

WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE

28 February 2013

7.00 - 9.20 pm

Present: Councillors Reiner (Chair), Kightley (Vice-Chair), Hipkin, Reid, Rosenstiel, Smith and Tucker,

County Councillors: Brooks-Gordon, Nethsingha and Whitebread

Officers:

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams

Project Delivery and Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/17/WCAC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Cantrill and Councillor Bick.

13/18/WCAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)

Councillor Hipkin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 13/22/WCAC and withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the item.

13/19/WCAC Present for Planning

Councillors: Reiner, Kightley, Hipkin, Reid, Rosenstiel, Smith and Tucker.

Also present: County Councillors Brooks-Gordon and Whitebread.

13/20/WCAC 12/1433/FUL - 37 City Road

The committee received an application for demolition of and re-building of outbuildings to form 2 residential units. The Principal Planning Officer apologised for of errors in the report.

Toni Johnson addressed the committee on behalf of herself and residents of neighbouring properties. She made the following points in objection to the application:

- i. The property is within the Kite conservation area.
- ii. The area is valued for the charm of its 'Human Scale'.
- iii. The 2006 Local Plan requires development to make a positive contribution to the local area.
- iv. The height, mass and scale of the proposal would dominate the area.
- v. A previous application had been rejected and the new proposal is not significantly different.
- vi. Evening light would be lost.
- vii. Proposed conditions distract from the central fact that the scale of the proposal is the problem.
- viii. The old buildings are beyond repair but the proposal is not in keeping with the area.

Chris Senior of DPA Architects addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant and in support of the application.

County Councillor Whitebread (Ward Councillor for Market) addressed the committee and made the following points:

- i. Local residents had expressed their concerns to her.
- ii. The site was small and the development would dominate.
- iii. The proposal was inappropriate for the area.
- iv. Parking was already problematic in the area.
- v. Any development should have a positive impact on the area.
- vi. She urged the committee to reject the application.

RESOLVED (Unanimously) to reject the officer recommendation of approval.

RESOLVED (Unanimously) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

-The proposed development would - by virtue of the new residential uses of the scale proposed, including in particular the proposed increases in massing, scale and footprint; the introduction of new residential uses into a relatively quiet rear garden area and the intensification of use that the residential units would create into the evenings and at weekends; and the potential and perceived overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy into neighbouring properties - result in a dominant and un-neighbourly built form that, within a tightly constrained urban site, would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupants of 33 and 34 City Road and 60, 61 and 62 Eden Street. The

proposal therefore fails to respond adequately to its context, achieve good interrelations between buildings and have a positive impact on its setting and is contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and National Planning Policy Framework guidance (2012).

-The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space/sports facilities, community development facilities, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation.

13/21/WCAC 12/1434/CAC - 37 City Road

The committee received an application for the demolition of outbuildings.

RESOLVED (unanimously) to reject the officer recommendation of approval.

RESOLVED (Unanimously) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

-The proposed demolition is contrary to policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, in that in the absence of an approved redevelopment scheme that has a contract for redevelopment and which preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area by faithfully reflecting its context or providing a contrast with it, the demolition of the buildings would result in the loss of a heritage asset in the form of historical buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

13/22/WCAC 12/1072/FUL 27 Benson Street

The committee received an application for the construction of a basement flat, to include the construction of a new concrete stairwell to the rear of the first and second floor flats and to remove existing ground floor nine-foot brick wall extension and replace and extend first floor flat to rear.

Jeremy Coles addressed the committee on and made the following points in objection to the application:

- i. The development would result in a loss of residential amenity.
- ii. Removal of trees, as demonstrated by photographs, had resulted in a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- iii. As per section 4.11 of the Local Plan this is a conservation area and developments should enhance the area.
- iv. As per section 4.3 of the Local Plan the development would have an adverse impact on the area.
- v. Mr Coles requested that the committee require the reinstatement of the trees to address the issue of overlooking.

County Councillor Brooks-Gordon (Ward Councillor for Castle) addressed the committee and made the following points:

- i. The proposal was out of keeping with the area.
- ii. Parking pressures
- iii. Basement developments should not be encouraged.
- iv. Small properties can be extended in more sympathetic ways by rearranging the internal space.
- v. The proposed flat would be of an inadequate size.

RESOLVED (by 5 votes to 2) to accept the officer recommendations and to approve the application, subject to additional conditions regarding landscaping in the rear garden adjacent to 27 Canterbury Street, to read:

-Prior to the commencement of development, a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail proposed planting at the rear of the site adjacent to the boundary with 27 Canterbury Street and indicate tree species, girth and height and a planting specification. The landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first available planting season following the implementation of the development. Any tree or shrub which dies within 5 years of planting shall be replaced with a similar species to the same specification as that approved, unless an alternative specification is otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To mitigate the potential for overlooking into the rear garden of 27 Canterbury Street (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14).

Councillor Hipkin withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the

consideration of the following item.

3d Planning Enforcement Control Enforcement Notice Report 13 Oxford Road
The committee received a report seeking the authority to close an Enforcement Investigation on the grounds that it is not expedient to pursue the breach of planning control further.

