



SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

CHAIR COUNCILLOR TAYLOR
LABOUR SPOKES COUNCILLOR MCPHERSON



AGENDA

To: City Councillors: Taylor (Chair), Blackhurst (Vice-Chair), Sanders, Al Bander, Dryden, McPherson, Newbold, Stuart and Swanson

County Councillors: Carter, Heathcock and Shepherd

Dispatched: Tuesday, 4 January 2011

Date: Wednesday, 12 January 2011

Time: 7.30 pm

Venue: Horobin Room - Homerton College

Contact: Martin Whelan

Direct Dial: 01223 457012

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11TH NOVEMBER 2010 (*Pages 1 - 14*)

3 MATTERS AND ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the committee are asked to declare any interests in the items on the agenda. In the case of any doubt, the advice of the Head of Legal should be sought **before the meeting**.

5 OPEN FORUM

6 COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

7 CENSUS 2011 PRESENTATION

- 8** **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LEISURE GRANTS** *(Pages 15 - 22)*

- 9** **PLANNING ITEMS**
- 9a 10/1003/FUL - British Telecom, Long Road *(Pages 23 - 38)*

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, recording and photography at council meetings is allowed subject to certain restrictions and prior agreement from the chair of the meeting.

Requests to film, record or photograph, whether from a media organisation or a member of the public, must be made to the democratic services manager at least three working days before the meeting.

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 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

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

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy>

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 Sargent – 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.

- 17th 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.
- 27th November – A seminar on the big society involving the local MP and Trumpington Christmas Fair.
- 4th December – Cherry Hinton Christmas lights switch on.
- 14th 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%**~~10%~~ 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 **Year 10** ~~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

Report by: Cambridgeshire Community Foundation

To: Area Committee – South, 12th January 2011

Wards: Trumpington, Queen Edith's, Cherry Hinton

Community Development Grants 2010-11

1. Introduction

This report reminds members of the process for the allocation of Community Development and Leisure grants by Area Committees, confirms the funds available, seeks approval for applications which have been assessed and lists further applications which are still under review.

The application process has been managed by Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (CCF) from April 09. CCF advertise available funds; support potential applicants; assess applications; present recommendations to Area Committees; advise applicants of Area Committee decisions; make grant payments and seek feedback and monitoring from the funded projects. CCF does not therefore make decisions on the grants awarded from the Area Committee funds.

Following directions from the East Committee, all applications received by CCF from voluntary and community groups in South Area since 1 April 2010 are referred to in this report.

2. Recommendations

To consider the grant applications and agree recommendations detailed below.

Community Development current applications.			Available: £3,955		
CCF ID	Group	Project	Requested £	Recommended from Area Committee Grants £	Offer from other CCF funds £
WEB1 8034	Trumpington Residents Association	To purchase a marquee	800	800	0
Total			800	800	0
Remaining				3,155	

3. Background

The Executive Councillor has approved the following allocation of 10% of the total Community Development grants budget and 5% of the total Leisure grants budget for area committee grants. It has been calculated using population levels and is also weighted to give additional funds to areas of economic disadvantage as defined by the City Council's *Mapping poverty* research report.

2010-11						
Area	Population	Mapping Poverty score	Combined score	Community Development £	Leisure £	Total £
North	29%	40%	36.5%	17,200	4,570	21,770
East	29%	35%	32.8%	14,930	3,970	18,900
South	21%	20%	20.4%	9,250	2,460	11,710
West Central	21%	5%	10.3%	4,720	1,250	5,970
Total				46,100	12,250	58,350

4. South Area Committee 2010-11 Community Development applications

4.1 Community Development spend to date: £5,295

ID	Group	Project	AC Grant
2296	Menelik Education	to fund pre-festival world music and culture activities across three events in three areas in Cambridge	450 (Chair's Action)
WEB9511	Trumpington Residents' Association	to erect a double sided community notice board for the high street	600
WEB5733a	Little Bunnies Mothers / Carers Playgroup	towards running a trip and purchasing a new world map rug	350
2315a	Trumpington Elderly Action Group	for running costs, holiday celebrations and auditor's fee.	335
WEB11512a	Hanover & Princess Court Residents Association	to fund the Community Christmas Event.	450
2401a	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	for a coach trip and lunch in St Ives	405
WEB10147b	2nd Cherry Hinton Guides	to buy camping equipment and to fund a Centenary guiding camp week in the summer	1,510
WEB114491	Cherry Hinton Residents	to run a community Christmas event including Christmas tree and lights erected on the green in the centre of the village	630

