

**WEST / CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**3 November 2011  
7.05 - 10.45 pm**Present:**

Castle (John Hipkin, Simon Kightley and Phillip Tucker)  
Market (Tim Bick, Andrea Reiner and Colin Rosenstiel)  
Newnham (Rod Cantrill, Sian Reid and Julie Smith)  
Also Present Councillor McGovern

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

County Councillors: Lucy Nethsingha (Newnham) and Sarah Whitebread  
(Market)

**Officers Present:**

Head of Legal: Simon Pugh  
Guided Tours Manager: John Milne  
Head of City Centre Management and Tourism: Emma Thornton  
Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams  
Environmental Improvements Manager: Andrew Preston  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**Also Present:**

Chris Capps: Cambridgeshire County Council, Head of Transport Asset  
Management  
Jane Darlington: Cambridgeshire Community Foundation

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****11/55/WAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from County Councillor Brooks-Gordon

**11/56/WAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)**

Name	Item	Interest
------	------	----------

Councillor Reiner	11/57/WACa	Personal - Member of the Cambridge Lawn Tennis and Hockey Club.
Councillor Kightley	11/57/WACc	Personal - Has purchased vehicles for personal use from the owner of the site.

### **Change to agenda Order**

**Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.**

### **11/57/WAC Planning Applications**

**3a** 11/1052/FUL Cambridge Lawn Tennis and Hockey Club, Wilberforce Road  
The committee received an application for floodlighting to three existing tennis courts at Cambridge lawn Tennis and Hockey Club, Wilberforce Road.

The applicant, Mr Arthur, addressed the committee in support of the application.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendation.

### **Reasons for Approval**

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: ENV6 and ENV7 Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4,3/7,3/11,4/2,4/3,4/4,4/11,4/13,4/15 and 6/2
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](http://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.

**3b 11/0784/FUL The Earl Grey, 60 King Street, Cambridge, CB1 1LN**

The committee received an application for a change of use from a betting shop (use Class A2) to restaurant (Use Class A3) and takeaway (use Class A5) with alterations to front windows and door and installation of extract fan and ducts.

Mr French addressed the committee and made the following points in objection to the application:

- Information on the application is inaccurate.
- No mention is made of the first floor on the building and how this is to be used.
- It is not clear how the physical design of the building will work.
- There is no detail given about the roof slopes and the impact of ducting and fumes.
- The takeaway use would be disruptive in the area and there is a danger that this may become the main function of the venue.

Ms Bilsby addressed the committee and made the following points in objection to the application:

- The extraction system will not prevent cooking smells disturbing residents.
- Traffic, litter and noise will increase.
- Residents of Manor Place will be forced to keep their windows shut.
- Parking for the takeaway section will cause obstructions and current enforcement is poor.
- People will consume the takeaways in parked cars and then litter the area.

The applicants, Mr Rahman Junior and Mr Rahman Senior addressed the committee in support of their application.

Members debated the possibility of requiring that cycle parking be provided but agreed this was beyond the gift of the applicant.

The flat above the restaurant was discussed. This is student accommodation belonging to Christ's College.

Members proposed the following amendment to the recommendations:

The venue will be primarily a restaurant with the takeaway service ancillary to this. (Agreed unanimously)

**RESOLVED (8 votes to 1)** to approve the application subject to the following additional condition.

The restaurant use (A3) shall operate only as the primary use of the premises, with the takeaway use only being ancillary to this.

Reasons for Additional Condition: To ensure that the takeaway use remains ancillary and does not give rise to unacceptable environmental problems or nuisance which would detract from the amenity of the surrounding area in terms of littering and increased noise and disturbance (Cambridge Local Plan 6/10).

**Reasons for Approval:**

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, ENV6, ENV7, WM6 and T1 Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 4/11, 4/13, 6/6, 6/10 and 8/1
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](http://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.

