



**West/Central Area Committee  
(City Councillors representing Castle, Market  
and Newnham Wards)  
8 June 2006 7:30pm – 10.25pm  
Minutes & Actions**

**Present:** Councillors: John Hipkin (Chair), Marie-Louise Holland, Simon Kightley (Castle Ward), Mike Dixon, Colin Rosenstiel, Joye Rosenstiel (Market Ward), Rod Cantrill, Sian Reid and Julie Smith (Newnham Ward)  
County Councillors: David White (Castle), Gaynor Griffiths (Market), Alex Reid (Newnham)

Additional information for public: City Council officers can also be emailed [firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk)  
The Committee Manager for West/Central Area Committee is [liz.whitcher@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:liz.whitcher@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](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/councillors/members.htm)

Members of the County Council can be emailed:

[Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

**06/17 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

Agreed unanimously that Councillor Hipkin be Chair and Councillor Kightley Vice Chair for the 06/07 Municipal Year.

**06/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

## 06/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Code of Conduct personal interests were declared as follows:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Nature of interest</b>
S Reid	Community Development & Leisure Grants	A prejudicial interest in relation to the application for a grant from the Youth Parliament as she was a Sponsor of the event. Councillor Reid left the room during the discussion of this item and did not vote.
Smith	New Cambridge Local Plan	A personal interest as an employee of the University of Cambridge.
Kightley	New Cambridge Local Plan	A personal interest as an employee of NIAB.
C Rosenstiel	Update on Environmental Improvements Programme	A personal interest as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign
C Rosenstiel	Update on Environmental Improvements Programme	A personal interest as a member of the Campaign for Real Ale

## 06/20 OPEN FORUM

Councillor Holland and a resident from Warwick Road asked Sergeant Hawkins from Cambridgeshire Police to give an update on the difficulties with the unsafe way parents at Mayfield School were parking to deliver their children to the school.

Sergeant Hawkins said that the Head was co-operating with the police and that a letter had been drafted which would be sent to all parents about the dangers. When he and the Police Community Support Officer were present on the site, drivers behaved sensibly. However, when they were not there the old habits took over. The difficulty was enforcing the message. A request to the County Council for double yellow lines had been turned down.

County Councillor White, a governor of the school, said that residents of Warwick Road needed to be able to park on the street so double yellow lines were not really wanted. One aspect exacerbating the problem currently was that there was only one entrance to the school during the rebuilding.

Councillor Sian Reid said that a solution to a similar problem at another school had been to have a rota of parents who wrote down car numbers and makes of car which were parking unsafely and then these were published in a school newsletter in a kind of black

list. This had been very successful.

County Councillor White said he would take that suggestion to the Governors.

The resident said that he was disappointed that double yellow lines had not been installed at the turning head only as he thought that would have some effect. He said that taxis and ambulances sometimes had difficulty in picking up an elderly neighbour because of the parking problems. Some of these were caused by teachers not parking where they should be a quarter of a mile from the school. He said parents had also been leafleted about the problem.

County Councillor White said that the officer at the County Council had said that experience showed that double yellow lines in the turning head would just be ignored.

## **06/21 NEW CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN**

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Local Plan and the main aspects which would affect all residents and some that would affect the residents of the West/Central area in particular.

Councillor Sian Reid emphasised that the meetings of the North West Fringe Member Reference Group were open to the public and that she hoped residents would come. She requested that feedback about progress on the development of the Area Action Plan for the area be brought regularly to this committee and this was agreed.

Action:  
Committee  
Manager

The Chair asked for clarification about the new planning regulations which had come into force recently which he understood would affect the new Local Plan.

The Planning Policy Manager said that there was a new planning framework and that one of the outcomes of that was that the Local Plan could be changed chapter by chapter rather than the whole Plan being changed all at the same time.

County Councillor Griffiths asked for more detail about why the Inspector had restricted the affordable housing provision to 40% or more. She also asked whether this included all key worker shared ownership housing and some rented accommodation at an economic rent and whether these would be part of the development rather than in a kind of ghetto.

The Planning Policy Manager acknowledged that this was an important but also a big subject. At the presentation at South Area Committee where the same question had been asked, he had agreed to do a briefing note along with his colleagues in the Housing section. When this was done it would be circulated to councillors and any members of the public who were interested. He then referred to the sites on the North West Fringe and said that

DR and  
Committee  
Manager

there would be 50% affordable housing on the University site and that for the site north of Huntingdon Road the level would be 40% subject to viability. A market assessment would be done to inform the Council what kind of accommodation would best meet the needs in that particular area. A guiding principle about the level of affordable housing was 30% of the median income rate in the city. Attention would be paid to where the affordable housing element would be located on any development.

