



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Area Committee (City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's, Trumpington Wards) 26 January 7.30pm – 10.06pm Minutes & Actions

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

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)**

06/01 APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

Nominations had been received from Cllrs Baker and McPherson.

A vote was taken. There being 4 votes for Cllr Baker and 3 votes for Cllr McPherson, Cllr Baker was elected Vic Chair for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

06/02 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from City Councillors Robert Dryden (Cherry Hinton), Sheila Stuart (Trumpington) and County Councillors Christine Carter (Cherry Hinton) and Geoffrey

Heathcock (Queen Edith's).

06/03 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

06/09 – Councillor Adigun-Harris declared a prejudicial interest as he had assisted his constituents in objecting to the application. He spoke as a ward councillor on the application, but took no part in the decision and did not vote.

06/04 MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

05/49 re. St James Community Forum - Councillor Baker had provided written information for the public on the background to this group.

05/51 re. Granchester Road/Maris Lane – Cllr Slatter advised that a public meeting had been held and some appropriate highways signs will be erected by the owner of Anstey Hall to inform vehicle owners of the waiting restrictions.

06/05 OPEN FORUM

1. Improvement to allotment land at Foster Road

The Chair raised a question on behalf of a constituent regarding environmental improvements to an area of allotment land at Foster Road. The constituent would be advised that any proposal should be submitted to the South Area Committee's Environmental Improvement Officer, John Broad. The Committee would be considering schemes for approval in 2006/07 at its meeting on 18 May.

John
Broad
01223
457322

2. Paths upgrade along Brooklands Avenue: is it complete?

County Councillor Kent advised following a meeting with officers on site on 23 January, there were still some minor elements to be completed e.g. seeding. Some edges would not be improved because of costs. At the Hills Road end improvement would be made for cyclists. On the south side nothing was going to change.

County
Councillor
Kent

3. When discussing possible sites for the proposed recycling centre for the south of the City we were told by a councillor at a meeting of the Trumpington Residents Association that the Bayer Crop Science site at Hauxton was too contaminated for the proposed recycling unit. We now understand that plans to build around 250 houses and construct light industrial units employing around 300 people on the site are at an advanced stage of planning – any comment?

County Councillor Kent would find out from South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC). She thought that the site was ideal for the recycling unit. Cllr Slatter agreed that de-contamination would be

County
Councillor

much more of a problem for residential use.

Kent

Subsequent to the meeting, the following was provided by the Planning Department at SCDC:

“The Bayer site at Hauxton is allocated for a mixed use redevelopment (housing and employment) in the Site Specific Policies DPD which the Council submitted to the Secretary of State (policy SP/7). If you do not have a copy it is available on the Council's web-site. The planned redevelopment is supported by the local community.”

4. Proposal for one extra parking bay for residents of Wulfstan Way bungalows and extend the fence from the parking bay to the wall of No. 160

Cllr Taylor undertook to look into this with City Homes South. Cllr Baker was due to have a meeting with County Councillor Heathcock and a County Council Highways Engineer and would make a site visit.

Cllrs Taylor
and Baker

06/06 CAMBRIDGE INDEPENDENT ADVICE CENTRE

Tony Schofield, Deputy Co-coordinator for Cambridge Independent Advice Centre, gave information about a current CIAC take-up initiative which would help local people claim tax credits, housing benefit, Council tax benefit etc. This has been funded by the area committee grants budget.

Information had been delivered to local households and residents were encouraged to contact the CIAC for advice.

Contact/more information at

01223 712222

www.ciac.org.uk

06/07 PRIMARY CARE TRUST – Choose and Book Service

Kevin Reynolds (Primary Care Trust) gave a presentation on the Choose-and-Book Service.

From January 1st 2006, all patients who need a referral to a specialist can expect:

- A choice of up to 4 or 5 hospitals
- To be able to book an appointment at a time and place to suit them
- Information to help them make their choice
- Rehabilitation/aftercare locally

The advantages for the GP and the hospital:

- Simple referral process
- Full directory of all the secondary care services available
- Fewer queries from patients chasing referral

- Advice and guidance facility
- Fewer “did not attends”

The advantages for the patient:

- Greater convenience and certainty reducing the stress of referral
 - Choice of a place, date and time that suits them, enabling them to fit their treatment in with their life, not the other way around
- Ability to discuss their treatment options so that they experience a more personalised health service

Main providers for District General Hospital services in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire:

- Cambridge University Hospitals FT
- Hinchingsbrooke Hospital
- Peterborough Hospitals FT
- West Suffolk Hospital
- Bedford Hospital

What is covered at present?

- First referral only
- Further appointments need to be made with the hospital
- Only contracted hospitals/clinics
- In future – all hospitals across the country

29 out of 34 GP practices

What is excluded?

