

**Draft until 28 September 2006**



**West/Central Area Committee  
(City Councillors representing Castle, Market  
and Newnham Wards)  
3 August 2006 7:30pm – 10.07pm  
Minutes & Actions**

**Present:** Councillors: John Hipkin (Chair), Marie-Louise Holland, Simon Kightley (Castle Ward), Mike Dixon, Colin Rosenstiel, Joye Rosenstiel (Market Ward), Rod Cantrill 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)

**06/30 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor S Reid and Councillor A Reid apologised for a late arrival.

**06/31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Code of Conduct personal interests in the planning applications were declared as follows:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Nature of interest</b>
Hipkin	103-107 Grantchester	One of the objectors is a friend

## Meadows

Smith	76 and 78 Huntingdon Road	One of the objectors is a friend
Cantrill	103-107 Grantchester Road	One of the objectors is a fellow board member of a charity
Dixon	PoNaNa	One of the objectors is known to him
C Rosenstiel	PoNaNa	One of the objectors is known to him
J Rosenstiel	PoNaNa	One of the objectors is known to her

## 06/32 OPEN FORUM

The theme of the Forum was consideration of the proposed developments in North West Cambridge which includes land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (the University's sector) and land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (the NIAB sector). For land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road, members of the public were asked to begin thinking about issues and options for the Area Action Plan (AAP) as public consultation would begin in September.

The Urban Extensions Project Manager gave an overview of the proposed extensions. In relation to the NIAB sector, Policy 9/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) releases land from the green belt and allocates it predominantly for residential development.

David Wilson Estates are proposing around 1800 homes on land within the city and are seeking land to be released from the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire for a further 1000 homes. The principle of this was considered at South Cambridgeshire's Core Strategy Examination and an outcome is anticipated in Autumn 2006. David Wilson Estates are intending to submit a planning application to the City Council in November 2006 and have already undertaken their own public consultation on the Master Plan they have drawn up for the site.

For land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are preparing a joint Area Action Plan. The first phase of this is an Issues & Options Report which asks the public and key organisations about a number of key issues and options for the development of this land. Some of the options that the public would be asked to comment on were the proposed uses of the green belt, the new orbital route, the proposal to have north facing slip roads off the M11, to create a new local centre, to have a new secondary school.

For both sectors, a Transport Strategy is being prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council and this will be available as part of the Area Action Plan Issues & Options consultation.

Residents then suggested the following issues be considered and the officer and councillors commented:

Resident 1: Infrastructure needs especially water supply and sewage disposal were critical.

County Councillor White reported that that issue had been raised at the last meeting of the North West Fringe Member Reference Group and they had been told that the providers of such infrastructure had a statutory duty to provide sufficient supplies and he considered this answer was less than satisfactory.

The officer said this was an issue that had been flagged up in the AAP and views from public and councillors were requested.

Councillor C Rosenstiel said that he had been at a recent presentation by the water industry and that the view was that there were sufficient supplies. Additional supplies of water were coming to Cambridge from Thetford.

Resident 2: It would be desirable that consideration be given to the character of the new secondary school, for example whether it might be an academy.

Councillor J Rosenstiel added that one school in the area, Manor Community College, was undersubscribed so attention needed to be given to the level of demand expected and the possibility of amalgamation with existing facilities.

The Chair said there might well be more need for a Sixth Form College rather than a secondary school.

Resident 3: It is vital that the phasing of work is given adequate attention to avoid the sorts of problems experienced in Cambourne where building the community facilities and the transport infrastructure lagged behind the house building.

Councillor Kightley said that getting the transport infrastructure right was critical and that a new orbital route seemed to fit.

Resident 4: expressed scepticism that such a route would be right.

Resident 5: Had attended the workshop run by David Wilson Estates and had been surprised to learn that completion of the development would take 10-12 years. Residents in the area needed some assurances that their lives would not be unduly disrupted during this very extended construction phase.

The Chair said a resident unable to attend the meeting had asked him to register that there be consideration of generating energy on the site itself.

Councillor Cantrill added that sustainability generally should be seriously considered.

