



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Area Committee (City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's, Trumpington Wards) 1 December 7.30pm – 10.15pm Minutes & Actions

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

Also Present: County Councillor 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

**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

05/45 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from County Councillors Christine Carter (Cherry Hinton) and Geoffrey Heathcock (Queen Edith's).

05/46 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none

05/47 MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

05/34 Rectory Terrace - Councillor Dryden advised the Committee that the Council did empty the bins in the area although it was private land.

05/48 OPEN FORUM - EDUCATION AND CHILDCARE PROVISION IN THE SOUTHERN FRINGE TO MEET ANTICIPATED NEED

Hazel Belchamber, County Council officer for School Organisation and Planning gave a presentation which outlined the Local Education Authority's current thinking on what would happen in the south of the city in response to the proposed housing developments.

The presentation can be viewed on the City Council's website at:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/councillors/comtab15.htm#Dec

During the question and answer session the following points were made by the officer:

- Whether a swimming-pool would be located on the site of a new secondary school would be a matter for discussion between the County Council and the City Council (the latter responsible for community leisure facilities).
- No provision was to be made for the Bell School site as the current proposals indicated 350 dwellings most of which were smaller units (ie. less children).
- Staff and pupils from Coleridge would be relocated if the proposals as currently planned were implemented.
- The County Council would ensure that Ridgefield School would not be affected by any development of the Coleridge site.
- The catchment area for the new secondary school would need to be looked at, catchment areas for the south generally would be reviewed.
- The new secondary school would take between 600-900 pupils (Netherhall takes 1400 at present; Coleridge 300).
- The school provision would be ideally in place before the families move in. A primary school takes two years to plan for and build and secondary school four years. A new secondary school would therefore be planned for 2009/10. Extending Fawcett School would first provide additional primary school places.

The Chair thanked Ms Belchamber and suggested that she come back to the Area Committee when proposals had firmed up.

05/49 OPEN FORUM

Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground: consultation on Multi-Use Games Area

The Chair read out an update on this matter (see past South Area Committee minutes 6 October, 11 August, 16 June, 21 April, 3

March).

“From Senior Sports Development Officer, Sally Stanhope: The community consultation ended on 18 November (community-wide and young people) and the results of this consultation will be compiled over the next month, with a full report being available for the next Area Committee on 26 January 2006.

A resident of Nightingale Avenue wrote to me on Friday, and subsequently telephoned me yesterday asking for information about where the questionnaires had been distributed within the community.

I have since replied to that request, and written her a letter today confirming that the questionnaires were distributed to the following locations: libraries, Cherry Hinton Village Centre, medical practice, post office, newsagents, pharmacy, shops, other businesses on Wulfstan Way, Queen Edith School, Netherhall School and to the secretary of St James Forum.”

The Chair advised that Ward Councillors had been concerned that the consultation questionnaires had not been delivered to immediate neighbours of the Rec.

Councillor Baker stated that there had been street by street consultation more than a year ago as well as a public exhibition. The intention of the recent consultation had been to target young people. However, he agreed that the consultation should have been wider and specifically to the immediate local residents. *Post meeting update: the consultation was delivered to properties adjoining the Rec over the weekend of 3rd/4th December with an extended period for replying.*

He undertook to organize a public meeting in the new year to consider the outcome of the consultation.

Cllr Baker

A resident of Nightingale Avenue spoke and made the following points:

- What was the role of the Queen Edith's Forum in the proposals for the MUGA on the Rec? This Forum had been mentioned by Council Officers and the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Leisure as representative of local interests – this was not correct. Local residents knew nothing about it. How can the Council use a small informal Group as a sounding board against the majority of local people.
- In a petition, more signatures had been collected against the proposals than had been expressed in support during the first consultation.

Councillor Baker responded that the **St James' Community Forum** was chaired by the Vicar of St James' Church, Wulfstan Way. This Forum had been incorrectly referred to throughout by City Council officers, councillors and public as the 'Queen Edith's Forum'.

The Forum had a fluctuating membership but most recently had involved the Deputy Head of Netherhall School, the Head of Queen Edith's Primary School, the Police Community Beat Officer and Police Community Support Officer, Ward Councillors. It did not have a formal Constitution or membership and had no powers over the local authorities or police. Meetings were not public. Councillor Baker was the current Treasurer and the Forum had a budget for small grants to voluntary groups in the local community. Its existence had been advertised but obviously not that well and efforts would be made to improve this. As far as he was aware, the City Council had not accepted the view of the Forum in any of the proposals for the Nightingale Avenue Rec. It had been treated as a consultee and had no undue influence.

(Note: Four other members of the public wished to speak on this matter. However, the Chair moved on to other business in the open forum, noting that the consultation results would be reported to the next Area Committee and that a public meeting was to be held before the next Area Committee).

Mill Road Winter Festival

A member of the public asked if the City Council had advised the organisers of the Festival to drop its reference to Christmas.

If the member of the public could provide more information, the Chair undertook to find out if any advice from the City Council had been given to the organisers of the Fair to drop reference to Christmas Festival and replace with 'Winter Festival'.

