



**North Area Committee
(Comprising City Councillors representing Arbury, King's Hedges, East
Chesterton and West Chesterton Wards)**

Thursday 9 March 2006: 7.35pm – 10.10pm

Minutes & Actions

Councillors Present:

Arbury: Anthony Hymans, Rhodri James and Tim Ward (chair)
Kings Hedges: Louise Downham and Elizabeth Hughes
East Chesterton: Jenny Bailey and Jennifer Liddle
West Chesterton: Max Boyce and Ian Nimmo-Smith

County Councillors: Rupert Moss-Eccardt (Arbury), Elizabeth Hughes (Kings Hedges)
and Julian Huppert (East Chesterton)

**Action
by**

06/74 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absences were received from Councillor Armstrong and Wilkins

06/75 MINUTES

The **minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2006** were confirmed as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair after some corrections.

06/76

MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

State of pavements in the Kings Hedges Ward

Cllr James advised that some pavements in the Kings Hedges ward will be repaired within the Housing repairs budget, which is approved by the Housing Management Board. Nevertheless, there was a procedure to prioritise the order of importance of repairs.

Councillor James formally asked for a report for the Housing Management

Board on paving and lighting repairs, and how much the Council spent on them as a proportion of its overall repairs budget.

Cllr
James

Update on Cowley Road Travellers' Site

Councillor Nimmo- Smith advised that the Council had decided not to proceed with the travellers' site and that Mr Francis had been informed personally.

For more details, see the urgent decision at the following web address:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/councillors/agenda/2006/RecDec/060130esp.pdf>

06/77 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6/78 OPEN FORUM

HIGHWAYS DEVELOPMENT CONTROL IN CAMBRIDGE

County Councillor John Reynolds, Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services made the following presentation.

Policy Background

- The Structure Plan sets out the broad development framework for the County (to be approved at the end of next year).
- District Councils prepare Local Development Frameworks/ Local Plans
- The Local Transport Plan links to these planning frameworks

Major Developments

- There is a need to comply with National Policy, the Structure Plans, the Local Development Frameworks and the Local Plans.
- Early involvement with developers is achieved by the County and City Councils.
- Joint development of planning briefs by Councils sets the context for development.

Planning Application Process

- Joint working by County and City officers to assist determination decisions made by the City Council.
- The City Council runs the consultation process.
- The County Council is a statutory consultee supporting the consultation process.
- The Developer submits the Transport Assessment
- Vetting by the County determines the transport/highways measures required, considering all modes of transport, such as cycling, walking, bus, etc.
- Funding towards measures secured through Section 106 agreements or developers is required to provide additional measures directly through planning conditions.

Post-Application Process

The County Council determines the details of any significant additional highways measures through the Area Joint Committee.

The County Council undertakes or oversees implementation for as long as a two-year period to maintain the contractors' liability.

Questions on Highways Development Control in Cambridge

1. How much money from S106 agreement are councillors allowed to spend?
It depends on the impact of the development on the community. There is a list of schemes that councillors negotiate with the developers such as schools or community centres. If we do not reach an agreement, the inspector decides.
2. Do Cambridge City Council and Cambridge County Council agree a S106 figure and then divide it?
No, the figure is decided through a needs assessment.
3. How is the Local Transport Plan funded?
The Government funds the Local Transport Plan through revenue and capital.
4. What happens if the money raised is not sufficient to cover all the needs?
The planning terms and conditions determine the amount of money for the S106 agreement, although this can be revised by the Planning Authority.
5. What is the communication process between councillors and officers?
The County Councillors officers communicate in writing with the councillors prior to the preparation of the report and papers, and again after the decision is taken.
6. What happens if there is an error after the development is carried out?
The County Council decides whether to renew the expenditure or to make a submission to the Government to consider extra needs or to change the priority.
7. Does the Section 106 fund health care, or is this funded by the Primary Care Trust?
No, these are funded by the National Fund. An essential part of the Section 106 agreement is to provide the community with facilities such as education or schools, although the actual running of the school is funded by the County Council.

OTHER QUESTIONS IN THE OPEN FORUM

6/79

Conversions without planning permission

Ward councillors and enforcement officers should be consulted on conversions and extension prior to the planning application. In any case, the works are carried out at their own risk. It is not illegal and the planning system cannot prevent it although there is a possibility of revision when the planning application is submitted with comments and rejections from residents. The planning application is measured against the planning regulations.

