



**West/Central Area Committee
(City Councillors representing Castle, Market
and Newnham Wards)
30 August 2007 7:30pm –10.25pm
Minutes & Actions**

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

Additional information for public: City Council officers can also be emailed firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk

The Committee Manager for West/Central Area Committee is 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

Members of the County Council can be emailed:

Firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

07/30 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from County Councillor Alex Reid (Newnham Ward)

07/31 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 May 2007 were agreed as a correct record.

07/32 MATTERS ARISING

Draft until 25 October 2007

Re: Minute numbers 07/17 and 07/27 Role of Conservation & Design Panel in relation to planning applications.

The Chair read from an email from the Historic Environment Manager. The Terms of Reference of the Panel listed those applications that the Panel would normally be asked to comment on:

- Major new developments/urban extensions
- Statutory development briefs/design guidance
- Single buildings of architectural or other significance
- Any building or site considered to require special consideration
- Significant Listed Building Consent applications involving additions, or other major works to Grade II listed buildings not otherwise referred to statutory consultees (English Heritage and / or the "6 Societies").
- Significant demolition and /or construction proposals in Conservation Areas
- Proposals for the listing of buildings of special architectural or historic interest
- Designation, boundary review, and Appraisals of Conservation Areas
- Proposals affecting Designated Historic Parks and Gardens
- Public Art strategies

The Panel may be asked to comment on other applications at the discretion of the Director of Environment & Planning.

Councillor Holland asked that the reply be sent to the member of the public who had asked the original question.

Cttee
Manager

07/33 OPEN FORUM

Councillors Reid and C Rosenstiel as city councillors on the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) introduced the theme - County Council Parking Policy Review:

City Councillors had pressed for a review to try and have more residents' parking in the city. The new policy was aimed at areas without schemes rather than at areas like Market Ward which had many schemes. Both urged councillors and residents to respond to the consultation about the proposals by writing to Richard Preston, Head of Network Management at the County Council. The County Council Cabinet were due to make a decision on the policy in the autumn.

Councillors and the public registered the following issues:
Re Policy 5 and the charging structure - this stated that "The residents' permit charge structure may allow discounts for low emission vehicles or those with smaller engine capacity to help meet environmental objectives." If such discounts were put in place then there would need to be additional funding from elsewhere eg that those with higher emission vehicles could be charged more. The policy was flexible and this could apply to all on-street parking. Longer vehicles could also be surcharged (Cllrs S Reid, C

Draft until 25 October 2007

Rosenstiel, Resident 1)

Policy 5 also states that “the charge may generate a surplus for investment in parking or highway and environmental improvements”. This was new and feedback would be welcomed.

(Cllr C Rosenstiel)

General points:

Defining an area should not be too rigid (Cllr C Rosenstiel)

When houses in small streets are converted to flats and become HMOs, those residents will not be allowed permits under the policy. Nevertheless they will have cars and will end up parking them somewhere. There also needed to be a review of planning policies in relation to this. (Cllr Griffiths)

In some narrow streets with single yellow lines (to deal with lorries not being able to pass between two rows of parked cars if there were no yellow lines), there may need to be parking on such single yellow lines for residents only at week ends. (Cllr C Rosenstiel)

Points raised by residents:

Resident 1 (from Castle Hill area where there is a scheme): Two problems

- 1) The bays are taken over by large numbers of skips so they are not available.
- 2) Quoted from Policy 5 - “It may also allow discounts in areas where the permit number to parking space ratio results in a lower level of service for residents.” This was “bizarre” as if permits cost less more residents would want them and there would be even less service!
- 3) The scheme only runs until 6pm. After that spaces are taken by visitors going to restaurants in the city. Who decides the length of time the permits cover?

Cllr C Rosenstiel explained that there were basically 3 time periods. What had been put in place in any particular scheme could be changed if enough residents expressed views about a change and could come to a consensus.

Cllr S Reid said that in Newnham Croft, the timing was to discourage shoppers from parking. Until the Park & Ride bus services were improved this would continue to be a problem.

