



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Area Committee (City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's , Trumpington Wards) 4 November 2004 7.30pm – 10.10pm Minutes & Actions

Present: Councillors
Eric Barrett-Payton, Russ McPherson (Cherry Hinton)
Richard Stebbings, Amanda Taylor (Queen Edith's)
Edrich Adigun-Harris, Sheila Churchill, Philippa Slatter (Trumpington)

Also Present: County Councillors Christine Carter (Cherry Hinton) and Geoffrey Heathcock (Queen Edith's)

Additional information for public: City Council officers can also be emailed firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk
The Committee Manager for Area Committee South is 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

Members of the County Council can be emailed:

Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

04/41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden (Cherry Hinton) and Baker (Queen Edith's). County Councillor Kent (Trumpington)

04/42 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

04/47 (2) Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest as a volunteer for the Medical Research Council

(3) Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest as she lived close to the premises.

On both applications, Councillor Taylor withdrew from the Committee, taking no part in the debate or vote.

04/43 MINUTES

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

04/44 OPEN FORUM

Can the Committee give a definition of affordable housing for key workers? What about low paid workers in general? Would young people in Trumpington get preferable treatment in the southern fringe developments?

The Chair undertook to provide the questioner with a written answer – this is copied below:

The availability of housing that is affordable and accessible to those in housing need is a major and growing problem in Cambridge and the Cambridge Sub-region. The Cambridge Housing Needs Survey 2002 identified that there was a backlog of housing need of 297 households. In addition, there are a further 1,564 households per year falling into housing need. Additional evidence relating to the needs of key workers in the Cambridge Sub-Region Key Worker Housing Research Report 2003 shows a yearly key worker housing demand in Cambridge of 295 units of which 247 are related to Addenbrooke's Hospital.

Chair/Dave
Roberts
Principal
Policy &
Projects
Officer

Affordable housing is housing provided for people who cannot afford to rent or buy housing locally to meet their housing needs. It is provided with the benefit of a subsidy of some kind, which can encompass free or discounted land and/or grant aid towards construction costs. It must be provided for the long term to meet existing and future needs. Affordable housing can include all of the following tenures:

- **Social rented housing:** housing provided at below market rents at levels controlled by the Housing Corporation, normally by Registered Social Landlords (Housing Associations).
- **Intermediate housing:** housing for those who do not qualify for social rented housing, but whose incomes are such in relation to local housing costs that they are nonetheless not able to access market housing. This includes:
 - **Intermediate rented:** under our new Local Plan rents are not to exceed 30% of net median household incomes in Cambridge except where provided for specific groups of key workers, where they should not exceed 30% of the net median household income for the specific group;
 - **Low cost home ownership:** including shared ownership, equity share, and discounted market housing. Costs (mortgage and any rent) are not to exceed 30% of gross median household incomes in Cambridge except where provided for key workers, where they should not exceed 30% of the gross median household income for that specific group.

Affordable housing includes housing for key workers allocated on the

basis of need. Key worker housing should be located within a 30 minute drive time of their place of employment. Key workers are normally involved in the care and comfort of the community and will normally be employed in the public sector. A register of key workers eligible for nomination to such housing will be kept by the City Council or by another body approved by the City Council. Key worker housing will be available to initial and successive occupiers unless there are no eligible nominees in which case units will be offered to others in housing need. The proportion of key worker housing on each site will be determined by the City Council based on evidence of need, location and land ownership, but will not normally be expected to exceed 30% of the affordable housing provision on each site. Housing for specific groups of workers other than those included in the above definition, and other than those deemed eligible by a body approved by the City Council to provide and manage the provision of key worker housing, can be included as affordable housing. This will be subject to evidence that their employers are facing recruitment and retention difficulties related to housing costs, and that the workers cannot afford to rent or buy suitable housing locally to meet their housing needs. In all cases the affordable housing provision over the long term will be secured by a legal agreement.

People in housing need will comprise people nominated by the City Council, from its Housing Needs Register, the priority homeless, those nominated by a Housing Association where the City Council does not have nomination rights, and those nominated from other registers of housing need as agreed by the City Council.

Monitoring pollution levels emitted from the University's chemistry laboratory in Lensfield Road

The Chair stated that she had been a member of the Planning Committee at the time the application for the laboratory had been considered. At that time, the University had given assurances on the control of emissions.

Chair/Env
Health –
Selwyn
Anderson

The Chair would write to the questioner with an answer to the Council's monitoring arrangements. (Answer sent copied below)

Environmental Services was consulted on the planning applications for these flues in 1998 and 2000. The University had a difficulty in that there were insufficient fume cupboards which resulted in them being shared. The University did not envisage more users but safer operation for users as each would have the use of individual fume cupboards.

Additionally the British Standard BS 7258 had increased the dispersion standards and in particular flue heights. This requires flues to be 3 metres above the height of the building or 1.25 times the height of the building the appropriate height being whichever is the greater figure. This resulted in a flue height 7 metres above the highest part of the building. The flues we understand were wind tunnel tested by the University as a further check on dispersion over and above the simple reliance on BS 7258.