2692	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	to fund the group's Christmas lunch	250
2676	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	to pay for a broadband connection which will allow the group to continue their computer class	315
Total			£5,295
Remaining			£3,955

4.2 Status of other applications from groups in South area received by CCF since 1 April 2010

CCF ID	Group	Project	Status
2293	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	To cover the costs of a 'Celebration of Age' party.	Awarded £575
WEB10147a	2nd Cherry Hinton Guides	to buy camping equipment and to fund a Centenary guiding camp week in the summer	Awarded £2,000
WEB10207	Cambs County Council: South City Locality Youth Team	to purchase several resusci-dolls in varying ages (adult, child, baby) and bandages for First Aid training	Awarded £500
WEB5733b	Little Bunnies Mothers / Carers Playgroup	towards running a trip and purchasing a new world map rug	Awarded £250
WEB11512b	Hanover & Princess Court Residents Association	to fund the Community Christmas Event	Awarded £450
2315b	Trumpington Elderly Action Group	for running costs, some holiday celebrations and auditor's fee	Awarded £300
2401b	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	for a coach trip and lunch in St Ives	Awarded £300
WEB16970	Normanhurst	to fund a Christmas Party for the residents and plants for the spring.	Awarded £160 from Community Initiatives Programme
WEB11098	Mission Impossible 7	to purchase new kit	Awarded £1,800
2780	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	to fund an outing to the Pantomime including coach costs.	Rejected
2692b	Denis Wilson Court Social Club	to fund the group's Christmas lunch	Awarded £250

4.3 Grant application background information

South Area Committee 2010-11 grants		CCF ref WEB18034
Applicant: Trumpington Residents' Association		Ward(s) : Trumpington
<p>Purpose of group: The objectives of the Association are to benefit the residents of Trumpington by associating together the residents, local authorities, voluntary and other organisations to improve the quality of life in Trumpington and to engender a sense of community through the provision of community activities and facilities. The Association holds monthly meetings; makes representations to councils and planning agencies; informs members and the public through direct contacts and information on its web site and has built up its membership to over 120 in recent years.</p>		
<p>Project: to purchase a marquee for community use Breakdown of costs: marquee £800 to £1,000 dependent on discounts/offers available at the time of purchase</p>		
Total cost: £800-£1,000		Requested: £800.00
<p>Expected benefits or outcomes as a result of funding as described by the applicant: Access to a robust marquee would greatly extend our capacity to organise and take part in events such as the Christmas Fair. It would provide display space and cover during winter and summer events and be particularly useful as a shaded area on hot days (for example, the Church Fete and School Fete are held in June and July). In addition to its use by the Residents' Association, we would welcome its use by other local groups such as the Gardening Society and Allotment Society. In estimating the number of beneficiaries, we have assumed a minimum usage at 3 events per year, each with 250 participants. The marquee should have a number of years of useful life. Number of beneficiaries: 750</p>		
<p>Background information: The Association has been borrowing a range of marquees for Fayres and Fetes in the past, usually cheap ones. Having borrowed a more expensive, robust marquee for the recent summer Fete it was decided that such a marquee would be a valuable resource for the Association, enabling good quality, long-lasting equipment to be available for future community groups as they develop in Trumpington. When purchased, the marquee will be loaned to other organisations for a nominal sum or will be lent on a mutual benefit agreement. Once purchased it will be kept in either the Pavilion or Village Hall. CCF Comments: The Association has budgeted to pay for whatever the marquee costs above the £800 requested. The group has a formal constitution and equal opportunities policy.</p>		
<p>Previous funding from this Area Committee: £400 in 04/05 for a planning presentation; £1,450 in 09/10 to replace the Trumpington Village Sign, £600 in 10/11 to erect a double sided community notice board for the high street</p>		
CCF recommendation: Award £800		

5. South Area Committee 2010-11 Leisure applications: none

5.1 Leisure 2010-11 spend to date: £0

If the above recommendations are agreed, the following budget will be available for later applications

2010-2011	Budget £	Allocated £	Remaining £
Community Development	9,250	6,095	3,155
Leisure	2,460	0	2,460
Total	11,710	6,095	5,615

BACKGROUND PAPERS and research used in the preparation of this report:

Grant applications.

Monitoring from previous grant awards

Telephone interview.

To inspect these documents contact Marion Branch on 01223 410535 or marion@cambscf.org.uk

Area Committee grant conditions

Community development grants enable projects which provide services or activities to benefit people living in one of the four areas of Cambridge City. Priority will be give to projects that are aimed at those people whose opportunities are restricted by disability, low income or discrimination.

