

# Public Document Pack



**NORTH AREA COMMITTEE**  
Chair : Councillor Diane Armstrong  
Labour Spokesperson:  
Mike Todd-Jones



## AGENDA

**To:** Councillors McGovern (Vice-Chair), Blair, Boyce, Brierley, Kerr, Levy, Nimmo-Smith, Pitt, Todd-Jones, Tunnacliffe, Ward, Znajak,

**Co-opted non-voting members:**

**County Councillors:** Rupert Moss-Eccardt (Arbury), Andy Pellew (King's Hedges), Siep Wijsenbeek (East Chesterton), Kevin Wilkins (West Chesterton)

*Despatched: Wednesday, 2 June 2010*

**Date:** Planning Items 6:30pm  
Main Meeting Thursday, 10 June 2010  
**Time:** 6.30 pm  
**Venue:** Main Hall - Manor Community College  
**Contact:** James Goddard **Direct Dial:** 01223 457015

## INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

**The Open Forum section of the Agenda:** Members of the public are invited to ask any question, or make a statement on any matter related to their local area covered by the City Council Wards for this Area Committee. The Forum will last up to 30 minutes, but may be extended at the Chair's discretion. The Chair may also time limit speakers to ensure as many are accommodated as practicable.

***To ensure that your views are heard, please note that there are Question Slips for Members of the Public to complete.***

**Public speaking rules relating to planning applications:**

Anyone wishing to speak about one of these applications, may do so provided that they have made a representation in writing within the consultation period and have notified the Area Committee Manager shown at the top of the agenda **by 12 Noon on the day before the meeting** of the Area Committee.

**Filming, photography and recording** is not permitted at council meetings. Any request to do so must be put to the committee manager at least 24 hours before the start time of the relevant meeting.

## AGENDA

### 13 AMENDMENT SHEET (*Pages 1 - 8*)

#### REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**Public representations** on a planning application should be made in writing (by e-mail or letter, in both cases stating your full postal address), within the deadline set for comments on that application. You are therefore strongly urged to submit your representations within this deadline.

**Submission of late information** after the officer's report has been published is to be avoided. A written representation submitted to the Environment and Planning Department by a member of the public after publication of the officer's report will only be considered if it is from someone who has already made written representations in time for inclusion within the officer's report. Any public representation received by the Department after 12 noon two business days before the relevant Committee meeting (e.g. by 12.00 noon on Monday before a Wednesday meeting; by 12.00 noon on Tuesday before a Thursday meeting) will not be considered.

The same deadline will also apply to the receipt by the Department of additional information submitted by an applicant or an agent in connection with the relevant item on the Committee agenda (including letters, e-mails, reports, drawings and all other visual material), unless specifically requested by planning officers to help decision-making.

At the meeting public speakers at Committee will not be allowed to circulate any additional written information to their speaking notes or any other drawings or other visual material in support of their case that has not been verified by officers and that is not already on public file.

#### **To all members of the Public**

Any comments that you want to make about the way the Council is running Area Committees are very welcome. Please contact the Committee Manager listed at the top of this agenda or complete the forms supplied at the meeting.

If you would like to receive this agenda by e-mail, please contact the Committee Manager.

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/>

## NORTH AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 10th JUNE 2010

### Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

#### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            **10/0280/FUL**

Location:        1 Scotland Close, Cambridge

Target Date:        25<sup>th</sup> May 2010

To Note:

Amendments To Text: No amendments.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

#### DECISION:

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            **09/1184/FUL**

Location:        Old Manor House, St Andrews Road, Cambridge

Target Date:        1<sup>st</sup> March 2010

To Note:

#### 5 new Representations received

##### Old Chesterton Residents Association

- No objection to the principle of the development. The Listed Building will be brought back into use.
- OCRA's view is that the existing access road should be retained and that no new access should be created on the inside curve of St Andrews Road.
- This corner is recognised locally as the most dangerous point of St Andrews Road.
- The proposed access is directly opposite a very busy cycle route used by nearly 2000 cyclists a day.
- The junction of the cycle path is badly positioned meaning cyclists swing into the

road.

- This manoeuvre will cause a direct conflict with cars exiting from the repositioned access.
- The visibility splays provided barely meet the minimum requirement.
- Most parents would be reluctant to use the access and unless the number of vehicles is carefully managed congestion is likely.
- Statements relating to parking are incorrect. St Andrews Hall has limited car parking and other streets nearby are private.
- Waiting restrictions are to be changed to allow waiting in parts of Church Street and St Andrews Road. These changes will make the existing access the preferred option for parents.
- It is OCRA's view that the existing access is sufficient, and is safer.