Fume cupboards are designed to ensure the health and safety of operatives undertaking small scale chemical investigations and as such emit small quantities of pollutants. Such operations consequently do not require permitting under the requirements of Part 1 of the Environmental Protection Act. The Council therefore has no regulatory powers and does not undertake specific monitoring of these stacks. Our monitoring is mainly limited to Nitrogen dioxide and Particles PM10 (that is those smaller than 10 microns in size). This part of Cambridge has been formally declared an Air Quality Management Area due to our prediction that Nitrogen dioxide will not meet the national air quality objective.

The University is required by the Health and Safety at Work Act to ensure that its operation is not only safe for those within the premises but also those outside it. The Health and Safety Executive are the responsible regulatory agency for educational premises and have the duty to check on the arrangements made by the University.

In conclusion it can be seen the Council did consider the flue height and dispersion at the planning stage but has no regulatory role and therefore undertakes no specific monitoring. If the member of the public is still concerned I recommend they contact the University Safety Advisor or the Health and Safety Executive.

The University Safety Adviser
1 Fitzwilliam Street
Cambridge
C. 333301

HSE
14 Cardiff Road
Luton
LU1 1PP
01582 444200

(Lack of) public footpath sign in Shelford Road?

The Chair noted that this had been removed when the footpath had been re-surfaced. Another sign indicating the path to Foster Road/Addenbrookes had also been removed.

Chair/High
ways (T
Radford)

The Chair undertook to investigate why the notices had not been re-instated.

04/45 CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN – PROGRESS REPORT

Dave Roberts (Principal Policy & Projects Officer) introduced the report. It was expected that the proposals following consultation (which were being co-ordinated with South Cambridgeshire District Council) would be reported to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Council in April and May 2005 respectively

Councillor Barrett-Payton and County Councillor Carter stated their opposition to the inclusion of the Airport and Marshalls as sites for future development.

The Chair asked that the City Councillor members of the newly appointed Cambridge East Area Reference Group were listed. They are: Councillors Bailey, Bradnack, Durrant, Reid.

04/46 UPDATE ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME 2004/05

Helen Hepburn, Landscape Architect, introduced the report. The following updates were provided:

Paget Close – an estimated price for the hard works was £34,000. This did not include the plating which will be in the region of £4,500. The Committee agreed that this scheme should be

included in the Programme.

Bosworth Road – County Councillor Heathcock requested that the planting commence as soon as possible as the planters were being used as a dog toilet.

Helen
Hepburn,
01223
457134

Mowbray Road/Glebe Road – the Royal Mail had written to the Council indicating that the post box should be moved by the end of November.

Hauxton Road – the Committee was provided with further details of the Environmental Improvement proposal. It was noted that the officers were arranging for the redundant lamppost to be removed, but also that the Highways Authority would not agree to remove the signage.

The Committee did not support the proposal because it was not deemed a priority.

Managing the Environmental Improvement Grants

Subject to consultation with all members of the Area Committee, the Committee agreed to support delegation to officers to allow minor schemes to proceed (up to £750)

RESOLVED

- 1) (by 5 votes to 1) To recommend to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Executive Councillor (Planning and Transport) restricted delegated powers to officers to allow minor environmental improvements to proceed up to £750 (para 6.1 – 6.11).
- 2) (by 5 votes to 1) To recommend to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Executive Councillor (Planning and Transport) to consult with all members of the Area Committee before making decisions on minor projects.
- 3) (by 6 votes to 0) Not to approve the scheme for Hauxton Road, Trumpington.
- 4) (by 7 votes to 0) To approve the inclusion of Paget Close in the 2004/05 Programme.

Helen
Hepburn,
01223
457134

04/47 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

1 Application no. C/04/1005/FP
Site R/O 46 Newton Road (Trumpington)
Proposal Erection of detached dwelling and 2 car garage.
Applicant Summerpark, c/o 1 Orwell Close
Public speaker - Mr Gilmore (architect for the applicant).

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

To approve the application as detailed in the report.

- 2** **Application no.** C/04/0829/FP
Site 15 , Chaucer Road (Trumpington)
Proposal Erection of new building to house MRI brain scanning equipment and associated plant.
Applicant Medical Research Council, 20 Park Crescent, London
Public speaker - Professor Marsten-Wilson (applicant)

Added in condition 7 “for scanning volunteers” being introduced after the word “used” and before the word “outside”, in the first line of condition 7.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)

To approve the application as detailed in the report with the addition to Condition 7 as above.

- 3** **Application no.** C/04/0850/FP
Site 281 Hills Road (Queen Edith’s)
Proposal Erection of 1no.2 bedroom bungalow with garage
Applicant Mr/Mrs Riches, 281 Hills Road.

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1)

To approve the application as detailed in the report.