County Councillor Griffiths asked that the affordable housing be “pepper-potted” as is planned at the new Northstowe development in South Cambridgeshire. She also asked whether tenants of affordable housing would be allowed to exercise the right to buy and if so, when they moved on would the property revert to affordable housing?

In response the Planning Policy Manager indicated that the new Local Plan requires the creation of mixed and balanced communities. Affordable housing would be distributed within sites in groups. He also indicated that right to buy exists in various ways depending upon whether any public subsidy was used to provide the affordable housing.

Resident 1 asked the following questions to which the Planning Policy Manager replied (A):

1. Some new developments in the city were being sold as good places for London commuters which seemed to contradict the Local Plan aspirations for people to live near their work.

A: Acknowledgement that there was no statutory means of addressing this issue. However, there was evidence that people were moving in to the City from the surrounding villages in order to be nearer their work. It is also a fact that there are twice as many jobs in Cambridge as employed residents which indicates that Cambridge is much more a place of inward commuting than outward commuting. Outward commuting by train does not have any impact on local road congestion or cause pollution.

2. A concern whether the developments planned in the Huntingdon Road/Histon Road area would be of interest to Cambridge people.

A: Developers have to pay for infrastructure requirements which included schools and community facilities which would benefit City residents in all areas of the city. These areas are also relatively distant from the station and would not be so attractive for outward commuters.

3. Can the City Council ensure that large developments have employment in the area.

A: There was some provision for some retained employment at the NIAB site and the land south of Huntingdon Road would include a large measure of employment floorspace related to the University and linked research and development.

4. Concern about traffic problems in West Cambridge which was already congested because there were only two

crossings over the river. Concern that cycle lanes seemed to disappear near traffic lights.

A: The City Council was working closely with the County Council on the Long Term Transport Plan. Developers were also required to contribute funds to mitigate the impact of the development. The Guided Bus should help with traffic problems.

Councillor Kightley referred to section 4.10 of the report which gave the thresholds for affordable housing of 0.5 hectares or 15 or more dwellings. What safeguards were in place to ensure the Council reached the target of 40% or more of affordable housing especially with sites that were less than the threshold.

A: Safeguards were in place to stop the subdivision of sites to avoid the policy size threshold as had been shown by a recent small development at Glebe Road. It would be very difficult for any developer to find a way round the affordable housing requirement. Genuine small sites would not have to contribute which is reasonable as such sites are often more difficult to develop.

Councillor Kightley also expressed the view that that it was a mistake to make no provision for an orbital road for the NIAB site.

A: The aim was to give priority to more sustainable modes of transport such as cycling and public transport. An orbital road had not been precluded.

Resident 2 representing Windsor Road Residents' Association made the following points: Windsor Road was on the edge of the NIAB development; currently, existing service provision was too little (eg doctors, dentists, open space). So a concern as to whether the norms would be applied fully. In the document entitled New Cambridge Local Plan (Item 5), Report page 5, section on Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, column "Other" there is a statement that the "Site potentially extends into South Cambs". So another concern about whether the development would begin to creep into South Cambridgeshire.

He also asked three questions:

1. When and by whom will the decision be made as to whether or not the site will be extended into South Cambs?

A: South Cambridgeshire are in the process of creating their new Plan. During the consultation process, David Wilson Homes, the developer for the NIAB site, objected and said they wished to build 1000 homes in the Girton Triangle. South Cambridgeshire opposed this and the developer's proposal has not been included in the Plan. In July 06 there will be a Public Inquiry into the South Cambs Plan and the Inspector's Report is expected in October/November 2006.

2. When and by whom will the area of housing and the housing density of any extended site be determined?

A: The site would be identified in the South Cambridgeshire Plan

which authority would also be responsible for agreeing the housing density.

3. If the site is extended, will the requirement for open space and other facilities be the same as for the main site within the City boundary, as specified in the Cambridge Redeposit Local Plan? If not, how will such requirements be determined?

A: South Cambs standards are similar to those of the City Council. On the Cambridge East site, if it were developed, South Cambs would use the City Council standards. There is agreement between the City Council and South Cambs that a green separation be maintained between the City and Girton.

Councillor Cantrill: The concentration and scale of proposed new developments raises issues about whether it is possible to create new communities. What positive steps is the Council taking to establish communities?

A: The large growth in the city that took place in the inter-war years is the nearest comparison and there is no doubt that these are successful communities that people want to live in. Natural links develop through such focuses as primary schools. However, there is also a role for the Community Development section in this regard as has been happening in Cambourne.

Councillor J Rosenstiel: In South Cambs the policy was to provide the capital funding but the local parishes were left to find revenue funding. What provision is being made for the upkeep of community and other facilities in the future?

