

**SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE**

11 November 2010

7:30pm – 11:05pm

**Present:** Councillors Taylor (Chair), Blackhurst (Vice-Chair), Sanders, Al Bander, Dryden, McPherson, Newbold, Stuart, Swanson and Heathcock

**Officers Present:**

Environmental Projects Manager – Andrew Preston

Development Control Manager – Peter Carter

Safer Communities Manager - Lynda Kilkelly

Recreation Officer - Justin Marsh

Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

**Also Present**

Chief Executive – Cambridgeshire Community Foundation

Chief Inspector Sargant – Cambridgeshire Police

Sgt Townsend – Cambridgeshire Police

**10/49/sac Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Carter and Shepherd.

**10/50/sac Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2010 were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**10/51/sac Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes**

There were no actions arising from the minutes.

**10/52/sac Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Taylor declared a personal interest as an employee of Cambridge University Press and vacated the chair and didn't participate in item 9.

Cllr Blackhurst declared a personal interest as an employee of Cambridge University in item 9.

Cllrs Dryden, McPherson and Newbold declared a personal interest in item 10 as office holders of Cherry Hinton Residents Association.

Cllr Al Bander declared a personal interest in item 7 and 8 as a board member for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Probation Trust.

Cllr McPherson declared a personal interest in relation to item 7, with regards to speeding on Church End, Cherry Hinton.

Cllr Stuart declared a personal and prejudicial in the planning application relating to 28 Panton Street, and withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the item.

### **10/53/sac Open Forum**

Dr Alan Baker congratulated the city council for the positive redevelopment of play and community facilities on Nightingale Avenue, and sought clarification on the current status of the current status of the project. It was agreed to answer the question during item 11.

### **10/54/sac Community Announcements**

Members of the committee made the following announcements about community events.

- 17<sup>th</sup> November – An opportunity to review material samples for the re-development of the Wulfstan Way Shopping Centre. It was advised that the events would at Queen Edith's Chapel between 6:30pm and 7:30pm.
- 27<sup>th</sup> November – A seminar on the big society involving the local MP and Trumpington Christmas Fair.
- 4<sup>th</sup> December – Cherry Hinton Christmas lights switch on.
- 14<sup>th</sup> December – Wulfstan Way Community Event

### **10/55/sac Safer Neighbourhoods**

The committee received a report from Sergeant Gavin Townsend the neighbourhood policing sergeant regarding Safer Neighbourhoods.

The committee were updated on the composition of the neighbourhood policing team and its role.

The committee noted that in comparison to the previous reporting period reported crime had increased, but had fallen in August and September and in comparison to the same period in 2009 was down.

The committee also noted that reports of anti-social behaviour were up on the previous period but compared with the same period in 2009 was down.

The committee were provided with an update on previous priorities.

#### Tenby Close and Cherry Hinton

It was explained that a combination of tactics including working in conjunction with City Councillors and through targeted patrolling, had resulted in a reduction of anti social behaviour reports. Sergeant Townsend recommended that the priority is discharged, but assured members that this would not result in the area being neglected and that appropriate levels of patrols would be maintained.

#### Cambridge Chalk Pits

The committee were advised that the problems were largely seasonal and through partnership working involving schools, local residents, councillors and land agents the problems had reduced significantly. It was noted that the majority of individuals stopped were not from immediate area. Sergeant Townsend recommended that the priority be discharged, but that the Police would continue to work with partners including local councillors to prevent future problems.

#### Anti social behaviour – Paget Road/Foster Road

Ongoing problems related to anti social behaviour in the area were highlighted, and it was proposed that the priority be continued.

The committee were advised that whilst some problems were largely seasonal, the Police in conjunction with partner organisations would continue to work to manage the problems year on year.

The following key points were highlighted for each ward.

### Trumpington

- Ongoing work in the Hanover Walk/Princess Court area to tackle drug and aggressive begging issues.
- Successful resolution of a number of thefts from property in the Aberdeen Avenue area.
- Successful engagement with Waitrose to reduce the level of thefts in the store.

### Queen Edith's

- Ongoing efforts to tackle anti-social behaviour on Gunhild Way were highlighted, and it was noted that the previous problems had virtually stopped.

