



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

South Area Committee (City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's, Trumpington Wards) 14 December 7.30pm – 10.10pm Minutes & Actions

Present: Councillors
Stuart Newbold (Cherry Hinton)
Alan Baker, Amanda Taylor (Queen Edith's)
Andrew Blackhurst, Philippa Slatter, Sheila Stuart (Trumpington)

**Also
Present:**

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

**Action by
(see
action
sheet
attached
also)**

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

FORMER TRUMPINGTON CITY COUNCILLOR JUDITH PINNINGTON

The Chair announced the recent death of former Trumpington Ward City Councillor Judith Pinnington.

WELCOME TO CLLR BUCKHURST

The Chair welcomed Cllr Blackhurst to his first meeting of the Area Committee.

06/51 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden, McPherson

Stebbing and County Councillors Heathcock and Kent.

06/52 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following personal interests were declared:

06/57 (1) – Cllr Slatter's husband was a Graduate of Pembroke College (the applicant)

06/55 – Cllr Stuart was on the Addenbrookes Hospital Board of Governors

06/57 (2) – Cllr Baker was known to three of the objectors. Also, the applicant's architect had been in partnership with the practice which designed his house.

06/53 MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 November were agreed and signed by the Chair. There were no matters arising.

06/54 OPEN FORUM

Bell School Development – a member of the public asked what influence the Council would have on the development and how would the objections raised at the recently held public meeting particularly relating to the Babraham Road junction be taken into account.

The Chair stated that a planning application for the Bell School site had been submitted and the notes of the public meeting would be part of the officer's report. The application would be determined by the City Council. The planning officer had told the public meeting that the application was likely to be reported for determination in June although the Chair was hopeful of an earlier timescale.

Coach parking on Queens Road - a member of the public stated that coaches were parking all day in bays set aside for short term parking only. The Chair undertook to look into this and ensure that proper enforcement was being carried out.

Cllr Baker

Pinch points – see under 06/56

06/55 ADDENBROOKES 2020 VISION

Mr Graves Director of Corporate Management, from Addenbrookes Hospital gave a presentation of the 2020 Vision (the planning application which had been submitted to the City Council).

Members of the public asked the following questions/made the following points – with answers included from the Hospital's representative:

Re. the Hospital's transport surveys of staff walking and cycling, do you ask if they have walked/cycled all the way? Answer – the survey included those as travelling by car that had parked their cars and walked from nearby streets.

Have you any idea how many staff park in neighbouring streets?
Answer – No, but employees are not permitted to park at the Hospital if they live within a two mile radius. To encourage use of other transport modes, the Hospital subsidises the local bus service and offers interest free loans for bicycle purchase.

Has provision been made in the 2020 vision for all these new people working on site? Answer – a new car park opens in April and there is further provision (for parking) in the 2020 planning application.

Have the Cambridge Cycling Campaign been consulted? Answer – not at this stage but will do so.

Adden-
brookes
represent-
atives

Will Addenbrookes become a regional Trauma Centre? Answer – more demand in this area of patient care and will soon be putting in a planning application for an on-site helipad.

Why is the electricity sub-station proposed for the green belt?
Answer – the developers have proposed this location to serve also the proposed developments at Clay Farm and the former Monsanto site.

06/56 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS – UPDATE

Referring to the report, the Chair advised the Committee that only two of the pinch points listed in para 3.1 were in the South Area, namely Rotherwick Way and Orchard Estate.

Cllr Slatter updated the Committee on the Foster Road allotment scheme and it was noted that the BMX track was now being dealt with outside the scope of the community orchard scheme.

Pinch points – a member of the public asked if the removal of the pinch points in Orchard Avenue (which he supported as a cyclist) could be accompanied by insertion of wooden bollards with reflectors. Cllr Newbold noted that although the gentleman had already spoken to the Council's Walking and Cycling Officer about this, he would clarify for the benefit of the committee why bollards were not recommended.

Cllr
Newbold

Although there was no formal decision to take on the removal of the two pinch points, the Committee did agree that they had to be removed to conform with requirements under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005.

Resolved -

Foster Road Allotments – to agree the final costs and proceed with

Abby
Jones
Landscape
Architect
01223

works for the community orchard as set out in the report.

457135

06/57 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

1

Site	32-40 Panton Street, Trumpington
Proposal	Erection of new building to provide 11 single student rooms, 4 student flats and one flat suitable for a disabled student at St Eligius Street
Recommendation	Approve with conditions
Application No	06/0781/FUL
Applicant	Pembroke College
PSR	Mr Stephens (for objectors), Mr Nix for the applicant

The Planning Officer (Mr Carter), highlighted the information that had been provided on the amendment sheet:

To Note :

In response to the amended plans an additional 14 letters of objection have been received from the following addresses.

26 Brookside
9 Brookside
1 Brookside Lane
3 Brookside Lane
2 Coronation Place
Brook Cottage, Pemberton Terrace
75 Holland Park (London)
2 Pemberton Terrace
3 Pemberton Terrace
16 Russell Court (On behalf of Newtown Residents Association)
4 Saxon Street
2 St Eligius Street
3 St Eligius Street
4 St Eligius Street
7 St Eligius Street

The representations can be summarised as:

- The amendments do not overcome the main objections.
- The amendments are minor and frivolous.
- The building is still not appropriate for the Conservation Area.
- The loss of dormer windows do not alter the scale of the development.
- The only improvement is the internal movement of the bins.
- The amendments do not appear to have overcome the concerns of the Conservation Officer.
- All other comments have been summarised within the Committee report.

