



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Area Committee (City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's, Trumpington Wards) 23 March 7.30pm – 10.33pm Minutes & Actions

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

Also Present: County Councillor Christine Carter (Cherry Hinton)

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)**

06/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from City Councillor Richard Stebbings (Queen Edith's) and County Councillors Geoffrey Heathcock (Queen Edith's) and Anne Kent (Trumpington).

06/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

06/15: Councillor McPherson a personal interest as Music Director of the Cherry Hinton Festival (grant request). Councillor Dryden and County Councillor Carter personal interests as members of the Colville Residents Association (grant request). Councillor Baker,

personal interest as treasurer of St James' Community Forum (grant request)

06/17 : Councillor Dryden declared a personal interest on agenda item 8(4) as he was a friend of the applicant's father. (Note that this application was considered after the Councillor had left the meeting not because of the interest but because of the late hour).

Councillor Slatter on agenda item 8 (1) as Camstead Homes was involved with a charitable award that she was also involved with.

06/12 MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

06/05 (1) Cllr Stuart updated on the Committee on the Environmental Improvement Programme. She stated that Area Committees had provisionally been recommended £31,500 for 2006/07 (equal funding for all four area committees). At the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 21 March, Councillors questioned why the funding was divided equally and not by population. If this were agreed, South Area Committee would lose about £6,000. The decision taken by the Executive Councillor on Tuesday 21st was to allocate £20,000 per Area Committee and consider how the remainder is allocated on 27 June.

06/08 Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground –

Cllr Adigun-Harris wished the minutes to reflect his grave concerns about the integrity of decision-making based on a report that had been questioned by both public and councillors. The Chair undertook to agree a form of words with Cllr Adigun-Harris and for the minutes to be re-submitted to the Committee at its next meeting.

Cllr Slatter

A member of the public expressed the view that the Minutes did not fully reflect the views expressed at the public meeting on the 23rd January or the discussion on 26th January. The Chair emphasised that minutes were not a verbatim report, but she confirmed that many people responding to the consultation had expressed support for a MUGA at Cherry Hinton Hall, which would be investigated further.

The Chair advised that the report on this matter due to be considered at Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 30 March had been postponed to 6 July.

[At the meeting on 30th March, the Scrutiny Committee was advised by the Head of Active Communities that the report had been postponed until the July Scrutiny cycle. This was because officers needed more time to consider and respond to the issues raised in light of the concerns of local people. The July report will consider a detailed outline of the project to date, and in so doing, will also

highlight identified concerns about the process].

There was a question as to the plans for a peripheral path and seating on the Recreation Ground, which had been strongly supported by the area committee. The Chair undertook to provide an answer to Committee on the status of the peripheral path.

Cllr Slatter

06/13 OPEN FORUM

Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve:
The Chair read out an information notice from Ellis Selway, Local Nature Reserves Liaison Officer.

Ellis
Selway
01223
457367

After the success of the recent channel works (see <http://nr.cambridge.gov.uk/news/> for further details) there has unfortunately been some vandalism taking place on the reserve. We have recently been experiencing an increased level of anti-social behaviour at Nine Wells LNR, in particular the use of motorbikes. There has also been mindless vandalism that has taken place on Sunday 19th March, when most of the large timber around springhead 4 (the deepest) has been rolled in. There has also been some graffiti.

The public should be encouraged to report any anti-social activities and to help safeguard the reserve. The use of motorbikes on and around Nine Wells is prohibited and action can be taken by the police to serve notices (under Section 59 of the Road traffic Act) on a rider/driver. If a further offence is committed then the vehicle/motorbike can be confiscated.

With your help we can report any incidents to the police or myself and help towards preventing the culprits getting easy access to the reserve. Most incidents seem to be over the weekend.

Similarly horses are not permitted on the reserve and please report any persons seen riding around the reserve.

There were no questions raised in the open forum.