**3c 11/0921/FUL 82 Richmond Road**

The committee received an application for the erection of four 4-bed semi-detached residential units, together with 9 car parking spaces, cycle parking and associated landscaping work (following demolition of outbuildings to the side and rear of 82 Richmond Road.

Mr Pyke addressed the committee and made the following points in objection to the application:

- He objects to the application due to scale, density and context.
- There would be a loss of amenity.
- The proposed access is insufficient for the number of dwellings.
- The site is not typical brownfield and is a wildlife haven.

- He was pleased that the mature trees on the site were now protected.
- Neighbours would be subjected to overshadowing and the proposal is very close to the site boundary.
- Plans would be more appropriate in a city centre area.
- The access and traffic survey is inaccurate.

The applicant, Mr Brown, addressed the committee in support of the application.

Members discussed the application and made the following points:

- I. Loss of garages currently on the site.
- II. Loss of parking spaces as additional double yellow lines would be needed.
- III. Does not conform to the Local Plan Policy 3.
- IV. Proposed buildings out of character with the area.
- V. The narrow access road would be dangerous.
- VI. Scale, height and massing is unacceptable.
- VII. Contemporary style not bad but not special.
- VIII. Elevation presents an unacceptably industrial look to the building.
- IX. Proposed buildings would be chunky and unattractive.

**RESOLVED (by 6 votes to 3)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**RESOLVED (by 6 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, height, design and massing of the proposed houses, would result in a bulky and dominant scheme, the appearance of which would appear industrial and heavy in terms of the use of materials and detailing. The proposed development would therefore not respond positively to the surrounding context or setting of the site. As such, the application is contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

### **11/58/WAC Declaration of Interest (Main Agenda)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Cllr Smith	11/61/WAC Discussion	Personal - As an employee of the University. She took no part in the discussion.

	on the North West Development	
--	-------------------------------------	--

### **11/59/WAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2011 were agreed as a correct record subject the following correction:

11/53/WAC Request that Cambac Shop Theft be added as a police priority. Councillor Bick had suggested that this item be considered at a later meeting but had not been advocating it.

### **11/60/WAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**

Minutes item - 11/52/WAC – Publication of Licensing Representations

This matter had been resolved at the recent Full Licensing Committee and the full decision would be published shortly.

Post Committee Update: The minutes of the meeting can now be viewed via the following link:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=957&T=1>

Minute item - 11/52/WAC – Gates Midsummer Common

Councillor Cantrill gave an update on the situation. New gates had been fabricated and would be installed shortly. Both the pub and the restaurant on the Common had been informed of their obligation and had been given a fob to operate the gate. Remote control of the gate would be possible.

Minutes item - 11/52/WAC – Round Church Wall

Councillor Rosenstiel stated that even though some tidying up had taken place in the area around the Round Church, the matter is not fully resolved.

### **11/61/WAC Open Forum**

#### **(Q1) Nicholas Hellowell**

**The planned North West Cambridge Development does not take account of the surrounding area. The size of the development, the mixed use of the site and the additional traffic has not been fully considered. Direct**

**approaches to the University have elicited limited responses, confined to the traffic junctions, and not addressing other issues raised. If implemented the site will force traffic from the North to access via the busy Queen's Road junction. There appears to be no plan to manage traffic or to provide additional slip roads. Rat running will also be increased.**

Members made the following comments:

- I. The consultation period was about to end and time was running out for public comment to be made.
- II. It is anticipated that traffic would circle the city to approach the site rather than cross the city.
- III. The City will be a key player in the discussions and would take concerns about the development being a city within a city to the University.
- IV. Members suggested that the County Council transport strategy was not sufficiently robust to cope with such applications.
- V. The size of the development was discussed.
- VI. It was agreed that the County needed a plan that will to encourage growth without damaging the City.

