



**West/Central Area Committee  
(City Councillors representing Castle, Market  
and Newnham Wards)  
29 July 2004 7:30pm – 9.45pm  
Minutes & Actions**

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

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

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

**04/26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Mike Dixon and County Councillors Bowen, Brinton and A Reid.

**04/27 OPEN FORUM**

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

#### **04/28 MATTERS ARISING**

The Chair raised items from the 16 June meeting Open Forum and so that updates on progress could be given – please see the attached Update Sheet for details.

#### **04/29 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 June were agreed as a correct record.

#### **04/30 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Nature of interest</b>
C Rosenstiel	C/04/0532/FP	Resident of Grafton Street but not close to the application site.
J Rosenstiel	C/04/0532/FP	Resident of Grafton Street but not close to the application site.

#### **04/31 LICENSING REFORM – INTRODUCTION OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003 PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY**

The Head of Environmental Health & Waste Strategy (EHWS) introduced the report which was intended to inform the committee and members of the public about the Licensing Act 2003 and the changes that would arise from implementing it. Public Houses and late night refreshment outlets could be open much later. EHWS explained that the Council had to have a policy and had to consult interested parties (the trade, restaurants, the Fire Service, Police, The Child Protection Agency). There was also an opportunity for councillors and members of the public to influence the policy and he encouraged completion of the consultation form contained in the report. Responses needed to be returned to him by 6 October 2004. He was also willing to attend local meetings of residents.

Members of the Committee then asked the following to which EHWS replied:

1. Was there a limit to the number of premises in any one area that could be open at any one time as this could have an impact on incidents of anti-social behaviour?

A: There was no limit and in theory there would be less binge drinking. The view of the police would also be important.

2. Was there not a place in the policy for education about the use of alcohol?

A: While protection of children was written into the new Act,

education was not included.

3. What was the timetable for the issuing of pre-consultation information to the public?

A: The Council was trying to make the consultation process as open as possible as it was taking on liquor licensing for the first time. The draft policy and the feedback form would be on the website as well as being available at meetings of area committees.

4. What steps could be taken if one area of the city had persistently high rates of anti-social behaviour – could licences be taken away?

A: It would be vital to look carefully at existing licences. There would be some control eg to vary a licence but not to withdraw it. If there were a problem on the highway, the police would object. The Council had a duty to consider public safety, protection of children etc. If there were problems at a premises which had an approved licence, then the police had authority to close the premises for 24 hours. The public would also have the right of appeal to the magistrates. Great care had to be taken in considering applications.

5. If pubs exercised their so-called grandfather rights to a licence, would they have to apply separately for a public entertainment licence and how thorough would the conditions be?

A: HEHWS acknowledged that this was a very difficult question and the Council would take legal advice. Each case would have to be treated on its own merits and conditions would be used to try and exercise appropriate control.

The Chair encouraged members of the public to respond to the consultation opportunity.

## **04/32 DRAFT CITY CENTRE MANAGEMENT EARLY EVENING ECONOMY STRATEGY**

The City Centre Manager introduced the report which planned for an early evening economy in the city centre from 5-8pm. Consultation with restaurants, shops, museums and the central library indicated strong support for this on one day per week in the first instance especially during the summer months and in the run up to Christmas.

She asked for the committee and members of the public to give feedback on the proposal.

Members of the public present raised the following concerns:

- a) Would it be possible to control this so that the city did not become a 24-hour binge city?
- b) There was already a problem with litter during the summer months and this proposal was likely to aggravate this.
- c) Shops in the city centre were needed – concern re them moving away.

The Committee made the following comments:

1. A great opportunity to make more of the Market Square – be a bit more continental. Were there any statistics on how many tourists stayed in the area in the evening?
2. At what point would there be a cleaning economy?!
3. Would the council have to fund extra staff for the evening opening of the Fitzwilliam Museum?
4. The arts and crafts market is good on a Sunday – expand that to the evening?
5. Do more to improve the front of the Guildhall.

The Chair said that there was general support so long as the concerns raised were addressed.

### **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LEISURE GRANTS 2004-05**

**04/33**

The Grants Manager asked the Committee to agree to the recommendations for grants given in the report at section 4.4.

The Chair suggested that each recommendation be taken in turn:

#### **Cambridge Independent Advice Centre (CIAC):**

Members made the following points:

- a) Was this organisation not funded out of the central grant fund?