### Cherry Hinton

- Successful recovery of stolen bicycles from a property within the ward.

The following questions or comments were made from the floor

- i) Clarification was sought on the management arrangements for the enforcement of the Addenbrookes Relief Road traffic regulations - The Police explained the nature of the regulations and agreed to answer the questions about enforcement outside of the meeting. Mike Davy attending on behalf of the County Council confirmed that the camera were owned by the hospital but operated by a private company on their behalf.
- ii) The increased policing of the Accordia development was welcomed, but clarification was sought on what was being proposed in relation to traffic and parking management once the roads were adopted. The Police advised that there were no specific proposals in place, but that the situation would be monitored.

- iii) Clarification was sought on the role of the Police in dealing with punt related issues, with specific reference to punt bombing. The Police advised that punt related issues were not an issue in the South Area but any incidents should be reported. The Safer Communities Manager confirmed that reports of "punt bombing" had not been received over the past 12 months and when reports are received City Council and police will investigate them.
- iv) The Police were thanked for their assistance in resolving a crime in Luard Road.

Members of the committee made the following comments

- i) The committee expressed thanks for the work undertaken by Karen Corp as Community beat manager for Queen Edith's Ward.
- ii) Disappointment was noted about the difficulty of tracking the perpetrators of fly tipping. The Police agreed to liaise with the Council regarding the issue across the whole area, but with specific references to St Andrew Cherry Hinton and Queens Ediths ward.
- iii) Ongoing concerns with regards to speeding in Cherry Hinton around Church End and Mill End Road were highlighted.
- iv) Significant concerns were raised about the prevalence of cyclists riding without lights, and the dangers that this creates. Previous initiatives and schemes were discussed to tackle this issue. It was agreed that was not a new problem or one unique to the South Area. Mike Davy agreed to liaise with the Police on behalf of the County Council to establish what was possible.
- v) Problems with highly aggressive cold sellers in the Cherry Hinton were highlighted, and it was welcomed that the specific problem had resolved.
- vi) With respect to Cherry Hinton Hall, it was explained that in recent weeks that there appeared to be an increase in the level of anti social behaviour, criminal damage and drug taking in the area.
- vii) The Police were asked whether they would be supportive of the installation of mobile CCTV cameras in Norman Way to address the issues, which had been raised about the Toyota and Lexus garages. It

was agreed that the Police would liaise with the Council regarding the issue.

- viii) Concerns were raised regarding the number of cyclists not obeying the traffic regulations around the Addenbrookes Hospital, and the associated danger of these actions. The Police outlined possible enforcement actions, and the committee welcomed the approach.

**Resolved** (Unanimously) to endorse the recommendations within the report.

The committee also noted that the exclusion of an item from the priority list did not result in it been neglected.

### **10/56/sac Cambridge Community Safety Partnership (CCSP) Plan 2011-2014**

The committee received a report from the Community Safety Partnership presented by Chief Inspector David Sargant regarding the proposed priorities for the community safety plan.

A member of the public sought clarification on the reason why burglary wasn't included in the short list, and also raised concerns that the changes in comparison to the previous priorities were not clear. The Chief Inspector explained that around 415 responses had been received to the initial consultation and that only 2 had mentioned burglary as an issue. The committee were advised that the proposed were based on a strong evidential base.

The committee welcomed the priorities and agreed that reducing offending was a very important issue. The Police were questioned whether the focus on re-offending would be primarily led by the Police or delivered through a partnership approach. The committee were advised that a mixed approach would be adopted.

The committee acknowledged that alcohol and drug abuse were at the core of many crimes, and that focus should be place on reducing the effect of alcohol and drugs.

In a response to a question from the committee, the Chief Inspector explained that the focus would be on high-level offenders in the re-offending theme.

**Resolved** (Unanimously) to endorse the recommendations with 1, 2 and 4 as top priorities.

### **10/57/sac Environmental Improvement Programme**

Cllr Amanda Taylor vacated the Chair and left the meeting for the duration of item 9.

The committee received a report from the Environmental Projects Manager regarding Environmental Improvement Programme.