The officer alerted residents and councillors to the next meeting of the North West Fringe Member Reference Group on 20 September at 5.30pm at a venue in the community to be advised. That meeting would be considering the new Transport Strategy.

## **06/33 GAMBLING ACT 2005 – STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES**

The Licensing Officer introduced the key aspects of the new Act which would apply to approximately 120 premises in the city. There would be three types of licence – personal, operating and premises

licences. The Council will be responsible for premises licences; the Gambling Commission for personal and operating licences. To be granted these licences applicants had to meet 3 licensing objectives:

- Preventing gambling from being a source of crime and disorder, being associated with crime and disorder or being used to support crime
- Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way
- Protecting children and other vulnerable people from being harmed or exploited by gambling

The Act would come into effect on 1 September 2007. Two hundred and fifty organisations (eg the police, statutory agencies working with children etc) had already been consulted.

The City Council was consulting the public on the Statement of Principles between 21 July and 13 October. She told the meeting that an information booklet and other papers were available on the Council's website at

[www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/ehws/licensing/gambling-act-2005](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/ehws/licensing/gambling-act-2005)

and that paper copies were available on the table at the back of the room. The information included a form for people to give their written comments about the Statement of Principles. The final document would be published in December 2006.

Residents and councillors then asked questions to which the officer responded:

Chair: (referring to page 16 of the agenda report) How would protecting children and other vulnerable people be enforced?

Officer: this is still a matter that has to be resolved by the legislators as different agencies have different views. Further legislation to cover this is expected.

Councillor C Rosenstiel: This would be particularly difficult in relation to the 16-18 year old age group and for those who had a compulsion to gamble such as the case of the book keeper who gambled away his employer's money.

Officer: As this would be something covered by the Operating Licence which would be issued by the Gambling Commission, it was not something the City Council would have to deal with.

Resident 6: asked about the differences between prize gaming permits and lotteries.

Officer: as the legislation was so new, not able to give a definitive answer but would get back to him.

Action:  
CA

After the meeting: The officer emailed the resident and referred him to pages 16, 25, 29 and 30 of the information booklet.

Chair: this Authority did not apply to have a casino, what is the situation for the future?

Officer: There were 68 applications nationwide of which 31 have been short-listed. Currently 17 casinos will be permitted and it will need Government legislation to increase these numbers. The decision whether or not to adopt a no casino resolution is in the

consultation paper and would be a decision to be taken by Full Council.

Councillor Dixon: What procedures are there for informing residents about applications for licences taking place in their area? Would the rules that applied to the liquor licensing applications apply?

Officer: There were no regulations in the legislation yet about advertising. It was likely that these would be in the local newspaper rather than to individual residents in the area. As in the case of liquor licensing, interested parties can make representations to the licensing authority.

Resident 5: Would enforcement of the licence be carried out by the police or by dedicated officers in the council?

Officer: There would be enforcement both by the police and by city council enforcement officers depending on the nature of the infringement.

Residents were encouraged to submit their written views to the Council about the Statement of Principles.

#### **06/34 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 June were signed as a correct record.

#### **06/34 MATTERS ARISING**

County Councillor Griffiths referred to minute number 06/21 and said that she had not yet received the briefing paper that the Planning Policy Manager had said he would send to members of the committee.

Committee  
Manager

The Committee Manager agreed to follow that up.

#### **06/35 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

##### **1 APPLICATION NO: 06/0250/FUL**

**SITE:** 103-107 Grantchester Meadows (Newnham)

**PROPOSAL:** Redevelopment to erect 3 no. new dwellings (1 no. four bedroom house and 2 no. three bedroom house).

**APPLICANT:** Pembroke College, Cambridge CB2 1RF

**PUBLIC SPEAKERS:** Mr Dyball (resident objector on behalf of a number of local residents); Mr A Nix (agent for the applicant)

The Planning Officer updated the committee on matters that had come up since the officer report had been published. She referred to the amendment sheet circulated at the meeting and said that a further letter of objection had been received from the occupier(s) of 12 Eltisley Avenue.