#### St Andrew's Vicarage, 10 Lynfield Lane

- No evidence is given that there is a local need.
- Strong concerns regarding the new access.
- The hall has many activities which would involve the physically vulnerable, such as older people and toddlers, who use the raised platform as a safer place to cross.
- The proposed drive would run straight into the crossing.
- Car and bicycles will be coming into this access at a time when hall users are likely to be arriving and departing.
- Increased pedestrian traffic would also make an already dangerous corner more perilous.
- We envisage bottlenecks on the driveway or illegal (and dangerous) waiting on or near the corner of the road.
- Parking in the hall is not practicable.
- Concerns regarding noise from children playing outside. The hall hosts a variety of organisations who appreciate the tranquillity of the meeting space.

#### Snap For Kids, 6A Chapel Street

- The main concern is traffic and children's safety.
- Care for 69 children will create a considerable increase in traffic.
- The bend is dangerous, as parents drop off their children they will create an obstruction, blocking sight lines.
- Sight line rulings have been relaxed to accommodate the proposal.
- With several vehicles parked either side there will be considerable highway safety ramifications.
- Frustrated drivers will be seeking to pass through quickly to get to work or return home, whilst at the same time children will be crossing.
- The development adjacent will be identified as a home zone, therefore an increase in traffic here will be a contradiction.
- Red lines round the bend would stop this problem.
- The Early Years and Childcare Team did not consult other nurseries of the proposal, which it is obliged to do.

### King Street Housing Association, 8 Rookery Close

- The applicants agent has suggested that there is unrestricted car parking in Ransome Close which could be used for picking up and dropping off children.
- These car parking spaces are however for residents only.
- I am not aware of any unrestricted car parking in the new development.

### Vie Residents Association

- The application makes reference to car parking on Ransome Close where there is no visitor parking. There will be further pressure on parking in the area.
- The association has not been contacted regarding any 'need' for the nursery.
- The association would like to see a use which caters for the whole community.

### **Further Officer Comments**

With regard to objections to the principle of the development, I would refer to my comments in paragraph 8.2 of the report. The proposal is supported by the County Council's Childcare and Young People's Service, but as previously rehearsed, policy 5/12 is positively worded, and an absence of evidence of 'need' does not in my view constitute sufficient grounds for refusal of the application.

In terms of the access, I recognise that from previous (and recent correspondence) received there are strong views that the repositioned access would have highway safety implications. My view remains however that the existing access would present a greater danger to highway safety than the proposed, and its use would do little to remedy any of the highway conflict concerns that have been raised. Clearly, some of these issues are also closely linked into how the premises will be managed and run. The applicant is very aware that the bend is sensitive, and will ensure that parents and guardians are fully informed about parking/drop off arrangements and parking restrictions on the road. There is no intention to promote the adjacent church hall for car parking.

With regard to amenity, concerns have recently been raised regarding noise disturbance to the adjacent church hall. In my view, the daytime noise which would be generated from the nursery, such as children playing outside, is not unexpected within an urban residential area. It would not in my view unduly detract from the amenities and function of the adjacent community hall.

Councillor Blair has requested clarification of paragraphs A8 and 8.11. The Highways Authority is of the view that arrival times tend to be concentrated in the morning and evening, as nurseries are often used by working parents. However, I believe it is reasonable to assume that trips to this nursery will be staggered through the day. The applicant has stated that some children will attend the nursery for only half day, and, given the long opening hours (7:00 to 19:00), trips to the nursery are in my view likely to be through the day rather than at specific times. The applicant has provided assurance that this will be encouraged and it is anticipated the nursery will operate in this way.

Some concerns have also been raised regarding the proximity of the outdoor playspace

in relation to the large conifers which define the boundary of the site. I note that there may be future pressure from the nursery to trim back the conifers. However, any future works to these trees would require notice to the Local Planning Authority under S211 of the Town and Country Planning Act. The Planning Authority has control over any works to these trees because the site falls within a Conservation Area.

### Summary

Following the reconsultation exercise and further comments which have been recently received, I recognise the strength of concern locally regarding the repositioned access. The repositioned access does however meet technical sight line requirements (and is wider), and with careful management of the premises, in my view the proposal as it stands is the best option. As previously rehearsed, the proposal will bring back into use an historic building, providing a community facility for which there is an identified need. My recommendation remains that of approval.