RESOLVED (by 6 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendations.

13/23/WCAC Declarations of Interest (Main Agenda)

There were no declarations.

13/24/WCAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 10th January 2013 were approved and signed as a correct record.

13/25/WCAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes

13/11/WCAC: Outstanding Action from meeting of 23 August 2012, minutes number 12/51/WAC question from Richard Taylor regarding planning permission for works carried out on Midsummer Common.

Councillor Cantrill was not present to respond but had confirmed prior to the meeting that the matter was being addressed.

13/9/WCAC: Councillor Smith to contact Head of Tourism and City Centre management regarding Cycle /Footpath maintenance.

Councillor Smith confirmed that the County Council were addressing the issue of dirty cobblestones. She had also had a meeting with the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services to discuss city centre cleaning. A plan had been agreed that would ensure that late night burger vans do not obstruct regular deep clean arrangements.

13/9/WCAC: County Councillor Whitebread to raise suggestions of expanded consultation regarding Maids Causeway signage.

Councillor Whitebread confirmed that this action had been completed.

13/14/WCAC: 7.5t weight restriction. Consult North Area Committee re inclusion of Victoria Road in Traffic Survey.

This suggestion had been passed on to the Chair of North Area Committee for consideration.

13/9/WCAC: Traffic light issues at Gilbert Road junction with Histon Road and Warwick Road. Councillor Kightley to assist Ms Leonard to refer this to the County Council.

Councillor Brooks-Gordon had passed this matter on to County Council Cabinet Member, Councillor Orgee who had agreed to look into it urgently.

13/26/WCAC Open Forum

(Q1) Roger Chatterton

Councillor Cantrill was asked for an update on the problems with the Midsummer Common gates.

(A) Councillor Cantrill was not present. However, other members confirmed that this was a work in progress and that Councillor Cantrill was in regular contact with the legal department regarding this matter.

Supplementary Public Question

What is the hold up? Why has this matter not been resolved?

Councillor Cantrill would be asked for a full response at the next meeting.

Action

(Q2) Edward Cearns

**What is the outcome of the consultation regarding Parker Piece lighting?
Will the public be able to comment on the design?**

Members confirmed that the consultation included design issues. However, as the consultation was not yet completed, no further information was available.

(Q3) John Lawton

The proposed lighting is out of character with the area and would attract vandalism. The bollards look like car park lighting and the rising lights would be unsafe. How do the proposals fit with the conservation plan?

Committee members suggested that, as the consultation was on-going, members of the public could input their views into that process.

(Q4) Richard Jennings

City Rangers have been tagging cycles parked informally. Can they also tag motor vehicles that obstruct the footpath?

Councillor Rosenstiel confirmed that the Police can and do, take action over obstruction or if a vehicle was parked on double yellow lines.

(Q5) Edward Cearn

Given the huge imbalance between the English Defence League (EDL) march and the Unite Against Fascism protestors, is the current approach giving the EDL a higher profile than it might otherwise achieve? Alternative, non-confrontational approaches could achieve more.

Councillor Reid responded and stated that it could be argued that different responses were equally valid.

Supplementary Public Question

It was noted that the Unite Against Fascism and other opposition groups were using equally antagonistic and aggressive slogans.

Councillor Reid she noted that although some councillors and our MP had attended the UAF march, Cambridge City Council itself did not take a formal position.

(Q6) Richard Taylor

Had the Police been consulted about the 20mph signage project?

Councillor Smith stated that the consultation had been undertaken following discussions with the Police.

13/27/WCAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The committee received a report from the Project Delivery and Environment Manager regarding the Maid's Causeway / Newmarket Road 20MPH signage project.

Members welcomed the report and expressed the hope that this would be the beginning of a culture change. It was hoped that this could be rolled out across the city at a later date and at this stage, the signage would not need to be as bold and intrusive.

(Q1) John Lawton

The height of the current signage is excessive. What are the timeframes for the work? How will success be measured? Will the scheme be extended across the city?

The Project Delivery and Environment Manager responded. The height of the signage would conform to required standards. Most of the work should be completed within six weeks. However, a road closure would be required for part of the work and this might take longer to arrange. The success of the project would be monitored with an automatic counter and with the use of Police priorities.

Members suggested that a before and after monitoring exercise would be useful.

(Q2) Member of the Public

Can members put pressure to bear so that the anomaly over the use of speed awareness courses as an alternative to penalty points is addressed? This penalty is not currently applicable in areas with a 20pmh limit.

Members agreed that this was a good point. The Chair agreed to write to Sir Graham Bright (Police and Crime Commissioner), Norman Baker MP (Parliamentary Under Secretary for Transport) and Julian Huppert MP.

Action

RESOLVED (Unanimously) to approve the Officer's recommendations for the implementation of the Environmental Improvement and Minor Highway Work Project, in accordance with the drawing in appendix D of the Officer's report, at a cost of £4,500 from the West/Central Committee's Improvement budget, added to the £3,000 approved contribution from the County Council's Joint Minor Highway Works budget.

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

CHAIR