

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

5 September 2012

7.30 - 9.15 pm

Present: Councillors Dryden (Chair), Meftah (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Blackhurst, Birtles, McPherson, Pippas, Stuart and Swanson

Officers Present:

Principal Planning Officer – Toby Williams

Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding (County Council) –
Dearbhla Lawson

Senior Programme Manager (County Council) – John Clough

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/38/SAC Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from County Councillors Carter and Heathcock.

12/39/SAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th July were approved as a true and accurate record.

12/40/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

There were no matters and actions arising from the minutes.

12/41/SAC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Birtles declared a personal interest in item 8 and choose to abstain from the debate and voting on the item.

12/42/SAC Open Forum

There were no issues raised in the open forum.

12/43/SAC Southern Area Transport Corridor Funding

The committee received a report from the County Council Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding regarding South Area Transport Corridor Funding. The committee were provided with an update on the projects suggested at the meeting in March, and an explanation of the criteria used to score them.

Amanda Taylor addressed the committee and expressed support for the proposed lighting on the Guided Bus route. She highlighted that with the support of her trade union, local residents and her employer a petition had been raised with 233 signatures in support of the project. Solar studs were welcomed, however, it was suggested that if lighting columns were preferred a small trial should be undertaken to fully understand the impact. Amanda Taylor also spoke in support of the Long Road Cycle Way proposed improvements.

A member of the public spoke in support of the Long Road Cycle Way improvements, which were proposed in the report. It was explained that the existing arrangements were dangerous and could result in an accident or serious injury, and were inferior compared with the principal north south arterial cycle routes.

The County Council Officers welcomed the support for the two projects, and agreed to look into whether lighting or studs would offer best solution. It was also noted that the layout of Long Road, may create certain restrictions on what can be achieved.

The committee made the following comments on the proposals

- i. Is the £3m associated with the Leisure Park Bridge the full or pro-rata cost? It was confirmed that this was the full estimated cost of the project, but it may be possible to share the cost with East Area Committee.
- ii. Clarification was requested on why the southbound bus stop on Brooklands Avenue was not included? It was agreed to add this to the list of potential projects.

- iii. It was noted that pot of money available could grow over next few years and depended on growth levels being delivered.
- iv. There was general support for agreeing to projects, 2.1 and 2.3-2.7 and further investigation on the Leisure Park Bridge and Hauxton Road Bridge improvements. During discussion members expressed support for a range of projects.
- v. Clarification was requested on the scoring criteria, and how improvements to radial route signage mitigated developed. Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding explained the scoring scheme and how the signage project was designed to provide clarity, improve traffic flows and reduce diversions.
- vi. The committee welcomed the proposals for Cherry Hinton High Street and agreed that that it was currently unsafe. The Cherry Hinton Ward Councillors expressed concern that a number of schemes that had been suggested had not appeared on the project list. Following discussion the Ward Councillors agreed to re-supply a list of those schemes to the County Council officers. The schemes included improvements to the bus stop at Teversham Drift and the traffic lights at the Robin Hood Pub. It was agreed to add this scheme to the list of potential projects.
- vii. The inclusion of a pedestrian crossing on Fendon Road was suggested. County Council officers agreed to add the scheme to the list for assessment, but suggested that S106 funding may not be the most appropriate and depending on issues raised it may be possible to progress the scheme through the road safety budget.
- viii. Clarification was requested on whether the interest on the accumulated sums could be used to fund additional projects. County Council officers confirmed that funding collected from developments has to be used in line with Area Corridor Plan approach and interest is taken into account, but that they would need to check the specifics. However it was noted that the City Council with their own contributions used the interest to off-set the effect of inflation.

Resolved

The committee agreed to support projects 2.1 to 2.7 with the following exceptions

- i. 2.2 – Further work on the details was required before making a final recommendation and a contribution from East Corridor Fund would also be required.
- ii. 2.7 – The scheme needed to be re-assessed before making a final recommendation.

In response to a question regarding sewers, the committee were advised that for issues relating the County Council responsibilities the Whittlesford Depot was responsible.

12/44/SAC 12/0834/FUL- 39 Long Road

The committee received a full planning application for consideration for 39 Long Road to extend house to rear and side including raising of roof ridge height by 300mm.