A: The Planning Obligation Strategy is due for review and part of that review will consider requiring developers to contribute to such revenue costs. It is also recognised that Primary Care Trust funding lags behind growth and this will need to be addressed. For East Cambridge, consideration is being given to the establishment of a Land Trust to raise money via a Land Bank. The North West Fringe Member Reference Group is a forum where such issues can be addressed for the developments in that area.

County Councillor A Reid: In relation to the development of communities, to register a concern about the importance of the provision of high quality green space (as did happen in the inter war years). The Urban extensions seem to vary in this so that in the Monsanto part of the Southern Fringe there is to be provision for three quarters of the site to be green space but only one half in the Clay Farm site. At the Marshall's Airport site if it were developed, three quarters is planned to be built on. Important not to miss the opportunity to create a very special place.

A: The Local Plan allows for much better provision that has been mentioned. For example Cambridge East will include a new Country Park and a significant green corridor.

## **06/22 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 April were signed as a correct record.

## **06/23 MATTERS ARISING**

None

## **06/24 IMPROVING ACCESS TO THE WINDSOR ROAD/WARWICK ROAD PASSAGEWAY**

The Walking & Cycling Officer tabled amended recommendations.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to agree the recommendations as amended:

- 2.1 To approve the removal of the posts and pram arms at either end of the passageway.
- 2.2 To approve the re-installation of a pedestrian guardrail at the Warwick Road side of the passageway.

Resident 3 asked if an audit could be done of old cycling notices before any new ones were installed.

The Engineering Client Officer informed the Committee that £10,000 had already been provided by the County Council for removing signs. Before any sign was removed, its removal had to be approved by the Highway Authority, the County Council. First efforts were being concentrated on the ring road. It was hoped that, in the future, funds could be allocated to area committees for this purpose.

Councillor S Reid reminded the meeting that Environmental Improvements funds could not be used for this purpose as they are designated as for capital works which removing signs is not.

## **06/25 WINDSOR ROAD TO RICHMOND ROAD PATH**

The Committee noted that the works had been completed by 28 April 2006.

## **06/26 WINDSOR ROAD ENVIRONMENTAL TRAFFIC CALMING AND LANDSCAPING**

The Chair clarified with the Engineering Client Officer that the proposal for traffic calming at the Oxford Road end of Windsor Road was not required by the Highway Authority. He then invited comments from residents of Windsor Road.

Resident 4: The proposals seemed contradictory as the priority from the residents' point of view was both for a safe crossing and something that would be easily passable for cyclists.

Resident 5: Based on experience of a scheme elsewhere in the

city, the raised level crossing is the most successful type.

Councillor C Rosenstiel spoke as a regular cyclist on this route and said that it looked as if the proposal for Windsor Road would lead to a conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. The Oxford Road proposal looked all right in this regard.

The Engineering Client officer acknowledged the concern but expressed the view that the relatively light pedestrian and cycle traffic should not lead to conflict; he felt that most cyclists would remain on the carriageway.

Councillor S Reid expressed concerns about spending such a large sum on one scheme when the Committee did not have those funds in the budget.

There was considerable debate about this. As the first recommendation was for further consultation work to be done and as the second recommendation indicated that the works would be considered at the September meeting of the Committee, members agreed that these issues could be more fully debated then.

**Resolved** (unanimously)

- 2.1 To authorise officers to undertake public consultation, detailed design and cost estimating for the proposals outlined in the officer report.
- 2.2 To request officers to present the results of this work to the September 2006 meeting of the Committee, with a view to a report being taken to the October 2006 meeting of the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee, seeking approval to proceed with the implementation of the scheme.

**06/27 UPDATE ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME**

The Committee had a full discussion of the recommendations and amended them as set out below:

**Resolved** (unanimously)

- 2.1 To get costs from EDF energy power and see whether running two circuits can be funded by Environmental Improvement funds, in Burleigh Street.
- 2.2 Having clarified the brief for the type of fence wanted in Grantchester Meadows, to arrange a meeting with the landowner, via Bidwells, and that the costs of £4,088 be shared 50-50 between the council and the landlord.
- 2.3 To arrange an on site meeting at the Lammas Land Hut, with members and debate options for its future.
- 2.4 To arrange a site meeting at King's Lane of Ward Councillors of

Newnham and Market with officers to consider what might be done including the installation of a peepod.

Members then referred to particular items under Recently Proposed Schemes:

#### 5.6 Parker's Piece Lighting

After considerable discussion, the committee requested that the following actions be taken and that a full report be brought to the 3 August meeting of the committee:

- a) That Councillors C Rosenstiel, Smith and Cantrill be consulted about a revised proposal including b) and c) below
- b) Re-consider the frequency and spacing of the lights required as the committee considered that there were too many on the current proposal, too close together. Try and avoid having one in front of Hobbs Pavilion.
- c) Obtain a full quote of the cost of installing class A poles at all sites proposed under a)
- d) Obtain information about what financial contribution might be made from one of the Council's safety funds.

