



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Area Committee (City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's , Trumpington Wards) 3 March 2005 7.30pm – 10.35pm Minutes & Actions

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

Also Present: County Councillors Christine Carter (Cherry Hinton), Geoffrey Heathcock (Queen Edith's) Anne Kent (Trumpington)

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

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

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

05/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology was received from Councillor Rob Dryden (Cherry Hinton) as he was on a Mayoral engagement.

05/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest in 05/10 as she was a user of the Nightingale Recreation Ground.

05/12 Councillors Slatter and Adigun-Harris as trustees of Trumpington Village Hall.

05/14 (4) The Chair declared a personal interest in that the agent for the applicant was a Liberal Democrat Councillor at another local authority and was known to her.

05/14 (7) Cllr Barrett-Payton was well known to the applicant declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting whilst the application was considered.

05/09 MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

05/06 (2) – 43 Long Road: *The following was reported by the Planning Officer as an information item and reproduced here for the record:* On reviewing the decision notice, officers were concerned that:

- a) one condition, condition No.4, was not quite as precise as was intended; and
- b) that a specific condition to restrict the use of the orthodontist practice element of the proposal to that use only, which was intended and which meant that the building could not be used for any other use within Class D1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) - without submission of a further planning application - had not been included in the report. Such other uses would have included a crèche, day centre, an educational use, a public hall, or for use in connection with public worship or religious instruction.

Agreement was therefore sought from the Councillors Slatter and Baker, to vary condition 4 and add a further condition.

To amend Condition 4 from the South Committee agenda wording:

No more than one qualified orthodontist may operate from the practice at any given time when the surgery is open.

To read:

Not more than one person working as an orthodontist shall operate at the practice at any one time when the surgery is open.

Reason: More intensive use of the facility could result in a level of traffic generation that might prejudice the free flow of traffic in conflict with transport policy (Cambridge Local Plan 1996 policies ET2, TR27 and the Eastern Area Corridor Transport Plan 2002).

The additional condition to read:

That part of the premises to be used for an orthodontist practice shall be used for that purpose only and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any

statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, and because use of the building for any other purpose would require re-examination of its impact. (Cambridge Local Plan 1996 policies EO1, and TR27)

05/04 – Citi bus routes: (i) C8 service - a member of the public representing COPE wanted to find out more about the County Council's proposal for the C8 service. The Chair undertook to assist with a letter to Basil Jackson, the Head of Passenger Transport at the County Council. (ii) Park & Ride intermediate stops ceasing? County Cllr Kent stated that there was an agreement between the County Council and Stagecoach to stop in Porson Road. Cllr Slatter

05/05 – Grant to Cambridge Volunteer Centre: a representative from the Centre advised the Committee of two events in April to encourage volunteering: 25 April and 26 April 12.30-2pm a public fair at Cherry Hinton Village Centre, with workshops from 10-12noon for those groups requiring more volunteers.

05/10 OPEN FORUM

A Parking at North Cottages, Trumpington

Parking provision outside of the cottages is not possible since Local Authority Parking Enforcement (October 2004). The pavement is wide enough for a car to park and for pedestrians to pass. There is precedent in other parts of the city. It would be inexpensive to introduce.

The Chair and County Cllr Kent undertook to visit the site and take the matter up with the Council's Engineers.

Cllr Slatter
and
County Cllr
Kent

B – Skateboarding on Byron Square

It would be good if the Council providing more skateboarding facilities ie increase the length of the ramp.

The Chair would write to the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Leisure to draw her attention to this.

Cllr Slatter

C – Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground – consultation on play equipment.

Mrs Clancey (of Nightingale Avenue) addressed the Committee in the Open Forum. In summary her points were:

- The Rec was created as part of residential development, it had a park keeper and was locked until the 1980s.
- The ground is already well used and enjoyed by all ages.

