

## East Area Committee

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday 17 December 2009  
**Time:** 7.00pm – 10.35pm  
**Place:** Cherry Trees Day Centre, St Matthews Street, Cambridge CB1 2LT

**Committee Manager:** Toni Birkin  
**email:** [toni.birkin@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:toni.birkin@cambridge.gov.uk)

**Telephone:** 01223 457086

or **write to:** Committee Services,  
Room 11, The Guildhall,  
Cambridge CB2 3QJ

#### **Council Members Present**

City Cllrs: Benstead, Blencowe, Ellis-Miller Hart, Howell, Lynn, Shah, Smart Walker and Wright

County Cllrs: Harrison, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

#### **Council Members that considered Applications for Planning Permission**

City Cllrs: Benstead, Blencowe, Ellis-Miller, Hart, Shah, Smart, Walker and Wright

### Minutes

#### **09/67 APOLOGIES for ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from the following:

City Cllrs: Bradnack and Herbert

County Cllrs: Bourke

#### **09/68 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2009 and 29<sup>th</sup> October 2009 were signed as correct records.

#### **09/69 MATTERS and ACTIONS ARISING from MINUTES**

09/61 Report on Tiverton House is on the agenda.

09/62 Several residents have volunteered as to be Recycling Champions.

**09/70      DECLARATIONS of INTEREST**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Benstead	9.1	PERSONAL Interests and family members lives near the property
Wright	9.1	PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL interest and took no part in this application as she had been involved in the petitions against the proposal

**09/71      OPEN FORUM**

**ACTION BY**

**Q.** Speaking on behalf of residents of Stone Street a resident requested the committee consider a small extension to the provision of yellow lines. Currently, only part of the street has restricted parking and this results in vehicles blocking the narrow road. The junction with Ainsworth Street is dangerous, refuse is often left uncollected as the road is blocked and the collection lorries cannot gain access. In the last year there have been two fires and on both occasions the emergency vehicles were delayed by parked cars blocking access.

**A.** Cllr Walker has already raised this with the County Council. County Cllr Harrison stated that there are many roads in the City that suffer the same difficulties and at present the County has no budget to address this. In addition, while some residents want parking restrictions an equal number would object to being unable to park near their homes. When the emergency services identify an area of risk action is always taken. However, this happens very rarely as parking restrictions alone do not ensure access. Obstruction is a police responsibility. Members discussed funding this via the Environmental improvements Projects (EIP) fund. However, some felt reluctant to fund a County responsibility and favoured making a case for funding to the County. The Chair reminded members that such projects have been funded through the EIP fund in the past. Consultation would be needed and any scheme would

have to meet the criteria of the EIP fund.  
The Chair recommended that the scheme be added to the EIP list to be prioritised at a later date.  
This was agreed (by a vote of 9 to 0).

**Q.** Is the Council considering renegotiating the Section 106 agreement with Brookgate the new owners of Cb1 station development? Student housing is to go ahead and a recent planning committee accepted re-phasing of S106 payment of 1.2 million pounds towards the guided bus and improved cycle parking at the station. This is a big risk as it amounts to a loan to the developer. Following the collapse of Ashwells the bus interchange will now be funded by Cambridgeshire Horizons and there is a danger that the cycle parking will be lost altogether.

Cllr Howell felt that S106 charges amount to a tax on development. County Cllr Harrison disputed this and further stated that planning permissions are linked to the land and not the owner. She was encouraged by Brookgates actions and felt they demonstrated faith in the development.

Members discussed the S106 agreements that have been deferred and suggested a pro-active approach should be taken to ensure that the original developmental goals were preserved rather than allowing profitable pockets of development to be cherry picked.

Members discussed the situation of cycle parking at the railway station and felt a temporary solution was needed urgently. A temporary release of land earmarked for development could be a solution.

The Chair suggested inviting the Director of Planning to the next East Area Committee to discuss the situation. However, it was agreed that by then decisions would have been made and that action is needed now.

Cllr Howell proposed the following:

*The East Area Committee makes a formal request to the Chair of the Planning committee and to the Director of Planning and Environment that the CB1/Station Area development's S106 agreement is reviewed in light of the recent situation regarding Ashwells.*

To be  
passed on  
and  
reported  
back to next  
area  
committee

This was agreed (by a vote of 9 to 0).

**Q.** Can additional parking restrictions be introduced to

Fairford Place?

**A.** In the interest of fairness in view of the earlier decision this area will be added to the EIP list for further investigation.

**Q.** Can the minutes of liaison meeting between Anglia Ruskin university and the City Council be made public?

**A.** This is outside the scope of this meeting. More information is available in the report on Tiverton Way (Item 7 of agenda). An additional meeting took place recently with residents of the Tiverton Way area and the minutes were sent to all those who attended.

## **09/72 SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS**

Steve Kerridge introduced the item. He began by saying he had attended all four area committees and the general situation is positive across the City. A multi agency approach has been adopted to address acute cases of anti social behaviour.