1. Funds may also be used to meet any needs specific to its area as determined by the area committee.
2. Each area committee may decide to reserve part of its budget for one or more of these purposes. Grants may be awarded for capital or revenue expenditure.
3. Applications will be invited from:
 - constituted voluntary and not-for-profit organisations.
 - groupings of local residents able to meet basic accountability requirements.
 - partnerships of constituted group(s) and local residents.

Statutory agencies (such as Parish Councils and Schools) and commercial ventures are not eligible to apply.

4. There is no upper limit on application or grant award levels.
5. Members will generally be asked to consider and decide on applications twice a year.
6. Grants may be made between meetings if the applicants can demonstrate that they are unable to wait for the next scheduled grants meeting. CCF will consult with the Chair and, where relevant, ward members. The full committee will be notified at the next appropriate meeting.
7. Grants from Area Committee will not generally be made retrospectively.
8. Grants will be publicised, administered and monitored by CCF.

Funds directly managed by CCF



10/1003/FUL
British Telecom Long Road Cambridge

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number	10/1003/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	5th October 2010	Officer	Mr Amit Patel
Target Date	30th November 2010		
Ward	Trumpington		
Site	British Telecom Long Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 8HG		
Proposal	Installation of a fenced enclosure and pole stack housing along with lighting and assitional CCTV to existing car park and associated works.		
Applicant	81 Newgate Street London EC1A 7AJ		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The British Telecommunication Telephone Exchange (also known as the Cambridge Trunks Telephone Exchange) is located at 109-117 Long Road, in the south of the City. An industrial/office block style building of two and three storeys, it is located on the north side of Long Road about 200 metres east of the junction with Trumpington Road. The building is bordered to the north by the residential properties of Porson Court; to the east by housing on the Long Road with the protected open space of the Peterhouse Sports Ground behind; to the west by housing on the Long Road frontage and the Perse Prep School behind; and to the south by a planting strip along the south side of the Long Road.
- 1.2 The site is not within a Conservation Area and does not fall within a Car Parking Zone. The building is not a Listed Building.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application as submitted was for the reduction of 128 car parking spaces and associated works. This has, however, been amended to "Installation of fenced enclosure and pole stack

housing along with lighting and additional CCTV to existing car park and associated works.”

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design Statement
2. Plans
3. Further comments from agent

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
C/83/0337	Alteration to existing vehicular access	PERM
C/89/0127	Provision of new car parking area (amended by letter and drawings dated 8/05/89).	PERM

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	No
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

5.2 **Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):** Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 5.3 **Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (2001):** This guidance seeks three main objectives: to promote more sustainable transport choices, to promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services, by public transport, walking and cycling, and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. Paragraph 28 advises that new development should help to create places that connect with each other in a sustainable manner and provide the right conditions to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport.
- 5.4 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions:** Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
- 5.5 **Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations:** Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 – places a statutory requirement on the local authority that where planning permission is dependent upon a planning obligation the obligation must pass the following tests:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

5.6 **East of England Plan 2008**

SS1: Achieving Sustainable Development
T1: Regional Transport Strategy Objectives and Outcomes
T2: Changing Travel Behaviour
T3 Managing Traffic Demand
T4 Urban Transport
T8: Local Roads
T14 Parking
ENV7: Quality in the Built Environment

5.7 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**

Planning Obligation Related Policies

P6/1 Development-related Provision

P9/8 Infrastructure Provision

P9/9 Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Strategy

5.8 **Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/1 Sustainable development

3/4 Responding to context

3/7 Creating successful places

3/11 The design of external spaces

4/4 Trees

4/13 Pollution and amenity

4/15 Lighting

8/9 Commercial vehicles and servicing

8/10 Off-street car parking

10/1 Infrastructure improvements

Planning Obligation Related Policies

8/3 Mitigating measures (*transport*)

10/1 Infrastructure improvements (*transport, public open space, recreational and community facilities, waste recycling, public realm, public art, environmental aspects*)

5.9 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction: Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change

adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

Cambridge City Council (March 2010) – Planning Obligation Strategy: provides a framework for securing the provision of new and/or improvements to existing infrastructure generated by the demands of new development. It also seeks to mitigate the adverse impacts of development and addresses the needs identified to accommodate the projected growth of Cambridge. The SPD addresses issues including transport, open space and recreation, education and life-long learning, community facilities, waste and other potential development-specific requirements.