- The proposals will have a vertical impact of steel mesh and railings, creating an urban playground.
- Residents already suffer from noise, disturbance and vandalism. They do not want a no go area Recreation Ground.
- The s106 projects as considered by the Queen Edith's Forum was not representative. of local residents.
- Consultation appears to be restricted to perceived needs of teenagers.
- A petition of over 200 signatures showed most support for a second tennis court and better walkways for those with mobility problems and pushchairs. A better walkway would the Council's disability and equalities objectives.
- Cherry Hinton Hall Park would be a better venue for young person's play equipment.
- Improved planting and wildlife areas.
- City and County Councils should re-open Netherall Youth Club

Councillor Slatter reminded the Committee of the representations received from young people in April 2004 requesting a skateboard facility on the Recreation Ground. She said that there had been positive outcomes of installing a skateboarding facility at Byron's Square in Trumpington and encouraged Mrs Clancey to speak to the relevant resident association for its views.

Councillor Taylor explained that the Recreation Ground was for the benefit of the local community and not just those living in the immediate area. She was concerned that there should be provision for facilities for young people. Cllr Taylor did support Mrs Clancey's request for improved pathways (for those with mobility problems and for those with pushchairs) and better planting.

Councillor Barrett-Payton stated that the adjoining residents views needed to be taken into account and favoured a second tennis court. He said that improved provision for young people should be located at Cherry Hinton Hall Park.

Councillor Baker stated that preliminary results of the consultation had shown strong support for improvements to the play area, mixed views on a kick about area and very strong views against a skateboarding area. There was support also for a second tennis court, a perimeter track and benches.

Councillor Stebbings supported the proposal for improved paths/tracks and improvements to the wildlife areas. Councillor Slatter suggested that any walkway should accommodate those walkers who require softer ground (for those people with problem joints for example) that had been an issue raised at a previous South Area Committee.

Committee

Councillor Slatter thanked Mrs Clancey for attending and expressing the concerns of local people. *The Area Committee noted that the petition would be referred to the Community Development & Leisure Scrutiny Committee on 24 March.*

05/11 OPEN FORUM – EXECUTIVE COUNCILLOR FOR ENVIROMENTAL SERVICES

Cllr Iain Coleman spoke about his areas of responsibility (waste collection and recycling, public toilets, street cleaning, removal of graffiti, abandoned vehicles, crematoria & cemeteries) and answered questions.

Can I get a lid for my recycling black box?

Yes, for a small charge (£1.75). Contact the City Services Helpdesk 01223 458282.

Is there a health & safety issue with leaving raw and cooked food in green bins for up to 2 weeks?

The plant where green bin refuse is composted is licenced by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. The compost is heated to a temperature high enough to kill off bacteria.

Having read that the South Area team has nearly £4,000 left in its Community Development and Leisure budget, I would like to suggest that some of the money could be used to purchase and install rubbish bins. I live off Harvey Road and notice that the route from Parkers Piece to the station is sorely lacking this facility. particularly on the corner of Harvey Road and Hills Road and Harvey Road and Gresham Road.

Councillor Coleman to reply – copy his answer in here.

If the Council is to collect plastic, why just bottles?

The City Council can only collect what the County Council can dispose.

From Cllr McPherson - *Are the public toilets on Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground to close?*

There is a review of the City's public toilets that have not been included in the first three years of improvement programme (most are outside the city centre). *[Update after the meeting - A consultation letter has been sent to Cherry Hinton Ward Councillors has been sent consulting on the option of closing the toilets on the Recreation Ground and making those within the Cherry Hinton*

Village Centre open for general public use].

**05/12 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LEISURE GRANTS
2004/05 and 2005/06**

Question from the public - I understand that there is nearly £4000 still available for Trumpington Residents. I would like to suggest that this money is used to subsidise entrance to the Botanic Gardens. I understand the price is now £3 per visit and the free Wednesday morning provision has been withdrawn. Perhaps a book of 10 tickets per applicant, per year giving them £2 off the entrance charge. This would be on a first come, first serve basis. This would enable 200 people to make frequent use of the gardens at £1 per visit. Proof of residence of Trumpington could be provided by the usual methods- pension letter, utility bill, driving licence etc.

The Grants Manager advised the Committee the remaining money 2004/05 was not all for Trumpington. The Committee noted that the criteria for awarding grants meant that a grant must enable such a facility to be available to any city resident. A city wide view was needed and the Grants Manager would approach the Botanic Gardens to pursue the idea further (and whether the Leisurecard could be used).