Resident 2 (from the Kite area): Was there a limit to the number of permits per household and what had happened to the plans for the residents’ parking in the Kite area?

Cllr C Rosenstiel explained that no fair way had yet been devised to determine how many permits per household but that so far things worked reasonable well. The delay in the Kite scheme was due to budget problems at the County Council in the previous financial year but that the implementation had been promised for the summer.

Resident 3: Businesses could buy visitor permits - he thought up to 20 per business - and this seemed excessive. He was also concerned about mis-use of blue badge parking spaces.

Cllr C Rosenstiel acknowledged both concerns and said that the problem was with the County Council not having the resources for enforcement. He did know of businesses that had had enforcement action taken against them.

07/34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor	Item	Nature of interest
J Rosenstiel	07/0612/FUL	She knows one of the objectors.

07/35 REVIEW OF COUNCIL'S STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

Jas Lally, Head of Environmental Services, introduced the review of the policy. He urged residents to respond to the invitation to give their views by completing the questionnaire available on line at www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/ehws/licensing/licensing-consultation.en

or taking away a copy from the meeting. He mentioned the 4 Licensing Objectives - Prevention of Crime and Disorder; Public Safety; Prevention of Public Nuisance and Protection of Children from Harm. He explained that Inspector Porter would outline the police case for a cumulative impact policy but that the decision was one that would be made by the City Council as licensing authority. The Council's Licensing Committee would first of all consider the responses to the consultation and then the Full Council (all 42 members) would make the decision about whether or not to adopt the policy.

Inspector Chris Porter then presented the case put together by the police. He said "Cumulative impact concerns the potential impact on the promotion of the Licensing Objectives of a concentration of licensed premises in a particular area." If the Council did adopt the policy, and the police objected to any new application in the area because it would impact on one of the four licensing objectives, then the burden of disproving that would fall on the applicant. He quoted some statistics:

33% of Cambridge City licensed premises are in Market Ward and that it has double the density of premises to any other ward in the city.

Cambridge Leisure Park also has a particularly high density of licensed premises.

The proposed cumulative impact area in Market ward had 8 times the number of violent crime, criminal damage and anti-social behaviour offences compared to the city as a whole with the Leisure Park at 15 times that average.

It can be shown that a significant proportion of these offences and incidents are likely to be alcohol-related. So the police are recommending a Cumulative Impact Policy for Market Ward and Cambridge Leisure Park.

Councillors raised the following to which Jas Lally (JL) and

Draft until 25 October 2007

Inspector Porter (CP) replied:

- Had all licensed premises been included eg college bars?

CP: Those that were not seen as problematic had been omitted eg college premises, conference centres, community halls and amusement arcades.

- As well as the density of premises, had their size been taken into account?

CP: No

- If residents requested a review of a licence because of problems they experienced, would this be done under the new policy if it were adopted?

CP: Yes

- If there were such a review would a problematic premises be able to be shut down?

CP: This policy would not address problems of crime and disorder. In addition, it is nearly impossible to identify which premises sold the drinks to an individual committing an offence.

JL: Agreed and said other powers and other activities would need to be used to reduce crime. Hours of operation of premises could be altered at review.

- As well as there being a density of licensed premises in Market ward there are a large number of people living in the same area and their lives are being adversely affected by alcohol-related behaviour. In addition, the behaviour is spilling out over the whole area of the City Centre eg up Castle Hill.

Resident 2 asked how the opportunity to respond to the consultation was being publicised as she had only known by coming to the meeting.

JL: acknowledged that more could be done and proposed putting an article in the Cambridge Evening News.

In response to a question from Resident 2, Inspector Porter acknowledged that the police IT systems needed to be modified in order to ensure that the data about alcohol-related offences could be more effectively collected.

Resident 4 asked whether high speeding vehicles in Maid's Causeway counted as public nuisance.

CP: Yes if alcohol related; if not dealt with under other powers.

07/36 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS – HALF YEARLY UPDATE

The Landscape Architect explained that she would be attending the committee in April and August each year but that in addition this year she would be coming to the October meeting as new projects were still being collected.