The Grants Manager said that it was but that this project was to support work targeted at residents in the West/Central Area wards.

- b) The write-up seemed to imply that more work might be required in future and would that require further funds?

The Grants Manager said that the bid included all costs including adviser time to help potential claimants with applications.

**Resolved** (by 7 votes to 0) to award £1200 to Cambridge Independent Advice Centre.

#### **Jesus Green Association:**

The Grants Manager explained that the focus of the project was to increase membership and they had good ideas for how to do that.

Members made the following points:

- c) Did the Association support the installation of skateboarding facilities?

The Grants Manager stated that this was a new group.

- d) Did the Association recognise wider community use?

The Grants Manager explained that the bid was for funds to increase membership and ensure that a broader range of views was represented.

- e) Would they ask for more funds next year?

The Grants Manager explained that the Council did make regular annual grants to similar organisations across the city and she

would recommend future grants subject to the usual conditions and the availability of funds.

**Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to award £360 to the Jesus Green Association.

**St Mark's Community Centre:**

**Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to award £1168 to St Mark's Community Centre.

**04/34 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

- 1 APPLICATION NO:** C/03/1185/FP  
**SITE:** 21/23 Lion Yard (Market)  
**PROPOSAL:** Installation of replacement shopfront  
**APPLICANT:** Snappy Snaps Ltd., Glenthorne Mews, London  
**PSR:** Applicant  
**REFUSED** (by 8 votes to 0) as the development fails to provide level or ramped access to the shop thereby denying access for wheel chair users.  
**RESOLVED** (by 8 votes to ) that the Head of Legal & Democratic Services be instructed to issue an enforcement notice on the owner and occupier and any other person who has an interest in the land, under S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for, without planning permission, the carrying out of operational development.
- 2 APPLICATION NO:** C/04/0430/FP  
**SITE:** 2 Huntingdon Road (Castle)  
**PROPOSAL:** Change of use from guest rooms to seven bedsit flats.  
**APPLICANT:** Mr & Mrs P Green, 2/4 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge  
**PSR:** Andrew Aarons (resident)  
**APPROVED** (by 8votes to 0) subject to satisfactory completion of S106 obligation and to the conditions and informatives as listed in the officer report.  
The Planning Officer reported that the planning obligation had been concluded.
- 3 APPLICATION NO:** C/04/0532/FP  
**SITE:** 3 Grafton Street (Market)  
**PROPOSAL:** Erection of single storey rear extension, rear conservatory and rear first-floor balcony.  
**APPLICANT:** Mr R Whitehead, 3 Grafton Street, Cambridge  
**PSR:** Ms Jane Howard (resident)

The Planning Officer informed the committee that the application was to be determined at Area Committee at the request of Councillor Joye Rosenstiel for the following reasons:

- 1 Concern about the loss of open space in the garden

- 2 Loss of privacy caused by overshadowing for the neighbour at no 2
- 3 Loss of amenity in a Conservation Area.

Councillor Joye Rosenstiel said she would speak as Ward Councillor and would not take part in the voting.

**REFUSED** against officer recommendation (by 4 votes to 3). Reason for refusal to be related to conflict with policies P1/3, P7/6, BE2 and BE32. Draft reason to be agreed by Chair as follows:

The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale and the resultant reduction in private amenity space, would be out of character with the surrounding area, which forms part of the City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). This also demonstrates a failure of the proposal to recognise the constraints of the site or to relate well to the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to policies P1/3 and P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and policies BE2 and BE32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 1996.

- 4 **APPLICATION NO:** C/03/0563/FP  
**SITE:** 38 – 40 Parkside (Market)  
**PROPOSAL:** Erection of three storey extension for offices with basement storage, re-ordering of car park and rear staff access.  
**APPLICANT:** Peterhouse, C/o Carter Jonas, 6-8 Hills Road, Cambridge

**APPROVED** (by 8 votes to 0) subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with Heads of Terms detailed at para 9.0 and to the conditions and informatives detailed in the officer report.

However, in the event that the planning obligation required in connection with this planning application is not completed by 31 August 2004, it is recommended that this planning application be reviewed and, following consultation with the Head of Development Services, be Refused.

The meeting ended at 9.45pm.

**CHAIR**