**Resolved** - (by 7 votes to 0 against the officer recommendation) that the application be refused (reasons to be drafted by officers

and agreed by the Chair)

Members proposed that the application be refused on the basis that there would be detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, that the development did not fit in with the character of the area, insufficient on site parking and problems with competition with existing users of off site parking.

**The following reasons were subsequently agreed by the Chair:**

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the lack of space and general relationship between proposed dwellings no.s 2 and 3 and the existing detached house, 107 Grantchester Meadows, and semi-detached house, 105 Grantchester Meadows, would result in a very prominent and cramped form of development, out of character with the immediately surrounding area which is typified by buildings with gaps between them. In so doing the development fails to have regard for the importance of the site as part of the visual transition between the tight urban fabric of the major part of Newnham Croft and the open land lying to the west. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies P1/2, P1/3 and P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development, PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment and guidance in the form of the Newnham Croft Conservation Area Appraisal 1999.

2. The proposed development, by virtue of the location of the principle access to the building on the side elevation, in close proximity to the site boundary, would result in an increased degree of noise and disturbance which would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers of 109 Grantchester Meadows. This also demonstrates a failure of the development to take account of the site context. The proposal is contrary to The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policies 3/4 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

3. The proposed development fails to make satisfactory provision for off-street car parking facilities and would be likely to result in additional on-street parking in an area within which competition for on-street parking is intense. These circumstances would be likely to lead to conflict between car drivers and other road users, congestion and noise nuisance which would undermine the amenities currently enjoyed by local residents. This also demonstrates a failure of the development to take account of the site context. The proposal is contrary to The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policies 3/4 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

4. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space or community facilities, in

accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2006.

- 2 APPLICATION NO:** 06/0622/S73  
**SITE:** PoNaNa 7A Jesus Lane (Market)  
**PROPOSAL:** Variation of condition 2 of planning permission C/97/1018/VC to allow trade or business commencing at 0800 hours on Sunday to Thursday, closing at 0100 hours the following day, and commencing at 0800 hours on Friday and Saturday, and Sundays preceding a Bank Holiday, closing at 0200 hours the following day.  
**APPLICANT:** Barvest Ltd, c/o 1 The Quadrangle, Banbury Road, Woodstock, Oxon OX20 1LH  
**PSR:** Mr C Doubleday (resident objector on behalf of a number of local residents)

The Planning Officer updated the committee. She referred to paragraphs 2.1, 2.2 and 8.5 and reminded members that under the new Local Plan there was a policy to do with the city centre as a vibrant part of the city centre. As well as planning consent, there would need to be consent from the Council as Licensing Authority. She said that one additional letter of objection had been received from 5 Malcolm Street.

A summary of the objections were;

- Noise late at night affects sleep.
- Often woken up between the hours of 12am to 4am, more than once a night and not just on weekends.
- Acts of vandalism have been witnessed.
- Noise levels are a huge problem for residents in this area.

**Resolved** - (by 6 votes to 0 against the officer recommendation) that the application be refused (reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by the Chair)

Members proposed that the application be refused on the basis that it would have adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties and the Sunday opening hours would affect the nearby Friends Meeting House.

**The following reasons were subsequently agreed by the Chair:**

1. The proposed variation of condition to allow longer opening hours would be likely to generate additional noise and disturbance in the local area at unsocial hours, which would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities currently enjoyed. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and

Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and policy 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

2. The proposed variation of condition to allow Sunday daytime opening would be likely to generate additional noise and disturbance which would directly impact upon the use of the adjacent building as a meeting place for the Religious Society of Friends. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and policies 4/13 and 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**3. APPLICATION NO: 06/0431/FUL**

**SITE:** 76 and 78 Huntingdon Road (Castle)

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of five flats to rear of 76 and 78 Huntingdon Road (with access off Westfield Lane)

**APPLICANT:** Blues Property, The Studio, 22 Newmarket Road, Cambridge CB5 8DT

**PSR:** Mr P Clough (resident objector on behalf of a number of residents); Mr R Haysom (for the applicant)

The Planning Officer updated the Committee. Following the reconsultation of amended plans to the front elevation four letters had been received from:

72 Huntingdon Road  
1 Priory Street  
3 Priory Street  
11 Westfield Lane

Comments on amended plans are summarised as

- The amendments do nothing to reduce the perception of overlooking.
- The building is still too big for its situation.
- The building is still too close to 1 Priory Street boundary
- These small changes do not take into account the major concerns expressed at the Development Control Meeting.
- The development is far too much for the site, both in scale and its effect on the locality.
- A house with parking would seem more appropriate to the area.
- The changes are merely cosmetic.