The following email has been received by Cllr Anne Kent

I am not sure whether I will be at the Area Committee on Thursday so wanted, as local councillor, to ask you to take a couple of aspects into account when you consider the application for St Eligius Street. I know that the local residents will cover these as well as their concern about overdevelopment.

The first is the conservation area and the impact the proposed development would have on the nature of the surrounding buildings and streets. At the moment, there is a fine balance between family homes, educational establishments, HMOs and college accommodation which makes for a friendly mixed community.

The second is the impact of additional cars on the role St Eligius St plays in local traffic. The proposal to make Panton Street two way for cyclists was rejected on grounds of safety together with the fact that there was a southern route for cyclists already via St Eligius St.

- Please also note the attached note regarding the recently published PPS3.

KG letter summarised for Committee

The Chair referred to photos circulated at the meeting by the objectors and that members should not take these into account because neither the applicant nor the planning officer had had time to assess them.

Those members inclined to refuse the application cited Local Plan policies 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 4/11, PPS 3, and commented on vehicular access/egress, not preserving or enhancing conservation area, mislocation of disabled facilities a shared vision by developers/Council and residents.

Refused, against the officer recommendation (by 5 votes to 1). Detailed reasons based on the Committee's comments above to be agreed by the Chair and Cllr Newbold prior to issue.

Listed below are the decisions in full agreed following the meeting.

1. The proposal, rather than drawing upon and taking inspiration from the key characteristics of the area to inform the proposal by recognising the scale of the existing subsidiary forms in the street, including the coach house on the application site, introduces a substantially larger built form that will result in the a much more marked enclosing of the street and a change in its character. This, the erosion of the current balance of walling and larger built forms close to the pavements that is an essential characteristic of the street, the failure of the proposal to properly address the street by having doors opening out directly towards the highway, and the loss of all the planting that makes such an important contribution to the visual quality of the street, make the proposal unacceptable. For these reasons the proposal has failed to recognise or respond to context and the constraints of the site, to be connected to the immediate locality and to have used the characteristics of the locality to inform the development; it is, therefore, contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and policies 3/4 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in PPS3 Housing (2006).

2. The scale of the proposed building and its relationship with the existing buildings at 32-40 Panton Street and on the opposite, western, side of St Eligius Street, is such that it does not provide a comprehensive design approach that achieves good interrelations and integration between buildings, routes and spaces or create an attractive street frontage. Instead, the new building dominates the street and has a significant adverse impact on houses opposite, to the west, and also allows inadequate space between it and 32-40 Panton Street to achieve appropriate defensible space, privacy, circulation space, access and turning space for vehicles, planting, and bike and bin storage provision. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design and inappropriate overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). These reasons and the failure to create a shared vision with residents also means that the proposal contrary to advice in PPS3 Housing (2006).

3. The proposed development, because of its scale and design; the consequent loss of space; the loss of visually significant trees, spaces and boundaries; and the retention of cycle parking and refuse storage provision to the front of 32 –40 Panton Street, would not contribute positively to or preserve or enhance the character or appearance of City of Cambridge Conservation Area 1 (Central), within which the site lies. Instead, it would detract from and erode the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy P7/6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and policy 4/11 of the

Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in PPG 15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994).

4. Inadequate width is provided on the St. Eligius Street frontage to allow appropriate vehicular access in accordance with Department of Transport Design Bulletin 32, without prejudicing existing allocated on-street parking, the loss of which, in an area where there is already strong competition for on-street parking would be detrimental to the amenity of existing residents and contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/10.

5. The proposed location of the 'flat suitable for a disabled person', more than 30 metres from the main access to the site and only slightly less from the car parking spaces, does not address adequately the requirement for appropriate provision to be made for disabled students and the proposal is, therefore, contrary to policy 7/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.6. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public informal open space or Area Transport Contributions, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals: policies 3/8, 8/3 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; policies P6/1, P8/2, P8/3, P9/8 and P9/9 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004, Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2006.

Decision

2

Site

95 Glebe Road

Proposal

Erection of no. 3 bed dwellings with parking for four cars plus retention of 95 Glebe Road

Recommendation

Approve with conditions

Application No

06/01078/FUL

Applicant

Mr and Mrs Cook, 95 Glebe Road

PSR

Mr Jones (for objectors), Mr Cound (for applicants)

Decision

Approved (by 4 votes to 2) as detailed in the officer report

3

Site

129 Shelford Road

Proposal

Erection of new house (and demolition of existing)

Recommendation

Approve with conditions

Application No

06/1114/FUL

Applicant

Upware Marina, 8 Stansfield Gardens, Fulbourn

PSR

None

Decision **Approved** (by 6 votes to 0) as detailed in the officer report.
4
Site 41 Walpole Road
Proposal Erection of two storey front and side and single storey front and rear extensions
Recommendation Approve with conditions
Application No 06/1052/FUL
Applicant Mr Carter, 41 Walpole Road
PSR None
Decision **Approved** (by 6 votes to 0) as detailed in the officer report

The meeting ended at 10.10pm

Chair