The Committee considered the various items in the report.

Resolved

1. To proceed with the bracket lights on the front corners of

Draft until 25 October 2007

Hobbs Pavilion on Parker's Piece at a cost of £2,040.

2. Auckland Road/Parsonage Street - to refurbish the existing paving and smooth out the trip hazards including tidying the verge at a cost of £3,300; to install more characterful light columns at £2,000 per column; not to install cast-iron fencing.
3. To install cycle racks at Lammas Land at a cost of £2,350.
4. To investigate the cost of modifications and proceed with the works to the barrier at the Windsor Road/Warwick Road passageway to make it safer for all users and to stop speeding cyclists.
5. That investigations be made re the cost of re-surfacing this area.

After considerable discussion about the various proposals to deal with pinch points in the West/Central area, the Committee agreed the following:

- That the officer investigate whether off-setting some of the bollards rather than removing them (especially those that are picturesque) would comply with the DDA.
- That the officer be authorised to remove pram arms at all sites as appropriate but that the whole bollard be removed in Christchurch Street as removing only the pram arms is insufficient
- That the officer come back to the next meeting with positive proposals about all the other sites.

07/37 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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 in the minutes.

- 1 **APPLICATION NO:** 07/0618/FUL
SITE: 23 Newmarket Road (Market)
PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey dwelling house (3 bedrooms)
RECOMMENDATION: Approve
APPLICANT: Mr Jeremy Ashworth, 2B Over Road, Willingham, Cambridge CB24 5EU
PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Mr Jeremy Ashworth (applicant)
DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED (unanimously) subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 September 2007 and to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the following amendments to Condition 4 "insert '3' number bicycles..." and to Condition 9 "Those windows in the west and

Draft until 25 October 2007

south (elevation to garden of main house) at first floor level shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut prior to occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, and shall be retained as such in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reasons – To protect the residential amenity of the adjoining residential properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/4 and 3/12)”

- 2 APPLICATION NO:** 07/0612/FUL
SITE: 23-25 Kings Road (Newnham)
PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey dwelling house
RECOMMENDATION: Approve
APPLICANT: Mr J D Scott-Organ, York House, 10 Wilberforce Way, Wimbledon Common, London SW19 4TH
PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Ms Abigail Sellen (resident)
REASONS FOR REFUSAL RAISED IN DEBATE:

The members who spoke against the officer recommendation said the development did not fit the character of the area which had a more rural feel at that end of King’s Road, that the design of the building would not enhance the area and that its footprint was large relative to the plot.

DECISION: Refused against officer recommendation (by 6 votes to 1) for reasons to be drawn up by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Vice Chair (Chair will be on holiday) based on the above reasons for refusal raised during debate of the application.

The Head of Development Services advised that, as the S106 agreement had not been finalised before the committee meeting, an additional reason for refusal (see reason 2 below) should be added.

Following the meeting, the reasons subsequently drafted by Head of Development Control and agreed by the Vice Chair were as follows:

The proposed development, by virtue of the scale of the building footprint in comparison with the application site fails to reflect the character of this part of Kings Road, which is epitomised by buildings set within large landscaped plots. In addition the detailing of the proposed house does not draw sufficient inspiration from that of buildings in the surrounding area. In so doing the proposed house would fail to make a positive impact on its setting or to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. 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, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to advice provided by PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment.

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

Draft until 25 October 2007

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.

3 APPLICATION NO: 07/0548/FUL

SITE: Fitzwilliam Museum, Trumpington Street (Market)

PROPOSAL: Alterations to existing Antiquities Hut to create servery and provision of a seating area in connection with proposed outdoor cafe

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

APPLICANT: University of Cambridge, c/o 74 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1 RW

PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Ms Margaret Greeves (for the applicant)

REASONS FOR APPROVAL RAISED IN DEBATE:

The members who spoke against the officer recommendation said that the Hut could not easily be seen from Trumpington Street and they disagreed with reason 1 that there would be a “highly visible impact on the setting of the museum buildings and site” of a negative kind. They suggested that the proposal could positively enhance the area. They suggested that a number of conditions could be attached to the approval eg limiting the use of the café to the times when the museum was open, granting a temporary approval for 3 years to allow review of the impact the café would have on the area and that the nature of the umbrellas, tables etc be approved by the planning authority.