5.10 Material Considerations

Area Guidelines

Cambridge City Council (2002)–Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan:

The purpose of the Plan is to identify new transport infrastructure and service provision that is needed to facilitate large-scale development and to identify a fair and robust means of calculating how individual development sites in the area should contribute towards a fulfilment of that transport infrastructure.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

- 6.1 The proposal will give rise to additional trips. This has a knock on effect on the competition for on street car parking. BT has confirmed that an additional 10-15 people will visit this site on a daily basis, increasing the total numbers from 250 - 320 to 265 – 335; the variance being up to 70 visitors. The 361 parking spaces available for these people will be adequate provision. The use of Long Road by additional HCV movements will not result in any significant highway issue and the site plan shows that a large vehicle can leave the site in a forward gear. There have been negotiations about the increase in traffic movements and it is now accepted that SCAPT payments will not be required. There is no reason to refuse the application based on traffic generation or highway safety.

Arboriculture Section

6.2 No Comments have been received.

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

6.3 There should be two marked spaces for blue badge holders.

6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Stuart has requested that this application be called in on the grounds of highway safety and car parking.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 4 – 6 Cowgate (Sustrans)
- 11 Porson Road
- 25 Porson Road
- 3 Porson Road

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Cycle parking not in a convenient location,
- The increase in heavy traffic to and from the site,
- Impact on the future amenity of the area,
- Work travel plan required to reduce number of staff arriving by private motor vehicles,
- On street car parking in the area will become worse for local residents,
- Long Road unsuitable for the large load traffic,
- Emergency vehicles cannot access Porson Road with current situation and this will make it worse,
- Highway safety will be compromised as more people will park here and conflict with other road users will increase,

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Disabled access
3. Residential amenity
4. Refuse arrangements
5. Highway safety
6. Car and cycle parking
7. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.2 The site is situated off Long Road, which is a primary road and part of the orbital route around the City. The trees on the site frontage, and the planting opposite, gives the road a very open, almost rural feel. The majority of the works will take place within the car park area located in the southeast corner of the site, close to the street frontage.

8.3 The proposal is to introduce a pole stack area and an enclosed cable storage area with associated works. The area is not very visible from outside due to the location and the mature tree planting that encloses the space on three sides. Poles are covered by an awning or 'tent' on wheels can be pulled out or pushed back to ensure the poles are covered. The width of each tent is 3.5 wide with the main section 4.5m long and 2.1 m high; when the three sections are fully extended the total length of the 'tent' will be 10.7m. The finish will be plastic coated steel sides with a canvas roof. The four 'tents' will be in a compound 20m x 15 enclosed by a wire mesh fence.

8.4 Closer to the road will be a cable compound 8m deep and 15 m wide which will be surrounded by a 2metre high, palisade fence. It will however, be set behind 28 metres from the road beyond railings, planting and existing stores which means it will not be

visible from the street, other than a corner through the access. In my view it will not be intrusive and is acceptable.

- 8.5 The proposal includes the installation of CCTV cameras to the existing lighting columns, which will overlook the application site area. This is broadly acceptable as they will not be intrusive in the street scene, but it is important that the potential for light spillage and overlooking over 97 Long Road, the nearest property to the east, is managed, which can be done by condition. I do however, consider that given the presence of lighting on the site already, and the dense planting on the common boundary between the two properties, that this will be mitigated to a degree that will ensure that the amenity of the neighbouring occupier remains satisfactory.
- 8.6 The relocation of the barriers will not be detrimental, as these already exist and are visible from the street.
- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12.

Disabled access

- 8.8 The access officer has commented that there should be two disabled spaces for the 19 new spaces, however this is already an existing parking area and the addition of a disabled bay is welcomed and I do not feel that the absence of a second disabled bay is grounds for refusal.
- 8.9 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.10 The proposal will be located in the south-east corner of the site within a car park area. The property most likely to be affected from the proposal is the adjoining neighbour to the east, 97 Long Road, but that house is located about 15 metres from the edge of the existing car park area with the compounds another 11m distant and strong planting between the two.

- 8.11 There has been objection from Porson Road about the intensification of parking from this development. Although there may be greater pressure for parking, I believe that the site still has ample parking. The agents have provided further information which is dealt with the car and cycle parking section.
- 8.12 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Highway Safety

- 8.13 The local highway authority have commented that this is a radial ring road which is capable of having larger vehicles servicing the site. The agents have confirmed that they expect that one large 40ft lorry will deliver new poles/cable drums to site once a week. The road is wide enough to accommodate a lorry and there would be no safety implications if that was to occur.
- 8.14 The use of Porson Road as a secondary parking area is not a planning matter and it is noted that the street is not within a Cambridge controlled parking zone where restrictions might apply. One must hope this is not an issue given the extent of the on-site parking, but on-street parking is a highway matter covered by separate legislation and County highway authority.
- 8.15 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 8.16 The agents have provided further information with regard to the number of people potentially using the site in terms of current parking facilities on site. There are currently 183 parking spaces to the north car park, a further 16 spaces within the lower car park (between the north and south blocks of the site), 35 parking spaces to the south car park and 127 spaces to the south eastern car park. In total there are 361 parking spaces on site which were required when the site originally housed over

500 members of staff. As the number of people now on site has reduced so has the demand for spaces.