06/14 PROPOSALS FOR THE ENGAGEMENT OF THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING TEAMS

Present for this item were

John Fuller - Southern Divisional Community Manager for Cambridgeshire Constabulary; Inspector Martin Gregory, Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Liz Bisset Director of Community Services were present for this report.

It was noted that the three other Area Committees had already considered the report and a report to the Strategy Scrutiny

Committee on 3 April had been published.

Following a presentation by John Fuller and a summary of the City Council report by Liz Bisset, the Committee and public made the following comments.

- The mechanisms used to gather information and data for the Neighbourhood Profile will be very important and will need to be monitored
- Why is the North Area Committee the pilot area? Won't the issues that arise be different in each area. A pilot is necessary to evaluate and monitor issues such as resourcing and representation for the City Council. It could have been any area but quite a lot is in place already in the North and it is not practical with available resources to evaluate and monitor all areas at once. A lot of the issues of concern to the City Council e.g. number of meetings to be attended by officers will be the same issues for all areas.
- South Area can be preparing with contacts lists etc. and continuing with the partnership work that already takes place.
- The process has already begun in April 05 and a number of things are in existence already e.g. Network of key individuals already exists
- Neighbourhood Watch, CBMs PCSO's turn up and give a great amount of support
- The initiative sits very well with Neighbourhood Watch
- The public will be invited to express their views on the Neighbourhood Profiles at Area Committee meetings

Comments by the Committee on the recommendations in the report would be reported to Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 3 April.

Agreed - in principle to the proposals to develop neighbourhood policing partnerships. To pass on the following comments on the practicality of the proposals:

- It was agreed to have regular reports and a regular item on the agenda
- It was felt that every two months may be too frequent
- It was doubted if 20 minutes would be enough for the item
- It was suggested that written reports and emails could be sent around about issues between meetings
- It was felt to be important not to rush decisions on priorities coming out of the Neighbourhood Profile and therefore maybe reports should only come to Area Committees every other cycle
- The role of Area Committees with regard to priorities being agreed should be clear i.e. they will not be decision makers but will give a steer
- Feedback will be given on the Neighbourhood Profile by

both the Committee and the public

06/15 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LEISURE GRANTS

Resolved -

To agree that the following grants be awarded from 2005/06 budgets:

- (i) Trumpington Local History Group - £853 for renovation of Henry Fawcett's Grave
- (ii) Cherry Hinton Local History Society - £1200 for laptop and projector

(The Committee noted this left an underspend of £1742 which would get allocated to city wide groups)

To agree that the following grants be awarded from 2006/07 budgets:

- (i) Cherry Hinton Festival Society - £1000 for site and equipment hire, licence fees.
- (ii) St James' Forum - £2400 for outreach work. This grant is subject to successful outcome in negotiation with Queen Edith's School, the Forum and Citizens Advice Bureau; a decision by the Forum to proceed; consultation with the Area Committee Chair.
- (iii) Trumpington Elderly Action Group - £680 covering a number of costs including administration, hall hire, summer outing, Christmas party.
- (iv) Colville Residents Association – £98 for art classes for young people

Chris
Freeman,
Grants
Manager
01223
457862

06/16 DATES AND VENUES OF MEETINGS JULY 2006-APRIL 2007

This was not discussed at the meeting and will be agreed before the next meeting by correspondence.

Committee
Manager

06/17 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

1. **Application no.** 05/1365/FUL

Site 2 Cavendish Avenue

Proposal Erection of terrace 6 no. townhouses (inc demolition of existing house)

Applicant – Camstead Homes, c/o Carter Jonas, 6-8 Hills Road

Public speakers - J Page (for applicant), Prof. Amaratunga, Mr Dawson (objectors) Nb. The Chair extended the time allocated for public speaking on this application.

