

**North Area Committee****Minutes**

At Manor Community College

**7 January 2010**

6:30pm – 8:45pm

**THOSE PRESENT FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION****City Councillors:** Armstrong, Blair, Boyce, Kerr, Levy, Liddle, McGovern, Nimmo-Smith and Pitt**Other Councillors Present:** Wright**THOSE PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING****City Councillors:** Armstrong, Blair, Boyce, Kerr, Levy, Liddle, McGovern, Nimmo-Smith, Pitt and Todd-Jones**County Councillors:** Pellew and Wilkins**10/01 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE****City Councillors:** Ward and Upstone**County Councillors:** Moss-Eccardt and Wijsenbeek**10/02 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Planning)**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Armstrong, Blair, Boyce, Kerr, Levy, Liddle, McGovern, Nimmo-Smith and Pitt	09/0876/FUL	Personal – Know Councillor Wright
Boyce	09/1089/FUL	Personal - Had been contacted about the applications by the Objector
Boyce	09/0942/FUL	Personal and prejudicial - Former car showrooms, Chesterton Road, is immediately behind his property (within a couple of metres)
Kerr	09/1089/FUL	Personal - Knows the Objector
McGovern	09/0942/FUL	Personal – Is a member of the Co-operative Group Ltd
Nimmo-Smith	09/1089/FUL	Personal - Had been contacted about the applications by the Applicant and Objector
Nimmo-Smith	09/0942/FUL	Personal - Had been contacted about the applications by the Applicant and Objector

### 10/03 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.

<b>Site Address:</b> Corona House, 1 Corona Road, Cambridge
<b>Application Number:</b> 09/0876/FUL
<b>Proposal:</b> Construction of a replacement Sheltered Housing Building (following demolition).
<b>Officer Recommendation:</b> APPROVE subject to conditions.
<b>Public Speakers:</b> Councillor Margaret Wright (Objector).
<b>Decision:</b> <b>APPROVED (by 7 votes to 0)</b> as per Officers report subject to the addition of a further planning condition relating to wheel washing as follows:  No development shall take place until details of proposed wheel washing and other mitigation measures in relation to dust suppression 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: To protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).  Councillor Wright spoke as a member of the public (and not as a Ward Councillor) then withdrew from this section of the meeting.

<b>Site Address:</b> 21 Belvoir Road, Cambridge
<b>Application Number:</b> 09/1089/FUL
<b>Proposal:</b> Loft conversion with roof extension.
<b>Officer Recommendation:</b> REFUSAL
<b>Public Speakers:</b> Julie Petrie-Symes (Applicant), Joyce Atkins (Objector), Beryl Brundish (Objector) and Councillor Boyce (Ward Councillor)
<b>Decision:</b> <b>REFUSED (by 8 votes to 0)</b> as per Officers report.  As Councillor Boyce spoke as a Ward Councillor, he did not participate in the decision making.

<b>Site Address:</b> 179 -185 Chesterton Road, Cambridge
<b>Application Number:</b> 09/0942/FUL
<b>Proposal:</b> Change of use from vacant car showroom (Sui Generis) to convenience store (Use Class A1) and external alterations to existing building,

including the installation of louvres, a new bin store, new sliding doors, security bollards, security gates and laying out of customer car parking.

**Officer Recommendation:** APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 15 February 2010 and subject to conditions.

**Public Speakers:** Chris Beebe (Applicant), Janet Lees (Objector) and Anne Sales (Objector).

Councillor Blair proposed an amendment to paragraph 8.14 of the Officer's report to restrict to the times of delivery hours from 0900 hours to 2100 hours instead of 0700 hours to 2100 hours Monday to Saturday and no deliveries or collections on a Sunday, Bank or public holidays.

**Amendment decision: REJECTED (by 4 votes to 2).**

**Substantive decision: APPROVED (by 8 votes to 0)** as per Officers report subject to completion of S106 Agreement and amendment of condition 10 to read:

No development shall take place until full details of the proposed roller shutter 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.

Delegated authority granted to negotiate transport and public realm contributions.

As Councillor Boyce had declared a personal and prejudicial interest, he withdrew from this section of the meeting. He did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

Councillor Nimmo-Smith's general letter of support concerning the Co-op remaining in the area was included in representations as the letter was forwarded to the Planning Department by the Applicant. Councillor Nimmo-Smith clarified at the Committee that his letter contained general support, rather than any specific to this application, so felt it pertinent to only declare a personal interest as he had been contacted about the applications by the Applicant and Objector.