- 4** **Application no.** C/04/0463/FP
Site 100-108, Shelford Road (Trumpington)
Proposal Outline planning application for residential development.
Applicant Marks & Spencer c/o James Quinlan, Forge House Foremans Road, Thriplow, Royston
Public speaker - Mr Dawson (Trumpington Environment Action Group), Mr Sillery (Bidwells for Countryside Properties)

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

On the recommendation of the Planning Officer, to defer the application to the next Committee to afford further clarification from the County Council on the relationship with the proposed southern access road.

- 5** **Application no.** C/04/0940/FP
Site Waitrose, Hauxton Road(Trumpington)
Proposal Erection of front extension to sales area. Rear extension to warehouse and reconfiguration of car parking.
Applicant Waitrose Ltd. C/o Turley Associated, 25 Saville Row, London

Public speaker - Mr Dawson (Trumpington Environment Action Group), Mr Harris (applicant)

The Planning Officer informed the Committee of the following from the amendment sheet:

In recognition of the concern expressed over light spillage from the car park the applicants are willing to install baffles to the car park lights following their reinstallation/ repositioning as a result of the car park works.

Additionally, in terms of light spill from the store itself, the applicants are willing to install blackout blinds to the main shopfront which will be controlled to power down when the car park lights are switched off. The applicants are happy to see condition/s imposed to this effect & also to have the car park lighting times subject to control as per the existing consent.

This can be agreed under condition 11 in the report.

Although landscaping is conditioned further work on this has been done by the applicants. A short landscape statement has been received, with drawings to follow. This refers to remedial works plus new planting to ensure an effective screen to Hauxton Rd and should reflect the landscape officer's requirements.

The applicant wishes to point out the following;

That as far as the tree belt to the south of the building is concerned, the boundary with Monsanto and that site will of course be coming up for redevelopment with its own landscape buffer to Waitrose. A related point is that provision has been made within this rear area to accommodate a pedestrian link to Monsanto, which was a specific member request.

A further point discussed with members was the vehicular pedestrian conflict at the front of the store: this has been addressed though the car park reconfiguration which take the immediate point of access to the parking away from the greatest area of pedestrian activity

The report does not mention our Green Travel Plan, which was prepared after lengthy discussion within the business & was welcomed by members when we discussed the proposals with them on a pre application basis. For the avoidance of doubt I would confirm that we are happy to see this conditioned

Amendments To Text :

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation :

Add condition 19:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the Travel Management Plan received by the Local Authority on 24 August 2004.

Reason: To promote and integrate sustainable means of transport and reduce reliance on the private car. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policy P8/2, Cambridge Local Plan policy TR51)

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

To approve with landscaping matters still to be resolved, including trees within the car park area and subject to the additional condition referred to above.

6

Application no. C/04/0926/FP

Site Land to the rear of 111-113 High /Street, Cherry Hinton

Proposal Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission c/00/0551/op (erection of one additional detached bungalows (Class C3) outline application) to allow 5 years for the submission of Reserved Matters.

Applicant Mrs Rowling, c/o Taylor Vinters, Merlin Place Milton Rd Cambridge.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

To approve the application as detailed in the report.

7

Application no. C/04/0907/FP

Site 66 Hartington Grove (Queen Edith's)

Proposal Erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and alteration to North elevation.

Applicant Mr Rothwell, 66 Hartington Grove.

Public speaker - Mr Rothwell (applicant)

The Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet which stated "The applicant has written indicating a willing ness to reduce the extension so that it stands 500 mm off the boundary rather than the 250 mm currently shown.

The Planning Officer explained that it is not in the gift of Committee to determine from among options, and that it can only consider the submitted plans. If the Committee wishes to see a reduced scheme it must defer the proposal so that formal plans are submitted and another round of consultation using the relevant plans is undertaken. The only option it could introduce, (and presuming it was minded to approve the amended plans), would be to give

officers delegated authority to approve the application on the basis of the amended plans, provided no objections were raised during the further period of consultation.

A letter, strongly recommending that the recommendation is overturned and the proposal approved, has been sent to the Case Officer by Councillor Alan Baker, who is unable to attend the meeting.”

The Committee noted that the applicant was also prepared to reduce the/hip the gable end.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

Delegated authority given to officers to approve the application, subject to the receipt of amended plans setting the two storey extension to the building 500mm off the common boundary and showing a hipped roof, and subject to no objections being received to those amended plans. (NB – the Committee’s decision was against the officer’s recommendation which was to refuse).

8

Application no. C/04/0951/FP

Site 260 Hills Road (Queen Edith’s)

Proposal Alteration to garage/store and erection of pitched roof (loft extension).

Applicant Mr Gerke, 260 Hills Road.

Public speaker - Mr Gerke (applicant)

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

To approve the application (against the officer’s recommendation to refuse). Following conditions attached.

1. CO1
2. C13
3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows or dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 1996 policies BE2 and BE8).

The meeting ended at 10.10pm

CHAIR

