



South Area Committee
(City Councillors representing Cherry Hinton, Queen
Edith's, Trumpington Wards)

2 August 2007
7.30pm – 10.20 pm



Minutes & Actions

Present: City Councillors

Cherry Hinton: (Robert Dryden, Russell McPherson, Stuart Newbold)

Queen Edith's: (Alan Baker, Viki Sanders, Amanda Taylor)

Trumpington: (Andy Blackhurst, Philippa Slatter, Sheila Stuart)

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

07/27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from County Councillors Carter, Heathcock and Kent

07/28 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A Code of Conduct personal and prejudicial interest was declared as follows:

Councillor	Application
Slatter	The Leys School Playing Field <i>Her husband is an employee of Leys School</i>

Councillor Slatter left the room, took no part in the discussion and did not vote on the application indicated.

07/29 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2007 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

07/30 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Open Forum Question Q1: What was the likely cost of the computer equipment

provided in the Dec Bus?

Cllr Stuart reported on the overall costs of the equipment in the Dec Bus and said that she would be happy to give anyone interested the detailed costs after the meeting.

07/31 OPEN FORUM

Q1 On the proposed review of parking and charges for on-street parking – will the use of this be monitored?

A Cllr Baker said he was a member of the Area Joint Committee, the joint City County body which considered traffic issues in the City. The Parking Policy was under review and when the consultation began, County Council staff would be invited to present proposals to the Area Committees.

Q2 What amount of social housing was planned for the Baldock Way development?

A Cllr Baker said that one house was planned.

Q3 What was the cost of improvement and maintenance of the greens spaces in Nightingale Avenue?

A Cllr Baker said that he would pursue the question with Councillor Smith, the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation and report back to the committee.

Q4 The dropped kerbs in Nightingale Avenue were not protected by yellow lines to prevent their being blocked by parked cars.

A Cllr Baker said that they should have been installed at the same time as they were installed. He would pursue the issue to make sure the lines were on the County Council's list. Cllr Dryden recalled that the County Council was experiencing difficulties with the traffic budget.

07/32 LICENSING REFORM – PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY AND THE INCLUSION OF A CUMULATIVE IMPACT POLICY

The Licensing Officer said that the Licensing Act 2003 required each Council to produce, adopt and publish a statement of licensing policy, stating how it would administer its duties. The policy had to be reviewed at least every three years and open to public consultation prior to it being adopted. The Council's current policy expired on 6 January 2008.

The purpose of the report was to set out the redrafted policy as a part of the public consultation process and to request feedback on its content, prior to the drawing up of a final policy. A draft of the amended Statement of Licensing Policy was attached as Appendix A to the report.

The consultation also included a request from the Cambridgeshire Constabulary, attached as Appendix B to the report, for the inclusion of a cumulative impact policy within the statement of licensing policy, relating to two defined areas, one in the city centre, the other at the Cambridge Leisure Park site (old Cattle Market).

The Licensing Officer invited residents to consider the report and the proposals and submit comments by 24 September, The Licensing Committee would consider all the

comments received and make a recommendation for the consideration of the Council in December. She said she would be happy to help any residents with queries or had difficulties in completing the form.

Agreed that the report be noted and residents invited to comment before 24 September.

07/33 GUNHILD PLAY AREA – CONDITIONAL REPORT AND ACTION PLAN

Ian Ross, Recreation Services Manager, reported on a survey of the Gunhild Play Area carried out as a result of discussion at the last meeting. A comprehensive report had been prepared and circulated covering the maintenance, equipment and proposals for the area, including some options for the Committee to consider.

Cllr Taylor thanked the officers for the maintenance work carried out and noted the success of the consultation process.

Cllr Baker proposed that the decision on the proposed options be delegated to the relevant Ward Councillors after consultation with residents and agreed with the Recreation Services Manager,

Agreed that the decision be delegated as above.

07/34 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 2007/08 PROGRAMME

The report by the Environmental Improvements Officers reflected the decisions made at the committee's last meeting in June, leaving a number of issues for determination at this meeting. Additional information on costs had been provided.