Members also felt that reason 2 regarding the needs of disabled users did not stand up as this was a secondary café and that it was no further from facilities than was the case in the main museum.

DECISION: Approved against officer recommendation (unanimously) for reasons to be drawn up by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Vice Chair (Chair will be on holiday) based on the above reasons for approval raised during debate of the application.

Following the meeting, the reasons subsequently drafted by Head of Development Control and agreed by the Vice Chair were as follows:

The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued, the hut removed and the land restored to its former condition in accordance with a scheme of works submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, on or before 30 September 2010.

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to re-assess the impact of the use on the amenity of the surrounding area. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P1/2, P1/3 and P7/6 Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/1, 3/4, 4/10 and 4/11)

Draft until 25 October 2007

The use hereby permitted shall only take place during such time as the Fitzwilliam Museum is open to the public.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining buildings. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

The use hereby permitted shall not commence until full details of the proposed reinstatement of the lawn adjacent to the external seating area, including the timing of such reinstatement, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policy P1/2, P1/3 and P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 4/10 and 4/11)

The use hereby permitted shall not commence until full details of the awnings, canopies, sun shades, tables and chairs to be used on and adjacent to the external seating area have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policy P1/2, P1/3 and P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/10 and 4/11)

Reasons for Approval:

Informative - Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions 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 and P7/6.

Cambridge Local Plan 2006: 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 4/10 and 4/11

2 After representations had been made by both the applicant and the Planning Officer, and with knowledge of the local area, Committee took the view that the proposed development would not detract from the setting of the grade I listed Fitzwilliam Museum or have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the Conservation Area. Therefore the development could be regarded as complying with policies P1/2 and P7/6 of the Structure Plan and policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Local Plan. The Committee also considered that development met the needs of disabled users particularly in view of the fact that the principal café area was well equipped and that the proposed development related to a secondary café. Therefore the development could be regarded as

Draft until 25 October 2007

complying with policy 3/7 of the Local Plan.

The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was 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 on the decision please see the officer report by visiting the Council Planning Department.

4

APPLICATION NO: 07/0547/FUL

SITE: Fitzwilliam Museum, Trumpington Street (Market)

PROPOSAL: Alterations to antiquities hut to create a servery in connection with proposed café, Fitzwilliam Museum

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

APPLICANT: University of Cambridge, c/o 74 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1 RW

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

REASONS FOR APPROVAL RAISED IN DEBATE:

The Committee noted that, as the Museum is a listed building, their approval of the application required a referral to GO-EAST to see whether the Secretary of State wished to call the decision in.

DECISION: Approved against officer recommendation (unanimously) for reasons to be drawn up by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Vice Chair (Chair will be on holiday) based on the above reasons for approval raised during debate of the application.

Following the meeting, the reasons subsequently drafted by Head of Development Control and agreed by the Vice Chair were as follows:

Any damage caused to the listed building during the carrying out of the works hereby permitted shall be rectified and the building restored to its former condition and appearance to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the existing listed building. (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P1/3 and P7/6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, and 4/10)

And standard time limit condition:

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Reasons for Approval:

Informative - Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions 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 and P7/6.

Cambridge Local Plan 2006: 3/1, 3/4, 4/10 and 4/11

2. After representations had been made by both the applicant and the Planning Officer, and with knowledge of the local area, Committee took the view that the proposed development would not detract from the setting of the grade I listed Fitzwilliam Museum or have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the Conservation Area. Therefore the development could be regarded as complying with policies P1/2 and P7/6 of the Structure Plan and policies 4/10 and 4/11 of the Local Plan.

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

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of listed building consent only. For further detail on the decision please see the officer report by visiting the Council Planning Department

The meeting ended at 10.25pm.

Chair