**Site Address:** Camflat Roofing Ltd, Sandy Lane, Cambridge

**Application Number:** 09/1024/EXP

**Proposal:** Extension of time for implementation of 06/0544/FUL (erection of one 5 bedroom house).

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

**Public Speakers:** N/A

**Decision: APPROVED (by 9 votes to 0)** as per Officers report subject to completion of Deed of Variation of s106 Agreement.

**3.5 Request for discharge of Section 106 obligation so that the guesthouse does not have to be operated by the original applicant or immediate family only, 61- 63 Milton Road, Cambridge**

**Decision: APPROVED (by 9 votes to 0) as per Officers report.**

**10/04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Main Agenda)**

Not applicable.

**10/05 MINUTES**

The minutes of the 12 November 2009 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

**10/06 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES**

- **09/57 Matters Arising (from 09/47 Open Forum) “What progress has been made on the problem of ‘L’ drivers using Woodhead Drive?”**

Councillor Armstrong has been notified of the route ‘L’ drivers will use for driving tests.

- **09/57 Matters Arising (from 09/47 Open Forum) “Have Councillors received the full speeding statistics from the police as promised at the last meeting? Will these be published?”**

Councillor McGovern has requested specific details concerning speeding in Kings Hedges. These have still not been received.

- **09/58 Open Forum “Is it a coincidence that the day the guided bus service finally starts to operate, the main city services and some of the buses that normally use the guided bus route are altered? We are told the changes are because of cuts by the “Council”, yet Stagecoach have publicly said that the guided bus system will not change the rest of its service”.**

Councillors Armstrong, Blair and Boyce have met Andrew Campbell (Managing Director Stagecoach Cambridgeshire). They held a general discussion on topics such as service provision, emissions and S106 for Orchard Park. Mr Campbell advised there would be no change to current service provision.

- **09/58 Open Forum “Can the flood/street lights at the zebra crossing by Jesus lock be fixed? I reported the problem in July and September”.**

Councillor Wilkins confirmed the light has been fixed.

**10/07 OPEN FORUM**

**Q1) Please clarify the situation concerning gritting in the City.**

**A)** Councillor Armstrong has been contacted by residents who wished to complain about the lack of gritting in Cambridge. Residents have been advised by the County Council that they should contact the City Council who in turn will liaise with the County Council to ensure gritting occurs. Councillor Pitt added that the City and County Councils work together, but the County set priorities/direction which the City Council are legally obliged to follow.

Councillors noted various complaints had been received concerning gritting. Residents did not care who took action so long as gritting occurs.

Councillor Nimmo-Smith observed the need for the City and County Councils to work together in a more flexible and strategic way in future, particularly in situations concerning poor weather, flooding, and emergencies. He appreciated the pre-Christmas situation was unacceptable.

Councillor Todd-Jones asked Councillor Pitt to explain the City Council's gritting policy/responsibilities. Councillor Pitt answered that the City gritten Council owned land such as the crematorium, sheltered accommodation and Mill Road Depot. Highways are the County Council's responsibility. The City Council have made street scene staff available to the County Council for gritting when unable to perform their normal duties, and refuse collectors in future. The County Council in turn allocate a supply of grit to the City.

**Action Point: Councillor Armstrong to source County Council contact for further clarification concerning gritting arrangements.**

Councillor Todd-Jones asked for clarification concerning the provision of salt bins and who could use them eg Council staff and/or members of the public. Councillor Pitt replied that since the ending of the Highways Agency agreement, the number of salt bins have been reduced.

**Action Point: Councillor Pitt to seek clarification concerning the provision of salt bins in Chesterton Road.**

**Q2) How could anyone think that over 200 properties at the VIE Development would have no need for extra visitor parking provision?**

**A)** Planning permission was granted allocating one car parking space per resident. Some developments have a smaller allocation. The site is designed to discourage car use in favour of other transport methods due to its location, hence no visitor parking.

**Q3) Where is the S106 money allocated for mitigating parking issues surrounding VIE? I understand there was some S106 money set aside to change the parking restrictions on Church Street, to mitigate the fact that VIE was provided with zero provision for visitor parking.**

**A)** Councillor Blair has been working for approximately two years to ensure this funding is used. There is still another ten months to spend it before City Enforcement Officers seek a refund from the County Council in order to pass back to the developer.