The Planning Officer referred to the following text from the amendment sheet:

To Note :

1 Since the report was completed, a letter has been received from the applicants' agent, confirming that the application site boundary shown in the application is correct. The letter also confirms that the boundary line between 235 Hills Road and 237 Hills Road, which is not correctly drawn on drawings submitted with the application, is not within the application site. The letter is accompanied by a site plan on which this boundary is in the correct position.

2 Since the report was completed, detailed arboricultural advice has been received. The advice approves of the manner in which the proposed development focuses on, and is attentive to the preservation of, the beech tree. It also accepts that the solution proposed for the frontage yew trees and hedge is appropriate. The arboricultural officer's comments on this site are attached, and the additional condition recommended is shown below.

3 Since the report was completed, a letter has been received from the applicants' agent, responding to issues raised at the Development Control Forum. The letter addresses the issues of the orientation of the building, overlooking, boundaries, heights of comparable buildings, the proposed landscaping of the frontage, gates, and traffic movements.

Amendments To Text :

1. Add to the end of Conditions 4, 6 and 12, the words 'and to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.'

Add to the end of paragraph 8.28, "Furthermore, the kitchen door, hall door, and WC windows, which are the only windows on the ground floor, are of obscure glass, and consequently have no outlook.'

3. Delete existing condition 11 and replace with the following:

No work shall start on the application site (including soil stripping, pre-construction delivery of equipment or materials, the creation of site accesses, positioning of site huts) until:

(a) A Tree Protection Plan, as defined in BS 5837:2005 "Trees in Relation to Construction – Recommendations", containing the following Arboricultural Method statements/specifications has first been submitted and agreed to, in writing, by the Council's Principal Arboricultural Officer:

- Arboricultural method statements for the precise location and erection of tree protection barriers and ground protection for all trees retained on, and adjacent to, the

site, in order to establish Root Protection Areas and construction exclusion zones;

- Arboricultural method statements for any special engineering operations within Root Protection Areas;
- Arboricultural method statements for root pruning and root barrier installation; including specifications for root-barrier material; and root-soil back-fill;
- Arboricultural method statements for the amelioration of the rhizosphere within the Root Protection Areas comprising of de-compaction (Terravention) and soil inoculation with spore derived mycorrhizae and bio-activators; soil tilthing utilising air-spade technology; irrigation; and mulching where appropriate;
- Arboricultural method statement for any development facilitation pruning.

- (b) there has been a pre-construction site meeting between the site agent, the developers chosen arboriculturalist, and the Council's delegated Arboricultural Officer.

and

- (c) all development facilitation pruning, where required, has been completed in accordance with BS 3998:1989, and tree protection barriers and ground protection measures have been installed to the satisfaction of the Council's delegated Arboricultural Officer.

All Arboricultural works shall be carried out by a competent tree contractor, proficient in both root-zone and aerial arboricultural work and shall follow strictly the agreed method statements and specifications.

All tree protection barriers and ground protection must be in accord with BS 5837:2005 clause 9 - "The construction exclusion zone: barriers and ground protection"

The developer shall appoint a competent arboriculturalist to oversee the project. The arboriculturalist shall monitor, record and confirm the implementation and maintenance of tree protection measures as set out in the conditions of the planning permission.

Reason: To protect the trees of amenity value (Cambridge Local Plan (1996) policies NE16 and NE17)

Add a further INFORMATIVE (32) : With reference to Condition 23, the developer is encouraged to inform neighbouring occupiers about the scheduling of demolition.

Resolved - (by 7 votes to 1 against the officer recommendation)

That the application be refused (reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by Chair and spokespersons)

Members proposed that the application be refused on the basis of conflicting with Structure Plan policy P1/3, Local Plan policy EO1 (light and noise not air pollution), BE1, BE2, BE4, Housing and development Design Guide, PPS1 and PPG3. PL Ob Strat Reason needed too.