Cllr Baker proposed that the committee consider the options set out below:

OPTION A	£
Queen Ediths Way grass verges (QE)	3,000 -5,000
Gladstone Way (CH)	1,500 – 3,000
Walkway Bishop's Ct/Hauxton (T)	15,000 – 30,000
Holbrook Rd/Glebe Rd passageway (QE)	1,000 – 3,000
Church End parking verges (CH)	<u>15,000 – 30,000</u>
	35,500 – 73,000

or OPTION B

Cherry Hinton High Street	70,000 - 75,000
---------------------------	------------------------

And the following projects be deferred:

QE Way litter bin (QE)	500 - 800
Gunhild way drop kerb etc (QE)	1,000 - 6,000
CH High Street grass verges (CH)	3,000 - 5,000
Hauxton Rd litter bin (T)	500 - 800
Trumpington High St litter bin (T)	500 - 800

Cllrs Dryden and Newbold pointed out that the Cherry Hinton High Street scheme had been awaited as the third part of phased improvements to the High Street. They

felt that the scheme should be completed, as originally agreed, rather be effectively deferred for a further unknown period.

Cllr Baker said that any deferred schemes would in any case be revisited within the 6 month review of schemes.

Cllr Stuart suggested that the three small litter bins schemes could be carried out under Option A as a further tranche of funding of £10,000 had been identified.

Agreed by 5 votes to 3 that the schemes in option A be carried out with the addition of the three litter bin schemes from Option B and that the remaining schemes be deferred until the next review of environmental schemes.

Approved:	£
Queen Ediths Way grass verges (QE)	3,000 -5,000
Gladstone Way (CH)	1,500 – 3,000
Walkway Bishop’s Ct/Hauxton (T)	15,000 – 30,000
Holbrook Rd/Glebe Rd passageway (QE)	1,000 – 3,000
Church End parking verges (CH)	15,000 – 30,000
QE Way litter bin (QE)	500 - 800
Hauxton Rd litter bin (T)	500 - 800
Trumpington High St litter bin (T)	500 - 800

Deferred:	
Cherry Hinton High Street	70,000 - 75,000
Gunhild way drop kerb etc (QE)	1,000 - 6,000
CH High Street grass verges (CH)	3,000 - 5,000

07/35 COUNTY COUNCIL’S DRAFT REVIEW OF ITS ON-STREET PARKING POLICY

On 24 April 2006, the Area Joint Committee had considered and noted a report on the parking policy review arising from the County Council’s Transport Local Plan 2006 - 2011. On 13th November 2006, an initial consultation event had been held to explore the issues that needed to be taken into account as part of a countywide parking policy review. Officers and Members from the County Council and all the District Councils had been in attendance. At the request of the AJC Chairman, a further Member consultation session was held on 20 December to explore in more detail the particular issues relevant to Cambridge.

On 22 January 2007 the AJC had considered a further report setting out the key issues under consideration as part of the review.

The new draft policy was shown in Appendix A to this report and comment invited from area committees and residents.

Cllr Baker had circulated a number of comments and proposed that this committee respond to the County Council in the light of those comments. Cllr Slatter commented on the number of residents eligible for residents parking in any one household. Cllr Dryden commented that changes to the Blue Badge parking system would not be helpful to the disabled.

Agreed that the comments proposed by Cllr Baker set out be submitted to the

County Council in response to the Draft Review of its On-Street Parking Policy:

General comments

- 1 The remit of the review approved by Cabinet included an examination of the balance of residents' and commuter parking controls. But the draft policy does not directly address that issue, despite the fact that it constitutes a major concern for many Cambridge residents.
- 2 Could there be some indication of the envisaged timetable for the move towards making the whole of the city a controlled parking zone with all on-street parking controlled in some way?
- 3 All AJCs and key stakeholder groups will be consulted on the draft policy before being progressed further. Will those groups include the city's residents' associations? [There now exists a loose federation of such associations and at the very least that body should be seen as a key stakeholder].

Comments on the proposed Policies (Appendix A)

Policy 1 The aims of the policy should explicitly include that of achieving a balance between residents' and commuter parking.

Policy 2 and Policy 5 We would like consideration to be given to the introduction of variable charges related to vehicle emission levels. The scale could be based on the VRD.tax disc rules – these are now widely accepted and only discriminate among more recently purchased vehicles (thus they do not penalise elderly persons with old vehicles as some had feared).

Policy 4 Amend to read “a reasonable and fair balance of all parking needs” and delete “to avoid any particular use from dominating the area” (because residents' parking must be expected to dominate in designated residents' parking areas).