#### 5.7 Lighting on Mud Lane

Market ward councillors thought that this had been a public right of way for many years and asked that this be clarified. Councillor C Rosenstiel said that the City Council had put in the lighting that is there. In addition, the suggested alternative routes are contrary to Council policy.

#### 5.8 Grass on Jesus Green

Councillor C Rosenstiel reminded the committee that the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) had offered financial support towards the refurbishment of the grass on Jesus Green. Agreed that the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation be reminded.

### **06/28 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LEISURE GRANTS 2006-07**

Councillor S Reid raised the difficulty in finding suitable applicants for grants in this particular area of the city.

The Grants Manager acknowledged the difficulty and said that members and officers were doing as much as they could to address the issue.

Councillor S Reid left the room as she had declared a prejudicial interest as a sponsor of the Youth Parliament. She took no part in the discussion and did not vote.

The Grants Manager explained that each area committee was being asked to give a grant to the Cambridge City Youth Parliament Cabinet.

**Resolved** (by 7 votes to 0) to give a grant of £250 to Cambridge City Youth Parliament Cabinet.

## **06/29 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- 1 APPLICATION NO:** 06/0453/FUL  
**SITE:** Maids Causeway, Cambridge (Market)  
**PROPOSAL:** 9.7 metre telecom mast in the form of a victorian flue with ancillary cabinets (adjacent to bus stop Midsummer Common)  
**APPLICANT:** T-Mobile, Hatfield Business Park, Hatfield, Herts AL10 9BW  
**PUBLIC SPEAKERS:** Prof Stephen Elliott (resident objector speaking on behalf of Brunswick & North Kite Residents Association)

The Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet which had been circulated and drew attention to new information received since the report had been written:

“Revised drawings were received on 26<sup>th</sup> May showing the layout as described in the report (with the cabinets immediately adjacent to the bus stop) and were circulated to all those who had commented on the application. In addition comments have also been received from:

- Brunswick & North Kite Residents Association
- Owner/Occupier 12 Maids Causeway
- Owner/Occupier 34 Maids Causeway
- Owner/Occupier 3 Brunswick Walk
- Owner/Occupier 1 Brunswick Walk

In addition the following also re-commented reiterating the points made in previous representations.

- 8 Maids Causeway
- 18 Maids Causeway

The comments can be summarised as follows;

- The proposal will have a negative impact on the immediate environment
- There cannot be any justification for placing a 9.7 metre structure at an apparently random position in a historical and environmentally sensitive area
- The mast will destroy the architectural integrity of the listed buildings
- It is inappropriate close to listed buildings and the common

- The mast and cabinet will cause and exacerbate obstructions on the pavement
- T-mobile have not demonstrated all possible alternative sites have been considered
- The phone reception is good in the area
- The mast would be discreet but its siting is not as effective as elsewhere
- The mast will blight views of houses from the common and vice versa
- The proposed mast will have negligible improvement in coverage strength
- The mast is at the same height as bedrooms in the houses opposite and so the permanent radiation levels will be unsafe
- It is close to within 200m of a school although the application states it is not
- No other sites around the common seem to have been considered
- The proposal does not conform to the City Council Telecoms Development Design Guide which discourages ground based masts

Comments relating to Need, appearance and public safety have been addressed in the committee report. The status of the Telecoms Development Design Guide is not formally adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and therefore carried little material weight. It is intended as a guide and includes criteria for minimising the impact of masts and states that installations on buildings and existing masts are preferred.”

**Resolved - (unanimously against the officer recommendation)** that the application be refused (reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by the Chair and Vice Chair)

Members proposed that the application be refused on the basis that the new equipment would add clutter to the existing street scene and would impact on the amenity of the open space of Midsummer Common.

**The following reasons were agreed by the Chair and Vice Chair:**

That in its proposed location and at its proposed height, the mast, despite the design camouflage as a Victorian flue and the chosen siting relative to a nearby tree, will have a material and adverse visual impact on the street scene and views into and out from Midsummer Common and Maids Causeway, which are both important vistas within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The mast and the associated equipment housing, given the proximity to the existing bus shelter and street lighting, will add significant clutter to the street scene. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policies P1/3 and P6/5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies BE2, BE4, BE32 and US3 of the Cambridge Local Plan

(1996)

- 2**     **APPLICATION NO:** 06/0468/FUL  
**SITE:** Land Rear of St Botolphs Rectory, Summerfield,  
Cambridge (Newnham)  
**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 1no. 4 bed detached house and  
garage.  
**APPLICANT:** Ely Diocesan Board of Finance, Bishop Woodford  
House, Ely, Cambs CB7 4DX

The application was withdrawn from consideration at this  
committee meeting.

The meeting ended at 10.25pm.

**Chair**