**Q.** Why is the use of fixed penalty notices for speeding so limited?

**A.** PCSO's are not able to issue these and can only issue a warning letter.

**Q.** Criminal damage continues to be a problem on the routes out of the City in the evening/night and the Glisson Road area has experienced problems. Mobile cameras have not helped and officers appear unaware of where they are deployed and do not use the evidence.

**A.** This is unacceptable and will be investigated. Cameras have been successful in other areas.

**Q.** Additional alcohol licences for Hills Road will be considered in the near future. Could the cumulative impact zone be extended to include this area.

**A.** This suggestion will be considered.

**Q.** How are hotspots identified and can the public influence this?

**A.** Officers use a mixture of data analysis and local knowledge to decide which areas warrant additional resources. The public can contribute information via e.cops. However, this should not be used to report incidents.

**Q.** Do the police take action on obstructed roads?

**A.** This would be decided on a case by case basis. A fixed penalty notice could be issued.

**Q.** Updates were requested on the following issues: Rustat Road anti social behaviour and Gwydir Street vehicle damage,

**A.** The situation has improved in both areas.

**Q.** Incidents on Coleridge Recreation ground have been reported in the local paper. What is the current situation?

**A.** The press impression is incorrect and there are very few problems reported in this area.

Cycle thefts were discussed. A special project has produced disappointing results. Paul Griffin stated that work is on-going and a new campaign will be launched in the New Year.

The following recommendations were agreed:

1. Continuation of work to tackle anti-social behaviour in North Barnwell
2. Promotion of community cohesion in Tiverton Way in response to complaints of localised anti-social behaviour, focused around the Forum
3. Vehicle-related crime and anti-social behaviour incorporating speeding

Members agreed that priority three should be promoted and advertised, with the results measured and reported. County Cllr Harrison will ask the County to take a lead on this.

#### **09/73 PLANNING INVESTIGATION SERVICE: THE FORUM (FORMERLY TIVERTON HOUSE)**

Members discussed the report and felt that lessons should be learnt from this and applied to future decisions. It was felt that the problems of placing a large block of student accommodation in a quiet residential area without supervision were predictable. Future decisions should include a local action plan. Cllr Benstead felt the report did not go far enough and offered to work with residents to seek redress. Members were concerned that other sheltered housing schemes, such as Seymour Court might be redeveloped in a similar way in future.

#### **09/74 ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

Cllr Wright had requested a discussion on the order of the agenda, as she was concerned that taking planning applications late at night was not convenient for applicants some of whom are elderly. She was also concerned about the quality of decisions made late at night.

Members discussed the 7.00pm start and considered the solution adopted by North Area Committee of an earlier start with planning first. Members felt this would not be in the spirit of area committees and would create a separate early evening planning meeting followed by an area committee.

Members agreed to maintain the current situation with the addition of an undertaking that planning will not be considered before 8.30pm.

#### **09/75 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

These minutes and the appendix 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.

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

Cllr Wright took no part in this application.

<b>1</b>
<b>Site Address:</b> 639 Newmarket Road
<b>Application Number:</b> 09/0977/S73
<b>Proposal:</b> Variation of Condition 6 of planning ref: C/00/0222 to allow restaurant to trade between the hours of 6am-11pm seven days a week for 12 month temporary period.
<b>Applicant:</b> C/O Agent Mr Baldip Basi 23 Furzton Lake Shirwell Crescent Furzton Milton Keynes MK41GA
<b>Officer Recommendation:</b> REFUSE
<b>Public Speakers</b> Emma Brighton
<b>Decision:</b> REFUSED (6 to 0) as agenda <u>To Note:</u>  <u>Amendments To Text:</u>  The following representations were accidentally omitted from the Committee report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 59 Ekin Road</li> <li>• 21 Wadloes Road</li> </ul> <p>A petition with 34 signatories has also been received. It states, “We the undersigned would not wish to see the drive-through restaurant at the corner of Newmarket Road with Wadloes Road open at 6am instead of 7am. We understand this is likely to be the subject of a forthcoming planning application following national publicity implying that all McDonald’s restaurants are opening at this time.”</p>

<b>2 Withdrawn</b>
09/0595/FUL Tiverton house

3

**Site Address:** Land Adjacent to 95 Ditton Walk, Cambridge

**Application Number:** 09/1045/FUL

**Proposal:** Residential development to form 7x2 bed dwellings and 1x1 bed flat with associated car/cycle parking, amenity area and landscaping, following the Demolition of the existing garages.

**Applicant:** C/O Agent Januarys Chartered Surveyors York House Dukes Court 54-62 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8DZ

**Officer Recommendation:** **APPROVE**, subject to conditions

**Public Speakers:** Mr Stepney and Paul Belton

**Decision:** **APPROVED** (7 to 0) with the additional conditions 11, 12, 13 and 14 rehearsed below and subject to finalising of the section 106 agreement.