Chris
Freeman
01223
457862

Resolved -

1) To agree the following grants for 2004/05 funding:

Centre at St Pauls - £2119 for furniture

Denis Wilson Social Club - £797 computer and software

Queen Edith's Primary School - £345 activities for Family Science Day

Trumpington Toddlers - £600 storage sheds and removal costs

Trumpington WI for microphone, amp and speakers – Defer pending Village Hall facilities upgrade.

2) To agree the following grant for 2005/06 funding:

Trumpington Elderly Action Group – up to £1165 subject to the income that the Group would be able to generate towards the cost of outings proposed.

05/13 VERGE PARKING

The Committee noted the current process. Trumpington ward

councillors had agreed that there was no scheme to propose for the ward. Queen Edith's ward councillors had proposed Mowbray Road and Cherry Hinton ward councillors were to propose Church End.

05/14 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

1

Application no. C/04/1235/FUL

Site 95 Glebe Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 7TE

Proposal Erection of 4No. dwellings (3No. 3 bedroom dwellings and 1No. 5 bedroom dwelling) plus retention of 95 Glebe Road.

Applicant – Mr and Mrs Cook, 95 Glebe Road

Public speakers - Mr Crouch (objecting), Mr Symonds (applicant)

The Planning Officer read out the information in the amendment sheet, which had been copied to the Committee and provided, to the objectors and applicant. The objectors had circulated photographs to the Officer and Committee the day before. The applicant was advised that these had been used at the Development Control Forum to which he had previously attended.

“ To Note : Additional drainage information has been received from the agent. This information was received after the appeal against non-determination had been lodged. Therefore, the additional drainage information forms part of the applicants appeal submission to the Planning Inspectorate and not part of the application. As such, it will be for the Inspector to assess the additional drainage information in determining the appeal.

Once an appeal is lodged in respect of an application, the application is taken out of the jurisdiction of the local planning authority and falls within the jurisdiction of the Planning Inspectorate. Any information submitted after the appeal has been lodged is for the Inspector to assess and determine.

Amendments To Text : None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation : Paragraph 9.1 amended to read “DELEGATED AUTHORITY is given to Officers to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.”

Resolved

That the City Council resolves not to approve the proposal but rejects it, and that the Councils case at the forthcoming appeal is based on the opposition to the scheme set out in the report. Delegated authority given, as set out above, to proceed with the s.106 in connection with the appeal

- 2** **Application no.** C/04/1208/FUL
Site The Barn, Tenby Close, Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 9YG
Proposal Change of use from brick barn / store to residential
Applicant CCC Property Services
The Guildhall Cambridge CB2 3QJ

Resolved

To approve the application as detailed in the report

- 3** **Application no.** C/05/0029/FUL
Site Land To The Rear Of 42 Sedley Taylor Road Cambridge
Cambridgeshire CB2 2PN
Proposal Change of use from annex to dwelling with rear ground
floor extension, erection of garage and creation of new drive to
Sedley Taylor Road
Applicant Vivien Perutz 42 Sedley Taylor Road Cambridge
Cambridgeshire CB2 2PN

Withdrawn as the matter could be decided under officer delegation.

- 4** **Application no.** C/04/0463/
Site 100-108 Shelford Road Cambridge CB2 2NF
Proposal Outline planning application for residential development.
Applicant Marks & Spencer Plc
C/o James A Quinlan Forge House Foremans Road "Thriplow,
Royston" SG87RA

Resolved -

To approve the application as detailed in the report

- 5** **Application no.** C/04/1397/FUL
Site Owen Webb House 1 Gresham Road Cambridge
Cambridgeshire CB1 2ER
Proposal Application for the amendment of planning permission
C/03/1035FP to provide 13 residential units (instead of 12) by
altering the internal arrangement of Owen Webb House to create 4
units in Owen Webb House (instead of 3).
Applicant Hill Residential Unit 2 Osprey House Trinity Business
Park Trinity Way Chingford E4 8TD

Resolved -

To approve the application as detailed in the report.