Mr Ron Clifton addressed the committee as Chair of the Brooklands Avenue Area Residents Association and made the following points

- i) The committee were encouraged to consider an additional survey of traffic during the evening period.
- ii) It was clarified that the references to CUP, equally applied to other businesses in the area and CUP was just an example.

Mike Davy explained the policy for 20mph limits and outlined possible solutions for the scheme, if the committee were minded to fund the installation.

The Environmental Projects Manager outlined the reasons for the not undertaking the survey during rush hour, and also indicated that through initial consultation with the highways authority they were not minded to fund the scheme.

### **Resolved to**

- a) (Unanimously) recommend the introduction of a 20mph limit
- b) (7 votes to 1) approve the introduction of speed-actuated signs.

The committee also noted that the residents association would write to the local businesses to encourage them to discourage their employees from speeding in the area.

**10/58/sac Community Development and Leisure Grants**

The committee received a report from the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation. The committee were advised that the report had incorrectly indicated that the Cherry Hinton Residents Association didn't have an equal opportunities policy.

In relation to Dennis Wilson Court it was questioned whether it would be possible for them to obtain cheaper broadband. The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation agreed to feed back the issue to the applicant.

**Resolved** (7 votes to 0) to approve the grant allocations as listed below

- Dennis Wilson Court - £250 towards a Christmas lunch
- Dennis Wilson Court - £315 towards a broadband connection for the computer group
- Cherry Hinton Residents Association - £630 towards a Christmas event

**10/59/sac Improve your neighbourhood**

The committee received a report from the Recreation Officer regarding potential "Improve your neighbourhood" projects. The Recreation Officer agreed to provide a written update to members of the committee on the Nightingale Avenue Pavilion project outside of the meeting.

All members welcomed the nature and range of projects. Members of the committee made the following comments

- i) Clarification was sought on the likely timescale for projects reaching completion from initial inception. The Recreation Officer outlined the process and indicated that some of the 2009 schemes were now at consultation stage.
- ii) It was noted if progressed the likely locations of the Cherry Hinton projects would be the "rec", rather than Cherry Hinton Hall.
- iii) It was agreed that focus should remain on ensuring that the Nightingale Avenue pavilion project was completed.



**Resolved** (Unanimously) to endorse the projects as listed with the additions of Donkey Common and Nightingale Avenue as potential projects.

### **10/60/sac 10/0815/FUL - Queen Edith Public House, Wulfstan Way**

The committee received an application for full planning permission to demolish the Queen Edith Public House and to construct 8 dwellings on the site.

The committee was addressed to by two objectors who raised the following issues

- i) Loss of community facility
- ii) Difficulty in accessing alternative pubs
- iii) The negative effect on the local area and community
- iv) The behaviour of the applicant
- v) The level of support against the application

The applicant in support of the application addressed the committee.

County Councillor Heathcock addressed the committee in his capacity as a Ward Councillor in objection to the application.

**Resolved (7 votes to 0)** – To reject the officer recommendation and reject the application for the following reasons.

1. The proposal is unacceptable in that the loss of the public house, which falls within a local centre, is a significant distance from other public houses (not easily accessed by public transport) and is valued locally, playing an important part in the local community, would constitute a significant and important loss to the local community and the economic base of the local area. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to advice in Planning Policy Statement 4 and Planning Policy Guidance 13 – Transport.

2. The proposed residential development, the height of which on the street frontage is not sympathetic in scale to the shops with flats over immediately to the north, or to the gardens of houses in Queen Edith's Way to the south, which will be dominated by the combined height and proximity of the new houses, is unacceptable. The development does not demonstrate that it has responded to or drawn inspiration from its surroundings. For these reasons the proposal is out of context and contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006

policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 and advice in Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005).

**10/61/sac 10/0519/FUL - 115 - 117 Mowbray Road, Cambridge CB1 7SP**

The committee received an application for full planning permission, for the construction of 2 bungalows to the rear of 115-117 Mowbray Road.

The committee was addressed by the applicant in support of the applicant.

The committee was also addressed by one objector who raised the following issues

- i) Garden Grabbing
- ii) The irrelevance of the comparative sites highlighted by the applicant
- iii) The motives of the applicant particularly as a certificate of lawful purpose had also been submitted.