Given that the revised access is the key issue for consideration, I have copied below all written correspondence relating to this matter:

### **Initial Highways objection**

No details have been provided of the number of children that the proposal would accommodate, nor has any transport statement been provided.

The parking provision would seem inadequate for more than a very few children.

The dropping off and picking up associated with a function of this type is, therefore, likely to lead to a demand for short term parking on street, and, given the nature of the operation, parents and carers may be tempted to park ignoring the double yellow lines on the bend of St Andrews Road.

This would endanger other road users and so refusal is recommended by the Highway Authority on grounds the likely adverse effect upon of highway safety.

Ian Dyer  
Lead Development Control Engineer (City and South)

### **Further Comments from County Highways**

Hello John,

Thanks for the additional information.

The alternative access can be explored and, within the site is acceptable, the sticking point will remain the visibility splays, and the ability of the parking to cope with demands from both staff (who must be on-site before children arrive) and dropping off.



The relationship of the point of access to likely drop off location can be explored further.

As regards the additional information supplied on drop off, this is largely unsubstantiated opinion, and, as most of it conflicts with our experience of such operations (for instance these facilities are used by working parents, which tends to concentrate the time of drop off and collection, rather than spread it over several hours, and I have never observed car sharing by parents at a nursery) would need some harder evidence to substantiate the applicants opinions.

It is commonly observed that parents using cars to drop off children seek to park in the most convenient location to themselves, without extensive consideration of the impact on the network of their chosen parking spot, or the existence of parking restrictions (even though they are their for the general benefit). Since this is, in many cases, the closest possible spot to their destination, this still leaves the bend in the frame.

Whilst the parking may be for short periods of time, or not, is not really the issue, it is that it is likely to occur in a location that results in increased risk of accident.

The risks associated with parking on this bend have long been an issue for the users of St Andrews Road, and the instruction of parking restrictions reflects this.

The other nursery that is referred to, in Chapel Street is unlikely to generate parking in locations with significant potential to result in accident.

Whilst I can understand the aspirations of my colleagues in the Education Department, their keenness for the Highway Authority to accept the risks of compromise in resolving their problems, the Highway Authority cannot accept the risk to road users for such reasons.

Ian

### **Revised access solution from the applicants agent**

John and Ian

Further to our recent discussions, attached is a Site Plan showing visibility splays at the proposed new access and forward inter-visibility, on the corner, with a car parked on the inside of the bend.

We note Ian's advice to us that, from previous surveys, speeds on this road are below 30mph. There is a speed reduction ramp adjacent to the proposed access. This should further reduce speeds. We therefore feel that this shows that the revised access is acceptable.

As previously mentioned, customer's Contracts with the nursery will contain safe parking

rules. Anyone breaking this Contract could have their child removed. Our client would be happy for a suitably worded condition to be attached to any Approval, requiring details of this to be submitted and approved by you and enforced.

In addition, staff will not be allowed to park on site. Our client has discovered that this is common practice in Cambridge Nurseries. This can be confirmed by the County Education Officer if required.

Regarding the ramp in the highway, we assume that the details of how this will be incorporated into the new access can be dealt with by a condition requiring further details to be submitted and approved or under the Agreement with the Highway Authority for the access.

Our client has suggested using a one way in and out system with the existing and proposed access points, if this would help.

We hope that the above, together with relevant previous submissions, is sufficient to show that the application is acceptable.

If you require anything further, or wish to discuss any matters, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards

Ted  
Brand Associates  
Architects

### **Highways Agreement**

Hello John,

I think we are nearly there.

The visibilities are OK, but the access layout results in a very constrained turn to turn left. This would be dangerous as cars would swing right across the road to make it. A similar situation occurs on the right turn in.

This would be resolved by splaying the northern side of the access, but it would result in the loss of some planting.

Ian

### **Highways comments regarding wider cycle improvements**

I have consulted Brian and his team.

The new access does not have any significant impact on any proposal that they have in that area, and their scheme would take the new junction in to account in any subsequent design process, and so the Highway Authority do not object to the proposed development with the junction relocated.

Amendments To Text:

No amendments.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

No amendments.

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION:      First    **10/0153/FUL**

ITEM:                      APPLICATION REF:

Location:      2 Primrose Street, Cambridge

Target Date:      22<sup>nd</sup> April 2010

To Note:      Nothing

Amendments To Text:      None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

**DECISION:**

---

This page is intentionally left blank