**Nicholas Hellowell responded:**

**Economic sustainability does not address wider sustainability issues such as water and energy consumption. In addition, landscapers should be engaged to work with planners to design any future junction.**

**(Q2) Richard Taylor**

**Mr Taylor had been made aware that Mr Lawton had obtained the minutes of the Neighbourhood Action Meeting using a Freedom of Information request. Why are these minutes not publicly available? The minutes demonstrate that they are no longer agreeing the police priorities suggested by the Area Committee.**

Councillor Bick responded. He had not attended these meetings and had not seen the minutes referred to, but would investigate the meeting's terms of reference and the activities they actually undertook and respond in that light.

**Action: Councillor Bick**

Members of the public also raised questions under items 11/46/WAC, 11/66/WAC and 11/67/WAC.

**11/62/WAC Review of trial period of a 7.00pm start time for this meeting.**

Members felt that the two meeting trial had not been long enough to fully assess the impact of the earlier start time.

**RESOLVED** to extend the trial period for a further 2 meetings.

### **11/63/WAC Area Committee Dates**

**RESOLVED:** to agree the following meeting dates for the municipal year 2012-13.

21<sup>st</sup> June 2012, 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2012, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012, 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013, 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and 25<sup>th</sup> April 2013.

### **11/64/WAC Punt Touting in the City Centre**

The committee received a report from the Guided Tours Manager regarding City Centre Punt Touting. He confirmed that a report on the matter would be presented at the Strategy and Resources Committee in January.

Members expressed satisfaction with the progress made by the Cam Conservators to resolve the situation in Garret Hostel Lane.

Members raised the following points:

- I. There was a need to work with the trade to resolve problems.
- II. Tourists do not necessarily raise objections but locals find the situation annoying.
- III. A voluntary approach should be backed up by powers to take appropriate action.
- IV. It is difficult to identify individuals who cause problems.
- V. The touts individually are generally polite but the cumulative effect of their numbers causes annoyance.
- VI. River safety is also an issue.
- VII. Resources need to be available to back any enforcement action.

Councillor McGovern (Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources) addressed the committee as this issue falls within his portfolio.

He was pleased with the progress made to date. He explained that it was not possible to use street trading laws to regulate punt touting, as these only



applied to the offer or sale of goods. He noted that some shops now sell punting tickets.

The Head of Legal Services confirmed this and added that street trading laws in London covered the offer of services, as well as of goods, and so potentially could control touting. Some local authorities outside London had promoted local Acts of Parliament to extend their powers.

**(Q) Peter Constable: Local residents are fed up with the activities of touts and feel it brings the City into disrepute. Residents are also poorly informed about how to complain.**

Officers responded that people should complain as soon as possible to either the Customer Access Centre or the Tourist Information Office. Information about how to complain would be published on the council website.

**Action: Emma Thornton, Head of City Centre Management and Tourism**

Members agreed that word is spreading amongst the touts that actions will be taken and that it might be useful to re-visit this issue in twelve months time.

**RESOLVED:** To note the contents of the report.

### **11/65/WAC Community Development Leisure Grants 2011/12**

The committee received a report from the Chief Executive of the Community Foundation regarding Community Development and Leisure Grants.

**RESOLVED:** to agree the grant of £2,000 (being £920 from Community Development budget and £1,080 from the Leisure budget) to St Augustine's Church.

### **11/66/WAC Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative Contract**

The committee received a presentation from Head of Transport Asset Management regarding the Street lighting Private Finance Initiative Contract.

The presentation can be viewed via the following link:

<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/transport/lights/streetlighting/street+lighting+PFI.htm>

The presentation covered the following issues:

- Street lighting powers, assets and energy usage.
- The lighting authority had the power to provide lighting, not a duty.
- He outlined the budget and the requirement to make savings of at least 10% on 2011/12.
- Private Finance Initiative Credits for the replacement of old street lighting columns and bollards.
- The style of columns and lanterns available.
- Reduction in the number of lights and how the change to white light would limit the impact of this reduction.