Councillor Huppert asked for the specific details and identity of the property, and will consider **the regulations and consequences of illegal building and the possibility of retrospective application**

County
Cllr
Huppert

Vandalism in Kings Hedges bus shelters

Councillor Bailey mentioned the possibility of replacing the glass with plastic. Councillor Ward advised that there is a limited **budget for these repairs** and suggested that this should be **delegated to the Area Committee** itself. **He will propose this possibility to the next public Transport Steering Group.**

Cllr Ward

Street lighting

The light outside the dwelling of one member of the public has been in need of fixing for the last 2 years. It was agreed that the County Council will repair it tomorrow and was explained that a possible cause of the delay could be due to problems with houses numbering.

Councillor Ward advised the member of the public to ring the County Council every day until they fix the light outside his house, as this has worked in the past.

6/80 PROPOSALS TO DEVELOP IN PARTNERSHIP NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING AND NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT

John Fuller, Southern Divisional Community Manager for Cambridgeshire Constabulary

Neighbourhood Policing: Working in partnership to deliver safe and confident neighbourhoods

Background:

Since 1995, the British Crime Survey shows that the risk of being a victim of crime has fallen by 16%, yet two thirds of people believe that crime has risen in the past 2 years.

We need to create neighbourhoods that are safe and feel safe.

Our mission is to work with others and be accessible to all citizens; enable

citizens to influence community safety priorities in their neighbourhood; intervene with targeted and controlled responses to neighbourhood priorities; and implement resolutions and provide answers to local concerns.

We will achieve this through:

- Dedicated and accountable resources with geographic ownership: Cambridge is divided into 4 neighbourhoods.
- Intelligence-led targeting of the issues that matter most to communities.
- Joint problem solving by the police, partner agencies and communities. By having a partnership we will have better access, influence, intervention, action and answers.

How will partners be involved?

- Neighbourhood Policing cannot work in isolation. Partnerships with other local agencies are vital to achieving neighbourhood policing.
- Making a reality of neighbourhood policing requires a genuine partnership: the constabulary, local councils and all other partners responsible for community safety.
- Solutions to problems in neighbourhoods require all local services to work together with the public.

Working together to tackle crime and grime

Neighbourhood Policing Partnerships will have far-reaching benefits including:

- Improvements to quality of life issues
- Reduction in crime and the fear of crime
- More efficient and effective use of resources
- Improved accountability
- Improved levels of public engagement with all services.

Liz Bisset, Director of Community Services, centred the discussion with the following questions:

- Does the North Area Committee want a regular item on Neighbourhood Policing on its agenda?
- Does the North Area Committee want a list of priorities?
- Does the North Area Committee want to be the pilot area to test this new scheme? After piloting this scheme in the north area of the city for two cycles, it would be introduced to other Area Committees.

The Committee agreed:

- To agree in principle to partnership working with the police on neighbourhood policing.
- To receive regular reports on neighbourhood profiles
- To have a regular neighbourhood policing item on the agenda.
- That the role of the Area Committees in identifying and agreeing priorities be through the Strategy Scrutiny Committee.
- That this initiative be brought up at the Strategy Scrutiny Committee next 3rd April.

Questions and Comments from the public on Neighbourhood Policing

Mr Francis, a member of the public, noted that antisocial behaviour meetings already have this role.

The proposal was widely welcomed for better communication, accountability and shared ownership to help prioritise issues within available resources.

6/81 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LEISURE GRANTS 2005-07

Chris Freeman, the Grants Manager, presented the report to the committee.

The Committee **resolved:**

To consider grant applications in sections 4 and 5 and agree the recommendations.

06/82 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

A 05/1285/FUL Leys Lodge, Union Lane, Cambridge CB4 1PX

Erection of flats (6 flats in total comprising 3- and 2-storey blocks) with car parking and ancillary building (bin and bike store) following the demolition of one dwelling

Public speakers: Michael Bond (objector) and Graham Handley (agent)

Recommendation: approve

Decision: REFUSED against officer's recommendation (by 4 votes to 1).

Reason for refusal relating to inappropriate design (Cambridge Local Plan policies BE1, BE2 and BE4). Reason for refusal to be agreed with the Chair and Spokespersons.

B 05/1279/FUL 28 Elmfield Road, Cambridge, CB4 1SF

Erection of two-storey rear extension and conversion of house to 2 flats.

Public speakers: Mrs Michalak (objector)

Recommendation: Approve

Decision: APPROVED (by 8 votes to 0, unanimously) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 31 March 2006.

06/03 DATES OF MEETINGS

The Committee recommended that further dates be sought so that committees can always be held on Thursdays.

06/73 NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 27th April at the Manor Community College, Arbury Road, Cambridge, CB4 2JF, commencing at 7:30p.m.

The meeting closed at 10.10pm.

CHAIR