- 8.17 As a result of the proposed works the spaces to the south eastern car park will be reduce down to 19 spaces. The result of which is that 253 spaces will still be provided on site. We understand that typically there is a demand, based upon numbers of cars counted within the car park at a peak time for 204 spaces currently which will increase by a further 10-15 spaces following the proposed works. The above figures would be an average usage for the site as a whole.
- 8.18 The agents have also provided details of vehicle movements, in which they state that the majority will arrive between 7:30 and 9:00am and leave site between 5:00pm and 6:30pm. 30 staff also have shift changes at 3.00pm and 10.00pm each day with approximately 30 staff on site between 6.30pm and 7.30am. The number of individuals operating from small liveried BT vehicles who commute to and from the site during the day is approx 20.
- 8.19 Following the proposed works it is expected that an additional 15 private vehicles arriving and leaving at the peak times noted above. We expect that of this 15 vehicles arriving on site, 10 will then pick up a liveried BT vehicle and leave before 8.30am and return before 5.30pm in the evening. These vehicles will then be parked over night in the proposed amended area to the southeast car park. Taking all of the details into account I do not feel that there will be overly excessive movements that might have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers or highway safety.
- 8.20 There is cycle parking on site, although not shown, the agents have confirmed the following: there is another bike shed to the south west corner of the site. The enclosure is secure, covered and has lighting. Further existing bike sheds are also provided to the northwest corner of the site. Therefore provision will still be maintained on site for both the front and rear entrances to the buildings.
- 8.21 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.22 There have been objections relating to cycle parking not being in a convenient location. I have addressed this in the car and cycle parking section, but it is acknowledged that it could be better placed. That notwithstanding, I do not consider what is now mooted is going to create such demand as to justify further provision now. The increase in heavy traffic to and from the site is addressed in the Highway safety section. Impact on the future amenity of the area has been addressed in the reports as a whole. In order to help address the issues raised by the proposal a work travel plan has been mooted. Requiring a reduction in the number of staff arriving by private motor vehicles. On street car parking has been addressed in as much as it can be in the report and the County highway authority position on HCV's explained. Highway safety has also been addressed and while understanding the concerns about the difficulty emergency vehicles might have accessing the street, I think that is a matter of good behaviour which should not be materially affected by this proposal.

Planning Obligation Strategy

8.23 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy.

The proposed development triggers the requirement for the following community infrastructure:

Transport

- 8.24 Contributions towards catering for additional trips generated by proposed development are sought where 50 or more (all mode) trips on a daily basis are likely to be generated.
- 8.25 The applicants have submitted a transport assessment.
- 8.26 From the additional information provided the trip generation will not trigger a need for a South Corridor Area Transport Plan and therefore the proposal is accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/3 and 10/1.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This is a relatively minor development with the existing site area. The proposal is related to the existing use and the reduction in car parking numbers is acceptable and will it is hoped encourage a modal shift. Although there is concern about overspill of car parking onto the street I do not think that either that or a limited number of additional heavy commercial vehicles on Long Road justifies refusal of the application. I therefore recommend approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION APPROVE

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of any new lighting and detail of CCTV cameras and their positions and the angles that they will cover shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval which is to be given in writing. Implementation of the lighting and cameras and the angles they cover shall be implemented in accordance with that agreed and not varied without the agreement of the local planning authority which shall first have been given in writing.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity of nearby residents (East of England Plan 2008 env7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/7)

3. Within 3 months of the date of this permission a Travel Plan setting out the steps to be taken to encourage a reduction in the use of the private car and the proposed setting of targets to be achieved and a process for monitoring what progress is made for a 5 year period shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its approval which is to be given in writing. The scheme shall then be implemented in accordance with that agreed.

Reason To encourage the reduction in the use of the private car (East of England Plan 2008 policy T2 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/1 and 8/2)

Reasons for Approval

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:

East of England plan 2008: SS1, T1, T2, T3, T4, T8, T14 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 4/4, 4/13, 4/15, 8/9, 8/10 and 10/1

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.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.