the site to the character and quality of the area, both visually and in terms of greenery and wildlife habitats and the extent to which this can be maintained if the site is developed;
- (b) the ability to achieve safe access to the site for vehicles without unacceptable damage to the environment and residential amenity;
- (c) any potential benefits to the area eg. removal of eyesores and non-compatible uses, use of derelict land; and
- (d) the opportunities for a comprehensive rather than a piecemeal approach to development.

The Committee was concerned that the application contradicted several of the Council's planning policies ie. BE1, BE2, BE4.

**Resolved (by 7 vote to 0)**

To refuse the application [against the recommendation of the officer].

Reasons to be circulated to all members, but for clearance by the Chair, Cllr Slatter and Labour spokes, Cllr Dryden.

**B Application No: C/03/1197**

**Site:** 22A Brooklands Avenue, Trumpington

**Proposal:** Installation of grasscrete blocks to form vehicular hardstanding to rear of premises (retrospective application)

**Applicant:** Camflats Ltd, Elmhurst, Brooklands Avenue

**Public speakers:** Mr Newton, 1 Shaftsbury Road

A copy of a letter from Michael Chisholm to Councillor Slatter dated 19 January 2004, had been received and circulated to members of the Committee.

In relation to the Highway Authority comments, the application was technically for retention of a surface already laid. The informatives recommended were for off-site works, which would not take place.

The Committee noted that the planning officer had again discussed the application with the Council's arboricultural officer who reaffirmed his view that the trees would be damaged if the grasscrete were removed. The Committee regretted that the application was retrospective.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 2)**

To approve the application.

- C**     **Application No:** C/03/1315  
          **Site:** 7A Gunhild Way, Queen Ediths  
          **Proposal:** Change of use of existing annexe to 1no dwelling  
          **Applicant:** Mrs Stark, 52 Swaffham Road, Watton, Norfolk

Amendments to the officer's report : Paragraph 8.9 of the report made reference to there being four car parking spaces being proposed, there were actually three spaces, and therefore in terms of the current standards this would be an acceptable number.

**Resolved** (by 7 votes to 0)

That the application be refused and that the Head of Legal & Democratic Services is authorised to instigate enforcement action.

The meeting ended at 10.05pm.

**CHAIR**