The committee received representations from Dr Merry in objection to the application, Mr Morrin in objection to the application and Mr Cooper in support of the application.

The objectors raised the following issues

- i. The issues raised by the Planning Inspector had not been overcome
- ii. The proposed screens were not defined and were effectively fences, which would have the same effect of enclosure as walls.
- iii. The need for the extension was also questioned particularly if the room layout was re-configured.
- iv. Un-necessary inclusion of certain windows
- v. The possibility of trees being removed at a later date removing all protection

The applicant spoke in support of the applicant.

Resolved (8 votes to 0) To amend the recommendations to insert a condition preventing the use of the first floor terrace area, with the condition to read

Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the commencement of the development, revised layout plans and drawing elevations of the proposed extensions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority showing:

- a) the removal of the privacy fencing from around the first floor rear terrace
- b) the removal of the first floor terrace storage area
- c) the amendment of the design of the door opening so that it no longer leads onto the first floor terrace with the provision of a juliet balcony or a non-projecting detail as otherwise agreed.
- d) the removal of the annotation showing a terrace.

The first floor flat roof leading from the bedroom one shall not be used as an external amenity area for occupants or guests of the house at any time and shall function as a flat roofing structure only.

Resolved (7 votes to 2) to approve the application as per the committee report with the following additional amendments to the conditions

-An additional condition is recommended to ensure the privacy of adjacent residents:

4: The following shall be installed prior to the use of the respective bedrooms and shall be retained as such thereafter:

-Bedroom 1 west-facing window at first floor level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall.

-Bedroom 1 east-facing lightwell at first floor level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and shall be fixed shut.

-Bedroom 4 north-facing window at second floor level privacy hood.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006

policies 3/4 and 3/14).

-An additional condition is recommended in relation to the protection of trees:

5: No development, including demolition, shall commence on site until the following details have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority:

(a) A plan showing the location of, and allocating a reference number to, each existing tree on the site which has a stem with a diameter measured over the bark at a point 1.5 metres above ground level, exceeding 75mm, showing which trees are to be retained and the crown spread of each retained tree;

(b) details of the species, diameter (measured in accordance with paragraph (a) above), and the approximate height, and an assessment of the general state of health and stability, of each retained tree and of each tree which is on land adjacent to the site and to which paragraphs (c) and (d) apply;

(c) details of any proposed topping or lopping of any retained tree, or of any tree on land adjacent to the site;

(d) details of any proposed alterations in existing ground levels, and of the position of any proposed excavation, within the crown spread of any retained tree or of any tree on land adjacent to the site within a distance from any retained tree, or any tree on land adjacent to the site, equivalent to half the height of that tree;

(e) details of the specification and position of fencing [and of any other measures to be taken] for the protection of any retained tree from damage during the course of development.

(f) details of any trees proposed for removal.

In the condition retained tree means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the plan referred to in paragraph (a) above.

Reason: To safeguard and ensure the protection of those existing trees which are to be retained on or adjacent to the site. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/4).

The committee approved the application for the following reasons.

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies: Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3./4, 3/7 and 3/14

2. 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 details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

12/45/SAC 12/0763/FUL - 51A Hartington Grove

The committee received an application for 51a Hartington Grove for the demolition of existing two bedroom house and single garage and construction of 3 bedroom 1 3/4 storey house, along with one storey lodge, bin and cycle store.

The Principal Planning Officer verbally updated condition 3 to read

Prior to the installation of any intended air source heat pump, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the proposed air source heat pump shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Resolved (Unanimously) to approve the application by 8 votes to 0, subject to an amendment to condition 3 for the following reasons.

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies: East of England plan 2008: SS1,H1,T14,ENV7 and WM6 Cambridge Local Plan (2006):3/1,3/4,3/7,3/12,4/4,4/13,5/1,8/2,8/6,8/10

2. 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 details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

12/46/SAC 10/0035/FUL - Outside 108, 110, 112, And 122 High Street, Cherry Hinton

The committee received an application for the retrospective approval of vehicle crossing and access outside 108, 110, 112, and 122 High Street Cherry Hinton, Cambridge.

Resolved (Unanimously) to approve the application for the following reasons

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies: East of England plan 2008: policy ENV7 Cambridge Local Plan (2006): policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 8/2

2. 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 details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

CHAIR