Parking control schemes should be flexible and capable of being designed to address specific local problems (e.g. controlling/limiting commuter parking in some roads by prohibiting parking from 9 to 10 am).

Policy 5 We question whether there should be a departure from the long-established policy that charges for residents' parking should be set to cover only administrative costs and not to generate a surplus to spend on unrelated matters. We can see no justification for such an additional imposition on a specific segment of the city's residents.

Policy 7 In first sentence, change “shall be able” to “may be able”. In some areas the shortage of parking spaces is so acute that only in the most deserving exceptional cases can even local businesses' parking needs be accommodated at all.

Comments on the Draft Guidance and Interpretation (Appendix B)

Policy 1 Add the following bullet point: The need to balance the interests of residents and of commuters.

Change the final bullet point to read: The environmental impact of parking, including the impact on air quality and on local residential amenity (noise, character and

appearance of an area). [Such factors have to be taken into account when there is a proposal for building development. The development of parking controls should also do so].

The final paragraph is far too restrictive, limiting the introduction of parking controls only on the grounds of safety and access. They should also aim to conserve or even enhance local environments (including supporting the implementation of Air Quality Management Zones). The Report to the AJC on the Design Guide for Streets includes a section on parking. It states: "On-street parking will be acceptable on adopted roads provided it is properly planned within the design. *However, there is a need to avoid new streets becoming car parks which will undermine the character and accessibility of the design*". This important principle should apply not only to new developments but also to existing streets. Both new and old streets should not be allowed to be or to become (long-term) car parks.

The Use of Surpluses: This section should be clarified. The first paragraph relates to on-street surpluses from Pay & Display and from Residents' Only Parking Charges; the second paragraph relates to revenue from Local Authority Parking Enforcement. Any parking surpluses should be allocated for spending for the benefit of the districts in which they have been generated.

07/36 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN FINDING OF MALADMINISTRATION

The Monitoring Officer, Antoinette Jackson, reported that after investigating a complaint made about a planning application, the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) has found maladministration by the Council, leading to injustice to the complainants.

A copy of the LGO's report was attached to the Monitoring Officer's report. She said that steps had been taken to improve the way that applications were dealt with and how the process was minuted. The procedures for dealing with planning applications at all committees had been reviewed.

Cllr Dryden pointed out that planning applications were frequently heard late in the evening at Area Committees when members' decision making abilities could be impaired and the public could be under the impression that decisions were given insufficient time for consideration. Cllr Newbold recalled recent advice by the Department of Communities and Local Government on a similar theme. Members also discussed the requirement for training Councillors in determining applications.

The Monitoring Officer was required by the Local Government & Housing Act 1989 to make a formal report to the Council when there had been a finding of maladministration against the Council, and she would be reporting to Council on 13 September.

Agreed

1 That the Committee agree a payment of £1000 to the complainant to compensate her for the injustice she has experienced and her time and trouble in making the complaint.

2 That the procedures for dealing with planning applications at all committees be

reviewed by the Environment Scrutiny Committee to address the issues raised by the LGO.

07/37 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those which the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up.

These minutes should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown.

1 07/0450/FUL
Site 157 Shelford Road Cambridge
Proposal Change of use of 2 rooms to the use for bed and breakfast.
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions
Applicant Mr O Kuwaider
Public Speakers Mr P Dawson (resident against) Mr M Ford (resident in favour)
Decision **Application Approved** (by 6 votes to 0)
subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report and the amendment of condition 3 to read:
The change of use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as drawings at 1:50, or larger, showing the full layout of one ground floor bedroom and its associated bathroom, demonstrating that they are suitable for occupation by disabled persons, including those using a wheelchair, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the scheme has been implemented in accordance with that agreed.

2 07/0442/FUL
Site **The Leys School Playing Fields, Latham Road, Cambridge**
Proposal Installation of synthetic grass pitch with fencing.
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions
Applicant The Leys School
Public Speakers Prof Gordon (resident); John Cadman (Applicant's agent)
Decision **Application approved** (by 5 votes to 0) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report

3	07/0731/FUL
Site	31 Sedley Taylor Road Cambridge
Proposal	Erection of new two storey dwelling in the garden of 31 Sedley Taylor Road following the demolition of an existing garage
Recommendation	Refuse for reasons set out
Applicant	Mr And Mrs Guy Warwick
Public Speakers	Mr N Ray (Architect)
Discussion	During discussion of the application these reasons were identified by members of the committee for approval against officer recommendation: that the proposal would add to the character of the area, respected the neighbouring properties, and complied with the requirements of the Local Plan policies and the Development Plan. Further it would provide an interesting addition to the street scene.