- 6** **Application no.** 05/0028/S73
Site Land rear of 23 Sedley Taylor Road, Queen Edith's
Proposal Variation of Condition 3 of planning permission
C/99/0562/OP (allowed on appeal) to allow a further five years for
development to commence

Applicant Barry Rencher Robinson
27 Bentley Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 2AW
Public Speaker – Prof. Muthesius (objector)

The Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet:

“To Note : Occupier of 23 Sedley Taylor Road wishes it to be noted that she believes the case officer’s report does not refer to one of her main objections: the absence of a turning circle for cars in the proposal.

A copy of the appeal Decision Letter from previous appeal, granting permission for the development of this site, is attached.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation :

No response has yet been received from the applicant regarding the need for a section 106 agreement to be entered into. Unless an agreement is completed it is therefore the intention to refuse the application on 4 March for the reason set out in paragraph 9.2 of the report.

Members of the Committee spoke of concern that the application if granted would be contrary to policies BE2 and NE8.

Resolved (against the officer recommendation)

Refused.

Reasons agreed by Committee subsequently are:

1. The development of this parcel of land to the rear, west, of 23 Sedley Taylor Road, by the construction of a single dwelling, constitutes an inappropriate form of backland development. The proposal does not reflect the residential character of this side of Sedley Taylor Road, which is one of substantial houses with street frontages and long rear gardens. Furthermore, the proposal fails the tests set out in criteria b) and d) of Policy NE8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996), in that it fails to demonstrate any access to the public highway (let alone a safe means of access), and has not addressed the opportunities for comprehensive, rather than a piecemeal approach to development. The proposal does not reflect the character of the area, recognise the constraints of the site, or relate well to its surroundings. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies NE8 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).

2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space or community development facilities, in accordance with the following policies: policies CS3 and RL3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996); policy P9/8 of the

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004, and the guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards, adopted as supplementary planning guidance by Cambridge City Council.

7

Application no. 04/1131/FUL

Site 32 Netherhall Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8NY

Proposal Erection of a two storey front and single storey rear extension including a rear conservatory

Applicant Mr & Mrs Bowyer

32 Netherhall Way Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 8NY

Public speaker – Mr Bowyer

Resolved (by 5 votes to 2 against the officer recommendation)

To approve the application.

1. Standard Condition C01 Commencement
2. No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policy P1/3 and Cambridge Local Plan 1996 policies BE2, BE4 and BE8)

Reasons for Approval

1.This development has been approved subject to conditions because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3

Cambridge Local Plan (1996): BE2 and BE4 and BE8

2 After representations had been made by both the applicant and the Planning Officer, and with knowledge of the local area, Committee took the view that the scale of the rear extension and conservatory proposed was not so great that there would be an unreasonably dominating impact, detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring property to the west (No.34). No unreasonable loss of light or outlook was expected to be suffered by that property, and there was, therefore, no failure to recognise the constraints of the site, nor an inappropriate relationship with the surroundings.

Instead there was conformity with Cambridge Local Plan policies BE2, BE4 and BE8.

The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further detail on the decision please see the officer report by visiting the Council Planning Department.

- 8** **Application no.** 04/1399/FUL
Site 25A Bishops Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 2NQ
Proposal Erection of a side extension and roof extension
Applicant Ms Tipping
25A Bishops Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 2NQ
Public speaker – Mr Couch for the applicant

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1 against the officer recommendation)

To approve the application.

1. Standard Condition C01 Commencement
2. No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policy P1/3 and Cambridge Local Plan 1996 policies BE2, BE4 and BE8)

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3

Cambridge Local Plan (1996): BE2 and BE4 and BE8

2 After representations had been made by both the applicant and the Planning Officer, and with knowledge of the local area,

Committee took the view that the scale of the rear extension and conservatory proposed was not so great that there would be an unreasonably dominating impact, detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring property to the west (No.34). No unreasonable loss of light or outlook was expected to be suffered by that property, and there was, therefore, no failure to recognise the constraints of the site, nor an inappropriate relationship with the surroundings. Instead there was conformity with Cambridge Local Plan policies BE2, BE4 and BE8.

The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further detail on the decision please see the officer report by visiting the Council Planning Department.

The meeting ended at 10.35pm

CHAIR