- Emergencies
- Urgent referrals – cancer, severe chest pain
- Maternity services
- Mental health services
- Cataracts (2 providers)

More information can be found at:

www.nhs.uk/healthspace and select ‘choose and book’

tel 0845 60 88 88 8

txtphone 0845 8 50 22 50

06/08 NIGHTINGALE AVENUE RECREATION GROUND: RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

The Head of Active Communities introduced the report. The Committee was informed of the background:

- 1) That the Council’s s106 Strategy was agreed by the then Executive Councillor for Environment in April 2004
- 2) Consultation undertaken in February 2005 by the then Head of Parks & Recreation
- 3) Report and petition to Community Development & Leisure Scrutiny Committee March 2005 and decisions of the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Leisure.

In Queen Edith's ward there were at 2001 census 1381 people under 16 out of a ward population of 8070. The Council's standard for outdoor informal recreation provision for children and teenagers is 0.3 Hectares per 1000 of population. The current provision for Queen Edith's ward is 0.0186 Hectares per 1000 of population – this is substantial under provision. There are 19 pieces of play equipment in Queen Edith's compared to a City average of 48.

The Council's Open Spaces Strategy (July 2004) sets out in more detail the types of equipment required.

At the public meeting on 23 January, members of the public had raised the option of using Cherry Hinton Hall Park as an alternative for such development. In a strategic context, the Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground is a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) (Council's Parks Strategy 2004). A NEAP serves an 600m straight line catchment area. Cherry Hinton Hall is classified as a city park and has a wider catchment. The Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground is a Local Area Equipped for Play with a local 240m linear catchment. The NEAP function is served by Cherry Hinton Hall. Apart from a small crossover, neither serves the catchment of Queen Edith's covered by Nightingale Avenue.

On the consultation responses, it was noted that 68 copies of the consultation were delivered to the properties surrounding the recreation ground of which 17 were returned. *This had been undertaken by Cllr Baker following 1 December South Area Committee see minute 05/49.*

The Committee noted an amendment to the report (page 13 of the agenda). Under question 3, delete first bullet point and replace with 76% (13) respondents expressed a view of where the MUGA should be sited.

Regarding the public meeting on 23 January, over 60 people were present. There was a mix of views on the proposed scheme. There was concern expressed of anti-social behaviour and how the facilities may make the situation worse. At the end of the meeting, a show of hands had resulted in 29 against the proposal and 20 in favour.

The Chair then asked the committee to comment.

Cllr Barrett-Payton:

- Questioned the officers assertions based on such a small number of responses from schoolchildren in favour of a MUGA (8%)
- Asking a question 'where do you want it (MUGA)

- presupposed (the respondent) wanted it in the first place
- Some consultees lived outside 600m radius
- Police said at the public meeting on 23 January they wanted to funnel the problems (of young people) onto the Rec.
- Was a second tennis court still included in the proposals?

Cllr Baker:

- Three sets of consultation had been undertaken
- The latest consultation (ending 20 December) achieved a 25% response, much more than the 10% response which would be regarded as acceptable in market survey terms
- The consultation is seen as an expression of opinion which Members would take into account
- If the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Leisure agreed the scheme, planning permission would be required. As he was a member of the Planning Committee he would take no further part in the debate

The Committee Manager confirmed that the Planning Committee would determine the planning application.

Cllr Slatter:

- Some people at the public meeting on 23 January had not previously been consulted about the proposals, but were very supportive (this included younger people)
- A peripheral path would need planning permission
- There should be a variety of surfaces available for different users of the path
- Seating should be provided by the MUGA and on the path

Cllr Taylor:

- Being a ward councillor for over 10 years, one of the things mentioned 'on the doorstep' was that the young people have nothing to do
- Pleased that the existing children's area and toilets are to be refurbished
- In favour of the MUGA and seating, peripheral path and seating, an additional tennis court.
- The MUGA should be sited not too close to people's homes

Head of Active Communities & Senior Technical Manager:

- The MUGA would have a 1m fence around it, no floodlighting and is primarily used for 5-a-side football
- It would be located away from properties – it needed to be visible
- A second tennis court would be located next to the existing one
- This type of facility (i.e. a MUGA) is included in the Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy which was adopted in July 2004. The majority of it is Supplementary Planning

Guidance. It supports and amplifies policies in the adopted Cambridge Local Plan 1996 and the Cambridge Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004.

A member of the public wished to speak. Following a suggestion from Cllr Baker and irrespective of the fact that there had been the public meeting on Monday, the Chair permitted new questions/statements;

Two members of the public made the following points:

- At the public meeting people had also expressed a preference for siting the facility at Cherry Hinton Hall

The Chair responded any provision for Cherry Hinton Hall would be in addition to that proposed for Nightingale Avenue Rec.

- Why were St Bede's not included in the consultation

The Head of Active Communities responded that a significant percentage of the pupils were not local (it is a Church School) and the City Council has set aside funding to invest in a community use sports centre on the site.

Cllr Adigun-Harris:

- Had concerns about the integrity of decision-making based on a report that had been questioned by both public and councillors.

In addition to the comments above, the Chair proposed that the Committee indicate its views to the Executive Councillor by means of a show of hands. Councillor Barrett-Payton proposed that this be done in two parts (i) for the MUGA (ii) for the others aspects of the scheme.