To Note:

## 2 Representations Received

Number 95b Ditton Walk

- The new buildings adjacent will block light
- The rear terrace is too close to the workshop to the north which creates noise

Agent acting on behalf of number 95b

I have copied this representation below in full:

*Mr John Evans Planning Officer*

*Following our meeting of the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009 at the Planning Offices in the Guildhall, I have been instructed by Mr Stepney to make the following responses regarding the application.*

- 1. While not an integral part of the planning application, the issue of building work on the boundary with 95b Ditton Walk raises key issues in relation to the exact position of the foundations that should not encroach on my client's land.*
- 2. Scaffolding would also need to be erected during the construction of flank walls and the curtain wall between the two housing blocks and the positioning of such scaffolding would need to be clarified by the contractors to avoid any encroachment on land at 95b Ditton Walk.*
- 3. Any piling/construction work would have a direct impact on the existing property at 95b Ditton Walk which already suffered physical damage from a previous development on the opposite boundary wall, despite the*

*housing units being at a greater distance from the property than the 1.4 metres being proposed.*

- 4. The proposed raised/open communal space between the two housing terraces would create significantly increased noise levels, especially in the warmer months. It is suggested that each property should have its own fenced space to reduce the possibility of larger gatherings. The communal area should not be elevated, as this would also increase the possibility of “overlooking” into the garden of 95b.*
- 5. The flank wall of units P5-P8 will significantly shadow 95b as the space between the properties would be minimal and these proposed units should therefore be sited further from the boundary of the properties. The existing path width between 95b and the boundary is only 1.4 metres.*
- 6. The “Buffer Zone” presents a potential security risk to 95b and the boundary wall should therefore be significantly higher than the 600 height currently shown on the proposal. Specific details of the gating arrangements at the rear of 95b also need to be shown in some detail.*
- 7. There are no details of parking spaces. Are they open marked spaces or will garages be built? In any event the total spaces are inadequate for the number of proposed units. There is also no provision for visitor parking.*
- 8. Overall there would be a loss of privacy from units P5-P8 as they would overlook the garden of 95b.*

Officer Comments

**The majority of the issues raised have been adequately considered within the main Committee report. I would however make the following additional comments:**

- Raised communal space: This is unlikely to create undue noise and disturbance to the neighbouring number 95b, because each unit has their own private area for sitting out. It is not considered necessary to form defined barriers to each of the patio areas, as this would detract from the character of the development.
- ‘Buffer Zone’: I would agree that the boundary wall to this area could be higher to increase security to number 95b. I would therefore suggest the imposition of a suitable boundary treatment condition for this to be agreed (new condition 13 detailed below).

### **Further Consultation Responses**



## Environmental Health

No objections in principle. Conditions are recommended regarding insulation requirements set out in the submitted Cass Allen Associates Noise Assessment. (New conditions 11 and 12 below).

## Landscape Team

I have verbally discussed the proposed landscaping to the shared amenity area. Comments are generally positive, although more seasonal planting is needed and specific species can be agreed through the imposition of a soft landscaping condition, (new condition 14).

## Cambridgeshire County Highways

**The front gardens occupy an area of public highway. This would require a Stopping up Order but the Highway Authority would object to a Stopping up Order.**

ECATP contributions are required.

No parking provision is made for the flat and parking is possible on the street. Therefore the development cannot be regarded as effective car free development. The access way should be designed as a true shared surface.

## **Officer Comments**

In response to the land ownership issue raised by the County Highways Authority, amended plans have been received which slightly alters the siting of the front terrace in relation Ditton Walk.

Units P1 to P4 now have a uniform building line and slightly reduced front garden areas. This change is not of such significance that further consultation is required. The revised siting will not in my view adversely affect the character and appearance of the development within the Ditton Walk street scene. These changes now meet the approval of the County Highways Authority.

The amended block plan now shows a shared surface access way, which is to the satisfaction of the County Highways Authority.

## Amendments To Text:

Paragraph 8.36: Please ignore the first sentence. This related to the previous application. The figures listed for the required contributions are correct.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

‘Approve subject to the satisfactory completion of the S106 Agreement by 5 January 2010 and subject to the following conditions’.

**New additional conditions as per Pre Committee Amendment Sheet**

4

**Site Address:** 12 Brookfields

**Application Number:** 09/0749/FUL

**Proposal:** Erection of 8 one-bed flats and associated external works.

**Applicant:** Mr M Swanborough C/O Agent Neale Associates The Tam Shed EastRoad Cambridge CB1 1BG

**Officer Recommendation:** : **APPROVE** subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 31st January 2010 and subject to conditions

**Public Speakers:**

**Decision:** **APPROVED** (UNANIMOUSLY) as agenda, subject to finalising of the section 106 agreement

5

**Site Address:** 36 Priory Road

**Application Number:** 09/1008/FUL

**Proposal:** Rear roof extension and part two/part single storey rear extensions.

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Bishop, 36 Priory Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB5 8HT

**Officer Recommendation:**

**Public Speakers:** **APPROVE** subject to conditions

**Decision:** **APPROVED** (UNANIMOUSLY) as agenda

Meeting finished at 10.35 pm.

**Chair**

Additional information for public:

City Council officers can also be emailed  
[firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:firstname.lastname@cambridge.gov.uk)

Information (including contact details) of the Members of the City Council can be found from this page:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/about-the-council/councillors/>

Members of the County Council can be emailed:

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