Post meeting update - upon investigation the name change had nothing to do with the City Council.

05/50 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & LEISURE GRANTS

Regarding the application to repair limestone griffins in Russell Court, (NAC/L2), the Committee noted that the funding would repair one of the griffins (not the pair as mentioned in the officer's report).

Resolved –

Group	Project	£
3 rd Trumpington Brownies	Holiday	860

*Chris
Freeman,
Grants*

Cherry Kids Club	New play equipment	447	Officer
Cherry Play Group	Furniture and equipment	600	01223
Cherry Toddler Group	Toddler group play equipment	480	457862
Romsey Mill	Youth work	3752	
SIN Cru	DJ course for young people	500	

Group	Project
New Town Res.Assoc.	Restoration of limestone griffin in Russell Court (£2703)
Trumpington Local History Group	Renovation of Henry Fawcett's grave (£447)

05/51 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME 2005/06

Helen Hepburn, the Council's Landscape Architect updated the Committee and introduced John Broad who will be taking over when she leaves her job with the Council.

Paget Close – trees had been planted and shrub/bulb planting was due to happen on 7 December.

Granchester Road/Maris Lane – the Chair had organised a public meeting and would report back to the next meeting. Cllr Slatter

Cherry Hinton High Street - the Committee noted that a total budget for the south area of £30,000 was forecast for 2006/07. Cllr Dryden supported the proposals for a holistic approach to the improvements (as in 4.10). Other members of the Committee indicated that a guideline cost for this scheme be brought back in the spring as well as any other schemes. John Broad, Landscape Architect 01223 457322

05/52 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

- (1) **Application no.** 05/1025/FUL
Site 95 Glebe Road CB1 7TE
Proposal Erection of 2 No3 bed dwellings with 2no double garages plus retention of 95 Glebe Road
Applicant – Mr and Mrs Cook 95 Glebe Road
Public speakers - Mr Cook, Mr Peters

The Committee noted the following amendments to the officer report:

To Note : An email has been received by the applicant regarding the following three points;

- *Para 4.1 Publicity- a yellow site notice was displayed for longer than the stipulated period. This is noted however, this part of the report refers to statutory site notices only.*
- *Para 8.20 Trees- the walnut tree within the grounds did have*

a TPO but this has been removed due to the poor health of the tree. The TPO has not been removed, however it is acknowledged that the tree can be removed as part of the overall development of the site.

- *Para 9.1 Recommendation- a unilateral undertaking has now been completed. (See below)*

Amendments To Text :

The Reason for condition 9 shall be amended to read;

Reason: To ensure the existing drainage and surface water run off problems are not exacerbated and to protect neighbouring properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 1996, policy BE2, and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan policy P1/2)

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation :

APPROVE subject to the 106 agreement, and subject to the following conditions:"

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

That the application be refused (*reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by Chair, Vice –Chair and Cllr Barrett-Payton*)

Reasons are as follows:

This full planning permission (reference C/05/1025/FP) for two houses to the rear of 95 Glebe Road Cambridge was considered at South Area Committee Meeting of the 1st December 2005. Committee resolved to overturn the recommendation of officers and refuse the planning application; Officers were required to draft reasons for refusal for the agreement of the Chair and Spokesperson. The draft reasons are set out below.

1. The development of the two dwellings proposed on this backland site would detract from and erode the quality and appearance of what is an attractive, green and tranquil area, important to the overall quality of the local environment. The scale, footprint, mass and height of the buildings fails to recognise the constraints of the site and, together with the materials, and in the absence of a street frontage, would result in an alien form which would not respect the character of the area or be in context with the surroundings; the proposal therefore constitutes poor design. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with policies NE8, BE1 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996) and advice on design in paragraph 34 of Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005).
2. The vehicular usage of the drive of the proposed development would, because of the proximity of the driveway to the house and its rear

garden, have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 97a Glebe Road, and the peace and quiet that that property currently enjoys. For this reason the proposal fails to recognise the constraints of the site or relate well to its surroundings and is contrary to policies NE8 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).

3. The introduction of two-storey forms, 7.1 metres in height, and extensive roofs of zinc and rendered walls, uncharacteristic materials, into this backland location, in close proximity to neighbouring boundaries, will unduly dominate the outlook from neighbouring properties, especially those in Baldock Way, contrary to objectives of policies NE8 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).

Application no. 05/0972/FUL

Site r/o 132 Shelford Road CB2 2NE

(2) Proposal Erection of 1 no dwellinghouse

Applicant – Dr Katz, 211 Queen Edith’s Way

Public speakers - Mrs Katz

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)

To approve the application as stated in the report.

Application no. 05/0927/FUL

Site 157 Queen Edith’s Way CB1 8PT

(3) Proposal Erection of part two storey and part single storey rear extension

Applicant – Miss Akhtar, 157 Queen Edith’s Way

Public speakers - none

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)

To approve the application as stated in the report.

The meeting ended at 10.15pm

Chair

Next meeting: 26 January at Fawcett School, Alpha Terrace,
Trumpington at 7.30pm