On a show of hands, the proposal for a MUGA, with appropriate seating was supported (3:2);

On a show of hands, a peripheral path with appropriate seating and a second tennis court was supported (5:1)

Note - Cllr Baker abstained as explained above.

06/09 APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Application no. 05/1201/FUL

Site Clarendon House, Clarendon Road CB2 2BA

Proposal Erection of two 6 m high external light standards

Applicant – La Salle Investment Mgt, 33 Cavendish Square po box 2326 W1A 1NF

Public speakers - Dr Owens

Updates were made and are repeated below (from the planning amendment sheet):

“The following has been circulated by email to Members of the Committee:

Subject: Retrospective Planning Application for two 6 metre high external lights at Clarendon House

To all Councillors of South Area Committee, (Trumpington, Queen Edith's and

Cherry Hinton Councillors) From: Ron Clifton, Chairman Residents Association on behalf of Residents of nos 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 21 Clarendon Road, Cambridge.

Ref: Planning Application 05/1201/FUL

Erection of two 6 metre high external light standards and lights

For consideration by South Area Committee on January 26th

Dear Councillors,

We are writing concerning our request to the Planning Department to refuse retrospective planning permission for these standard lights. We have written objecting over the last few months about the excessive night lighting around Clarendon House installed in recent refurbishment.

We have read Mr Doe's report to you, and it fails in a Statutory Duty to mention in his Representations Summary 7.0 - 7.3 five important objections raised in our letters about this retrospective application. These are:

1. The Conservation Area Status of Clarendon Road
2. That it was a retrospective application
3. The History of Lighting at Clarendon House
4. The quality and quantity of new lighting on the site, and energy waste
5. The health and well-being implications for residents.

See below:

1. The Conservation Area Status

Mr Doe does not record the fact the residents pointed out the proximity to the Conservation Area. The inappropriate nature of these lights can only be

fully understood in this context. The 1990 Act states that any development

adjacent to a Conservation Area "should maintain and enhance" its character; in this case it is mostly Victorian.

2. Retrospective Application

Although it was reported in May to the Planning Department that these

lights were illegally erected, no action was taken or time limit set for the developers to put in a retrospective application until further action in November.

3. History of lighting at Clarendon House

There has been no history of this level of lighting at Clarendon House before the redevelopment. Mr Doe does refer to the nearby Lockton House.

These lights were erected before the Conservation Area was defined and established.

4. Quality and quantity of the new lighting and energy waste

Mr Doe mentions the design of the lighting columns as "standard", but not the complaint that they shed a harsh white light in an area already overlit by other lights. He does not mention the existing level of lighting at Clarendon House. There are in addition six large amber fluorescent lights at a lower level in the small entrance area to the Car Park where these standard lights are erected as well as two standard lights in the road of access to the Unex site which is only yards away running alongside.

There

are in total ten bright lights on all night in a very small area. A new large 90 square foot glass entrance on to the pavement and the car-park at basement level are also lit up all night This is all wasteful of energy.

5. Health and Well-being Implications for local residents

We complained about the adverse affect on the sleep and health and well-being of residents living opposite bright all-night lighting. The lights shine into bedroom windows opposite.

Thank you.

Officer Response:

The Site Description explains that part of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.10 boundary runs along Clarendon Road. The description of the proposal makes it plain that the application is retrospective. That the lights are too bright and unneighbourly and will contribute to light pollution, and that there is already sufficient lighting on the building, does address elements of concerns about new lighting on the site and by implication, energy waste.

That notwithstanding it would in retrospect have helped to have had a fuller summary of concerns of neighbours in the report."

-o0o-

Resolved - (by 6 votes to 0 against the officer recommendation)

(i) That the application be refused (*reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by Chair and spokespersons these were agreed and are set out below*)

(ii) That officers prepare an Enforcement Report and delegated

authority to the Chair and Spokes to make a decision on the report.

Agreed reasons for refusal:

The proposed lamp standards and their Priory Luminaire PY1077 head fittings are poorly designed for purpose. As a consequence, instead of directing light downward in a limited area, they allow the escape of light in a horizontal plane which, despite the standards being set approximately 16.5 and 27.5 metres back from the highway edge, is of such brightness that it means that:

- i) the proposed lights together with other lighting in the immediate vicinity of, or within, the building constitute an excess of illumination which has a harmful impact on the local townscape, contrary to Policy BE4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996);
- ii) the proposed lights and their illumination have a detrimental impact upon and neither enhance nor preserve the character or appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area, contrary to the spirit of Policy BE32 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996) and advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment (1994); and that
- iii) the proposed lights have a harmful affect on the residential amenity of the local residents and therefore fail to recognise the constraints of the site or relate well to the surroundings contrary to policy BE2 and BE8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).

For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design, that is inappropriate in its context, that fails to take the opportunities for improving the character of the area, and that does not contribute positively to making places better for people; it is therefore contrary to advice in Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).

The meeting ended at 10.06pm

Chair

Next meeting: 23 March at British Legions Hall, Fishers Lane,
Cherry Hinton at 7.30pm