The Applicant had submitted additional supporting documentation showing the relationship of the building with the neighbouring properties and a photo of the proposed dwelling within the streetscene.

**Resolved** - (by 2 votes to 6 against the officer recommendation) that the application be refused (reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by the Chair).

Members proposed that the application be refused on the basis that there would be competition for on street parking due to inadequate provision for off street parking, the development was an

over-development and did not adequately reflect the constraints of the site.

**The following reasons were subsequently agreed by the Chair:**

1. The proposed development by virtue of its design, layout and external appearance fails to respect the site context, does not take account of the site constraints and represents overdevelopment. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 and of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

2. The proposed development fails to make satisfactory provision for off-street car parking facilities and would be likely to result in additional on-street parking outside the controlled parking zone in an area within which competition for on-street parking is intense. These circumstances would be likely to lead to conflict between car drivers and other road users, congestion and noise nuisance which would undermine the amenities currently enjoyed by local residents. This also demonstrates a failure of the development to take account of the site context. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policies 3/4 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities and education and life long learning, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2006.

4. **APPLICATION NO:** 06/0662/FUL  
**SITE:** 197 Huntingdon Road (Castle)  
**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 4no. 5 bed semi-detached houses to replace existing dwelling  
**APPLICANT:** Prime Crest Ltd., Barn Studio, Lindsell, Great Dunmow, Essex CM6 3QJ  
**PSR:** Mr J Fowler (resident objector)

The Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet which gave details of the following:

The applicant had submitted amended drawings which show the removal of the car parking spaces on the frontage, apart from one disabled parking space, and replaced with landscaping. The proposal now accords with the Parking Standards and policy 8/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

The access had been amended and now occupied the same position as that agreed through the approval of planning reference 06/0242/FUL for flats on the site.

In comparison with the previously approved scheme on this site for nine flats and one house (reference 06/0242/FUL) I can comment as follows. The footprint of the previous scheme measured approximately 28.8 metres in length, 10.4 metres in width with gable wings projecting from both the front and rear facades. The building was set back from Huntingdon Road by 17.2 metres and measured 10.35 metres in height.

The scheme being proposed through this application measures 28.2 metres in length, 12.3 metres in width with the garages and the bays projecting out to the front. The buildings are set back from Huntingdon Road by 19 metres and measures 9.5 metres at the highest point.

**Resolved** - (by 2 votes to 4 against the officer recommendation) that the application be refused (reasons to be drafted by officers and agreed by the Chair).

Members proposed that the application be refused on the basis that in design, layout and external appearance it was out of keeping with the area.

**The following reasons were subsequently agreed by the Chair:**

1. The proposed development by virtue of its design, layout and external appearance fails to respect the site context, does not draw inspiration from the key characteristics of the surrounding area and does not take account of the site constraints. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 and of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities and education and life long learning, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2006.

**5. APPLICATION NO: 06/0468/FUL**

**SITE:** Land rear of St Botolphs Rectory, Summerfield (Newnham)

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 1 no. 4 bed detached house and garage.

**APPLICANT:** Ely Diocesan Board of Finance, Bishop Woodford House, Ely, Cambs CB7 4DX

**PSR:** Mr Nedu (Resident objector); Mr J Emmerson (for the applicant)

**Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0) to approve the application subject to the satisfactory completion of the S106 agreement by 18 August

2006 and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

**Refusal of application** unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, and the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 18 August 2006, it is recommended that the application be **refused** for the reason set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 10.07pm.

**Chair**