The following reasons were agreed by 14 April 2006

1. The six houses proposed, if approved, because of their height and relative proximity to the site frontage, to the corner of Cavendish Avenue and to the neighbouring property to the south (235 Hills Road), would create an unduly prominent and visually intrusive form that would detract from the local townscape and, notwithstanding the density actually achieved, appear cramped, constituting an over-intensive and inappropriate use of the site. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be an alien form, which would not respect the character of the area or reflect its contextual role and its relationship to its surroundings; the proposal therefore constitutes poor design. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with Policy 1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies BE1 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996), advice on design in paragraph 34 of Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005) and the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001) which is supplementary planning guidance adopted by the City Council.
2. The proximity of the southern end wall of the proposed terrace of townhouses to the common boundary to the south and to the neighbouring dwelling house 235 Hills Road (which has its entrance on the northern side), combined with its height, is such that the proposed southern wall would unduly dominate and be overbearing in its relationship with No.235, causing the occupiers of that adjacent property to suffer an unreasonable sense of enclosure and a diminution in outlook and enjoyment of their property. For this reason the proposal has failed to recognise the constraints of the site or to relate well to its surroundings and is poor design, contrary to Policies BE1 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996), advice on design in paragraph 34 of Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005) and the Housing Development and Design Guide (2001) which is supplementary planning guidance adopted by the City Council.
3. The proposed introduction of car parking spaces into the very rear of the site, immediately adjacent to its boundaries with nos.

235 and 237 Hills Road and 3 Cavendish Avenue is unacceptable. Car parking provision in this location would have an unreasonable adverse impact upon the amenity of those properties by reason of the noise and the splay of lights created by cars traveling to and from and manoeuvring in and out of the parking spaces, and of people talking and closing doors when entering and leaving their vehicles. The proposal is considered neither to have recognised the constraints of the site nor taken heed of its contextual relationship with its surroundings. It does not constitute good design which would contribute positively to making this place better for people, but is inappropriate in its context, failing to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with Policy 1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, Policies EO1, NE8 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996) and advice on design in paragraph 34 of Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005).

2. **Application no.** 05/1368/OUT
Site 78/80 Fulbourn Road
Proposal Demolition of two bungalows and redevelopment for residential development
Applicant – Messrs Leeds and Ellis, c/o Morris & Partners, 51 Newnham Road
Public speakers - 0

Resolved - (by 6 votes to 0)
That the application be approved as in the report.

3. **Application no.** 06/0089/OUT
Site 2 Long Road
Proposal Residential development of site following demolition of the existing residence
Applicant – David Shoenberg, 1985 Settlement, c/o Parry Jones, 39a Almoners Avenue
Public speakers - 0

Councillor Baker proposed that the first Informative, listed on page 80 of the agenda, be removed.
The proposal was lost by 5 votes to 4, with the Chair having had to use her casting vote.

Resolved - (by 4 votes to 3)
That the application be approved as in the report.

4. **Application no.** 06/0066/REM
Site Land to rear of 111-115 High Street Cherry Hinton
Proposal Erection of a bungalow and garden shed
Applicant – Messrs. SP Rowling 113 High Street Cherry Hinton

Public speakers - 0

The Chair asked for an Informative re considerate contractors.

The Planning Officer stated that he would check what had been put to the Inspector at Appeal and if he thought it would be possible he would include it. [Following the meeting, the Standard Conditions did include the details of the construction programme. However, It was the only suggested condition the Inspector did not use, presumably because it was thought the site too small to warrant it. The Council could not therefore reasonably attach it to this reserved matters decision notice.]

Resolved - (by 4 votes to 0)

That the application be approved as in the report.

Application no. 06/0015/FUL

Site Land to rear of 259 Hills Road

5. Proposal Erection of single storey dwelling (access off Glebe Road)

Applicant – Mrs. M Colbran 24 Valerian Court Fulbourn

Public speakers - 0

Resolved - (by 6 votes to 0)

That the application be approved as in the report.

The meeting ended at 10.33pm

Chair

Next meeting: 18 May at Queen Edith's Chapel, Wulfstan Way,
Queen Edith's at 7.30pm