**Resolved** (5 votes to 2) to accept the officer recommendations and reject the application for the following reasons.

1. The proposed development would unreasonably erode the existing rear garden space and create a visually intrusive and incongruous form. When viewed from the host dwellings and from neighbouring properties to the north and south in Mowbray Road they would appear as a cramped and intrusive presence that would unacceptably detract from the prevailing open character and appearance of the rear garden areas along this stretch of road, also impacting upon the quality of those rear gardens immediately adjacent to the development site. The proposed development therefore fails to positively enhance the townscape and fails to respond to the local context or recognise the constraints of the site. The development is contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS3 Housing.

2. The proposed development, because of the subdivision of the site to accommodate an additional two dwellings with associated requirements for car parking, cycle parking, bin storage and amenity space, in the rear gardens of 115 and 117 Mowbray Road, would result in a contrived and cramped development out of character with the surrounding area on this rear garden

plot, which would not provide the attractive, high quality living environment that Local Plan policy 3/7 aspires to provide. This demonstrates a failure of the development to respond to the context of the site and its constraints and the development is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/10 and advice provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS3 Housing.

3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space, community development and waste facilities in accordance with policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2010.

### **10/62/sac 10/0764/FUL - 28 Panton Street**

The committee received an application for full planning permission, for the change of use of 28 Panton Street to educational use.

One objector who raised the following issues also addressed the committee

- i) The saturation effect of education premises in the area resulting in a negative effect on the historic nature of the community.
- ii) Potential issues with the behaviour of students and the effect on the resident's properties in the vicinity of the proposed facility.

The applicant in support of the application addressed the committee.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and approve the application for the following reasons.

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 4/11, 4/13, 5/3, 7/2, 7/11, 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.

Subject to the amendment of conditions four and six (changes marked in bold)

‘Any Class D1 school or college user of the site shall provide the local planning authority before occupation with an accurate record of its student numbers in this locality prior to any use of the application site. From the time of occupation, any user shall keep an accurate student roll for all its sites in the locality, including the application site, and shall make that information available to the local planning authority on demand. The total student roll of the user in the locality shall not increase by more than **20%**~~40%~~ during its use of the application site.’

This amendment is sought on the basis that the MPW student roll currently fluctuates by 10% either side of the typical figure, and that this condition places too tight a limit on the use of the combined sites.

Regarding Condition 5, the applicants offer the following amendment to make the condition more restrictive (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

‘Class D1 educational use on this site shall be restricted to students or pupils in **Year10** ~~Year 7~~ (or the equivalent year in any replacement classification by the Department for Education) or above only.’

Regarding Condition 6, the applicants offer the following amendment to make the condition more restrictive (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough):

‘No students or pupils shall use the building between the hours of 1900 and **0800** ~~0700~~ on weekdays, before **0800** ~~0700~~ or after 1330 on Saturdays, or at all on Sundays or public holidays.’

### **10/63/sac 10/0319/CL2PD - 117 Mowbray Road**

The committee received an application for a certificate of lawful purpose relating to 117 Mowbray Road.

The applicant in support of the application addressed the committee.

**Resolved** (Unanimously) to committee resolved unanimously to accept the officer recommendations and approve the application for the following reason.

Based on the evidence supplied in the plans accompanying the application and the planning statement, it is concluded that the proposed outbuilding will constitute permitted development under Class E of Part 1 (the garage/store) and Class B of Part 2 (the formation, laying out construction of a means of access to a highway which is not a classified or trunk road) of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(Amendment)(No 2) (England) Order 2008 and accordingly such works do not require specific planning permission and would be lawful for planning purposes.

### **10/64/sac 10/0561/FUL - 39 Shelford Road**

The committee received an application for full planning permission for 39 Shelford Road.

The committee were addressed by the applicant in support of the application.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and approve the application subject to the completion of unilateral undertaking by 31 January 2011 for the following reasons.

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and following the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), 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: P6/1, P9/8

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/14, 4/4, 8/2, 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.

The meeting ended at 11:05pm

**CHAIR**