Decision **Application approved against officer recommendation** (by 6 votes to 0) subject to finalising of the section 106 agreement and conditions to be drawn up by the Head of Development Services. The agreement of Chair and Spokes was not required for the completion of the section 106 or conditions and reasons for approval. Remove “and agreed by the Chair of South Area Committee.

The following conditions were subsequently agreed:

1. CO1A Commencement
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed, without the prior written agreement of the local planning authority
Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/14).
3. CC62
4. CC63
5. CC80A
6. Prior to the commencement of development (including soil stripping, pre-construction delivery of equipment or materials, the creation of site accesses, positioning of site huts) the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority,
 - 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;

and,

b) that there has been:

A pre-construction site meeting between the site agent, the developers chosen arboriculturalist, and the Council's delegated Arboricultural Officer.

All development facilitation pruning, where required, has been completed in accordance with BS 3998:1989.

All 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.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention and protection of existing trees on site. Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4.

7. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the proposed fencing shall be aligned to provide a 2 metre by 2 metre pedestrian visibility splay from the edge of the highway and shall thereafter be retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, Policy 8/4)

INFORMATIVES

A104

A106

Reasons For Approval to read:

1. This development has been approved, subject to conditions and following the prior signing of a section 106 obligation, because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/2, P1/3

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 4/4

2. After presentations by the Planning Officer and on behalf of the applicant, and having heard the 'green light', positive recommendation of the Design and Conservation Panel, Committee took the view that the design, far from being uncharacteristic of the area, would sit comfortably with the variety of design forms and materials in the street, and would make a positive and imaginative contribution. The implications of the proposed building for the existing house, 31, were not considered inappropriate or unreasonable, or likely to have an overbearing or overwhelming presence that would detract from the amenity of future occupiers to an extent that would warrant refusal of the application.

The decision was been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which were considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further detail about the application please see the officer report by visiting the Council Planning Department.

4	07/0598/FUL
Site	39 Shelford Road Cambridge
Proposal	Erection of three dwellings following the demolition of the existing bungalow (revised scheme)
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions
Applicant	J Cooper
Public Speakers	Mrs J Latimer (resident)
Decision	Application Approved (by 6 votes to 0)

subject to completion of the section 106 agreement by 3 September 2007 and to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report and an additional condition:
15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), none of the development otherwise

permitted by Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A to E (inclusive) of that order may be implemented without the express permission of the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent overdevelopment of the site and to protect the amenity of adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)

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 3 September 2007, it is recommended that the application be **refused** for the reason set out in the report.

5 07/0534/FUL
Site 40 Queen Ediths Way Cambridge
Proposal Erection of a two storey 3-bedroom dwelling.
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions
Applicant Queen Ediths Way Ltd
Public Speakers Mr Nick Gaw (resident)
Decision **Application Approved** (by 6 votes to 0)

subject to the to completion of the section 106 agreement by 1 December, and conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report and the amendment of Condition 10 to read:

10. The windows illustrated on the drawing 07001-10A as having, "sandblasted (obscure) glazing" shall be so glazed when first introduced to the building and shall remain as such thereafter; the velux windows in the north elevation shall, as illustrated on the drawing 07001-10A, have an external cill level of at least 2.0 metres above first floor finished floor level.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14).

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 1 December 2007, it is recommended that the application be **refused** for the reason set out in the report.

6 07/0593/FUL
Site 95A Shelford Road Cambridge
Proposal Change of use from residential dwellinghouse to Religious Meeting Hall, involving minor internal and external alterations.
Recommendation Approve subject to conditions
Applicant The Radgund Trust
Public Speakers Andrew Smart (for applicant)
Decision **Application Approved** (by 6 votes to 0)
subject to the conditions set out in the officers' report, and the following amendment to Condition to read:
3. No amplified music shall be played or transmitted in or on the premises to be used as a religious meeting hall.
Reason: To protect the residential amenity of adjoining and nearby dwelling (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/4)

The meeting finished at 10.20pm

CHAIR