Councillor Reid questioned the purpose of the presentation as she had previously written to the County Council on this matter and had asked for a commitment regarding areas of specific areas.

This is the first stage of a process to roll out new lighting across the City. Some lights in the centre would be replaced within the next six months. However, lighting in the West Central Area would not be addressed for 12 to 18 months. The Chair suggested that Ward Councillors would welcome a meeting with County Council officers to go over the detail of the proposals. It was agreed that this level of detail was inappropriate for this meeting.

The following points were raised the following points;

- I. In response to member questions, the officer confirmed that motion sensors to turn light on had not been considered due to costs. Should this prove economically viable at a future date they could be installed retrospectively.
- II. Heritage columns would be retained where possible.
- III. Wall mounted lights would be considered. However, these were unpopular with some residents.
- IV. The newer lights would have increased reliability and the contract would penalise failures.
- V. Traffic routes would have brighter lights than residential street.

Councillor Bick raised safety concerns. Issues such as dimmed lighting, fewer columns, the definition of a residential area and reduced lighting hours should be discussed in the public arena. The proposals present an opportunity to get the process right and to make improvements.

**Q) Mr Lawton – The Richardson Candles are now listed, will they be retained?**

The officer confirmed that the protected lighting would be retained.

The officer concluded that an on-going dialogue with members would continue. Additional information would soon be available on the County Council website.

## **11/67/WAC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

The committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding Environmental Improvement Projects.

### **Fitzroy Street Tree Replacement**

**(Q) Richard Taylor: I object to the felling of the mature trees in Fitzroy Street. Have all the options for resurfacing the area without removing the trees been investigated?**

The officer confirmed that the problems had been caused by the way the trees had been planted and would get worse over time. Replacing them now with semi-mature trees would provide an attractive streetscape for the future. Other trees in the area were likely to suffer in a similar way in a few years. Delaying this decision could result in the loss of all the trees at the same time at some point in the future. Members expressed regret at the loss of the trees but agreed this was the best solution.

Some concerns were expressed regarding the consultation process which was felt to have been unnecessarily complicated.

Wider issues of trees in this area were discussed. The officer confirmed that the County Council is responsible for highway safety and had a contract with the City Council to maintain highway trees. Adding trees to the area was seen as desirable, however, the area has a high level of underground equipment making new planting very difficult.

### **Manor Street / King Street**

**(Q) Beverley Nichols: What type of cycle rack will used? Have other options been explored?**

The racks would be metal D shaped bars, attached to the walls. Ground fixed racks were not possible as this would create a liability for the landowner.

Members welcomed the actions that had been in the pipeline for many years.

### **Gough Way Bridge Replacement**

**(Q) Sir David Harrison on behalf of Gough Way Residents Association:**  
The footpath and bridge were the result of the actions of local residents over 50 years ago. The amenity is greatly valued by residents. The path had never been a right of way and is closed for one day per year to preserve this. The bridge was built in 1977 and the City Council assumed responsibility for it in 1987. Residents would like to the committee to support the proposals.

Members agreed that, while not ideal, this was the best solution that was possible to achieved with Jesus College.

**(Q) Mr Lawton: The cost of this project appears high. Why?**

The officer responded that the estimated cost included a contingency element and was likely to be less when delivered.

### **RESOLVED (unanimously) :**

- I. Approved the replacement of the two highway trees on Fitzroy Street as part of the approved Fitzroy/Burleigh Street refurbishment Scheme.
- II. Approved the implantation of the Manor Street/king Street scheme at a cost of £9,000.
- III. Approved the sealing of a license between Cambridge City Council and Jesus College, in order to regulate the agreement to provide cycle racks and to carry out resurfacing on land by Jesus College at the Manor Street/king Street junction.
- IV. Approved the replacement of the Gough Way Bridge to improve access for cyclists and pedestrians along Gough Way path, despite the lack of its adoption as a public right of way by the County Council.

The meeting ended at 10.45 pm

**CHAIR**