**Q4) We would like the VIE RA to be involved in developing a recycling policy for future developments to ensure no one is left in the same situation our estate is. I also have still some concerns about the service provided re: waste removal, specifically when waste isn't collected and how this is reported.**

**A)** Jen Robertson, Waste and Street Strategy Manager has replied to resident's concerns about there being no clear strategy for how shared facilities could/would work in December 2009. She will liaise with John Summers to ensure restrictions are enforced.

**Q5) There are a number of ways planning conditions on VIE site that have not been enforced - just two are the cycle parking provision and there being no dropped pavements onsite. The council should follow these up ASAP. When will council enforcement officers (or whomever is responsible) ensure these failures are rectified?**

**A)** It is acknowledged that cycle shed provision is not fit for purpose, City Officers are looking to improve provision. Further clarification will be sought concerning the drop pavement issue.

**Action Point: Wendy Lansdown (County Council Neighbourhood Panel Liaison Officer) to liaise with Mr Manning concerning drop pavement query.**

Members of the public felt there was a need for traffic restrictions so that bona fide users could park on-site, but commuters could not use VIE for easy parking. It was suggested unspent S106 funding could be used to action this.

Councillor Wilkins observed that cycling provision would be discussed at the 25 January 2010 Area Joint Committee.

**Q6) S106 funds - what S106 monies remain unspent from the major redevelopments in East Chesterton? In particular:**

- **What funds are available for community development?**

- **What has happened to the money due to be spent on Stage 2 of the Chesterton Traffic Calming Scheme?**

**A)** Councillor Blair is sourcing a breakdown from City Officers to specify projects S106 has been spent on. Money can be spent in East or North Chesterton. There is little funding remaining as money has already been allocated to East Chesterton projects.

Wendy Lansdown added the traffic calming scheme along the High Street was developed by the City Council as part of an Environmental improvement. At the time the City Council were agents of the Highway Authority (the County Council) and the Engineering Team (Council employees) provided engineering support for the design, which was undertaken by an outside consultant employed by the City Council.

The funding derived from Section 106 monies, which result from Planning Permissions. These are the responsibility of the City Council as Planning Authority.

Details are to be confirmed relating to the funding of the proposed second phase of the traffic calming scheme, as it will derived from agreements between any developer and the City Council as Planning Authority.

**Q7) Guided bus: Could anyone tell us what benefits will arise for residents of Cambridge from the Cambridge Guided Bus way given that the most convenient stop for the Grafton Centre at New Square has been closed to residents using local bus services and we are promised reductions in bus frequencies on Citi2 and removal of evening services on Citi4?**

**A)** Stagecoach have advised City and County Council representatives that Citi 2 and 4 services have been reduced due to the recession and not the introduction of the Guided Bus way. However, Councillors and members of the public have noted Stagecoach adverts contradicting this.

**Action Point: Wendy Lansdown to seek clarification concerning impact of Guided Bus way on Citi 2 and 4 services.**

Councillor Blair noted the Local Liaison Forum will occur 14 January 2010 and expressed her intention to attend.

**Q8) Citi2: The service appears to have worsened significantly over the past few months with extensive bunching extending into the evening, a recent wait of 50 minutes between 2.35 and 3.25 p.m. concluded with four Citi2s arriving at once, I counted them, and later that evening a Citi2 arrived and left St Andrew's Street a couple of minutes before the due**

**time of 7.13 p.m. at High Street Chesterton the scheduled service bus was right behind it. Any chance of calling Andy Campbell to account over this? The service is too expensive, and needs to be faster, more frequent and more reliable.**

**A)** Councillor Pellew observed that the Office of Fair Trading announced 7 January 2010 they are looking at Stagecoach's monopoly in Cambridge.

**Action Point: Councillor Armstrong to invite Andrew Campbell to attend a future Area Committee.**

**Q9) Land due to revert or pass to the City Council from the Pye estate redevelopment: What is the position on the schemes briefly consulted on in the summer of 2009. According to a report on S106 schemes the consultation is ongoing at the present time. With who and why hasn't OCRA had any invitation to make input to it or response to representations already made?**

**A)** Land around the Pye estate has been used for residential purposes then reclaimed for community facilities. It is recognised that open space is important to residents, so reclaimed land will be used for a football pitch (with changing rooms) and a nature reserve. Tennis courts will be considered in future. The questioner felt that Old Chesterton was badly served with poor amenities and no recreational space. Councillor Blair offered to pass on concerns to Officers.

The meeting finished at 8:45pm.

**Chair**