

South Area Committee

Minutes of a meeting on 11 March 2010

At Hills Road Sixth Form College, Hills Road, Cambridge

7:00pm – 10.20 pm

Present:

City Councillors

Stuart Newbold (Cherry Hinton)

Alan Baker, Viki Sanders and Amanda Taylor (Queen Edith's)

Salah Al Bander, Andy Blackhurst (Chair) and Sheila Stuart
(Trumpington)

County Councillor

Geoffrey Heathcock (Queen Edith's)

10/07 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2010 were confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

10/08 Apologies for Absence

City Cllrs: Dryden and McPherson

County Cllrs: Sheppard and Carter

10/09 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

10/10 Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
Taylor	10/13	Declared a personal interest as a regular user of Brooklands Avenue.
Blackhurst	10/16/f	Declared a personal interest as member of the USS Pension Scheme
Baker	10/16/f	Declared a personal interest as member of the USS Pension

10/11 Open Forum

There were no questions raised during the open forum.

10/12 Safer Neighbourhoods and Policing

The committee received a presentation from Sgt Townsend regarding Safer Neighbours and Policing.

Members of the committee and public asked the following questions.

1. Can the reduced levels of anti-social behaviour (ASB) be attributed to weather or more pro-active policing?

The Police responded to explain that the weather does affect the level of crime and disorder, but that targeted patrols did also have significant effects.

2. With reference to s59 powers, a member of the public expressed concern about the potential abuse and lack of safeguards with the system and encouraged members of the committee to challenge the Police on the use of the powers.

The Police responded and explained that currently the powers were not being used in the south area of the city, but they were an additional tool available to the Police to tackle particular types of crime and disorder.

3. Concern was expressed about the statistical basis of the report, and the difficulty of making an informed assessment without the full information about all recorded crimes and disorder in the area.

The Police explained that the reports were produced to a consistent format for each committee agreed with the Leader of the Council, but that each area committee could ask for specific information in advance of the meeting.

4. With reference to the level of dwelling burglary in Queen Edith Ward, the Police were asked for an update on the work undertaken in the ward to tackle the crime.

The Police explained a number of tactics employed to tackle the number of incidents in the ward. The Police further explained that a number of the initiatives were focussed on key individuals committing high volumes of crimes. In response to a supplementary question it was agreed that the Police would review the mechanism for communicating key messages about the issues raised to Councillors and the wider public.

5. Clarification was requested on the current mechanisms in place to tackle verge and pavement parking where appropriate.

It was explained verge and pavement parking was primarily an issue for the local authority, but that where appropriate the Police would address specific

issues. The public present at the meeting were encouraged to report issues to the local authority.

6. Concern was raised about the number of cyclists riding without lights and it was suggested whether it would be possible to have a “purge” on failing to use lights particularly around Addenbrookes Hospital and Queen Ediths.

The Police highlighted the recent “no bike no light” campaign focussed on reducing the levels of cycling without lights. The Police also accepted concerns raised by the public and the committee regarding the prevalence of cyclists not adhering to traffic regulations.

7. A member of the public asked whether targeted operations in specific areas of the city, had the result of displacing crime to other areas of the city.

The Police explained that in a small city displacement could occur.

In response to a supplementary question regarding the responsibility of the Police in relation to re-offending, the Police explained that whilst the Probation Service are the responsible service for the management of offenders, where appropriate they would be involved. The Police highlighted significant improvements in the targeted intelligence of offender

8. The Police were asked whether it would be possible to include information regarding re-offending rates within future reports. The question also expressed significant with regards to the rate of violent crime.

The Police assured the committee and the public presented that the re-offending rates were closely monitored but that to date they had not formed part of the report to the Area Committee. The multi-agency approach to manage and tackling persistent and prolific offenders was explained, and it was also noted that the Community Safety Partnership actively scrutinised the issue.

With regards to violent crime, the Police explained that violent crime was a very broad concept, which included a wide range of offences. It was further explained that certain types of violent crime were under reported; so increased reporting would result in higher levels of report violent crime.

9. Clarification was sought on whether the changes to the Licensing Laws had resulted in increased problems.

The Police explained that whilst the relaxation of the licensing laws had not resulted in significant changes in the nature or extent of the problems, that

there continued to be peaks on Friday and Saturday nights between 11pm and 3am.

10. The Police were questioned, whether deterrents were in place to discourage the excessive consumption of alcohol and the associated problems.

It was explained that a number of deterrents were in place to discourage inappropriate consumption of alcohol. The Police explained that a number of different powers were available to use, but that each had to be used appropriately and proportionately.

11. A member of the public expressed concern about a number of assertions in the committee report regarding the level of crime in his area, and noted that since moving to the area that he had not seen a Policeman in his street.

The Police noted the concerns raised and explained that the area identified did form part of one of the priority areas. The Police re-iterated the proposed priorities as;

- *Tenby Close – Anti-Social Behaviour*
- *Aberdeen Avenue – Gilpin Road – Youths on Mopeds and associated Anti Social Behaviour*
- *Lawrence Crescent – Burglary*
- *Russel Court/Princes Court*

Following discussion regarding the additional potential priorities including anti social and illegal parking it was agreed that other authorities were better placed to tackle the issues highlighted.

Resolved (Unanimous): To adopt

- 1) The Policing and Safer Neighbourhood Priorities as outlined in the Committee with the addition of
 - a. Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour
 - b. Dwelling Burglary
 - c. Cycle lights and other cycle related issues.

10/13 Environmental Improvement Projects

The committee received a report from the interim Environmental Projects Manager. The report updated the committee on the progress of the current projects, and the following decisions;

- To defer a decision on Cherry Hinton High Street Verges pending a planning decision on the item.
- To put on hold the Rectory Terrace project pending the publication of the developers' proposals.

Cherry Hinton High Street

Cllr Newbold sought clarification on the status of the planning application, and questioned whether a decision on Cherry Hinton High Street needed to be deferred if the planning decision was going to be resolved through the Officer delegated route. Other members of the committee agreed that a decision in principle could be made prior to the outcome of the planning decision.

The Interim Environmental Projects Manager was questioned on the reference in the report to strengthening of CATV cabinets. It was explained that the existing fibre optic cables were designed to be underneath a verge, so would need to be strengthened prior to the proposed changes.

Trumpington War Memorial Survey

The Interim Environmental Projects Manager advised that following advice from Finance the project was ineligible for EIP project funding because it was a revenue cost. It was noted that the work had been undertaken through a different funding stream.

Rectory Terrace

The Interim Environmental Projects Manager advised that proposals were unlikely to be forthcoming until after the conclusion of the EIP scheme. Members agreed to defer the scheme.

Brooklands Avenue Traffic Calming Scheme

Cllr Stuart addressed committee and proposed the inclusion on an additional scheme to introduce traffic calming on Clarendon Road and Shaftsbury Road leading up to Brooklands Avenue. The Interim Environmental Projects Manager advised that the project was feasible, but clarified the nature of the available budget.

In response to questions regarding support for scheme, Cllr Stuart explained that that local residents association had collected a petition in favour of the scheme.

Resolved (6 for, 1 not voting) to;

- 1) Approve the Cherry Hinton Scheme for implementation at the cost of £40,000 subject to the outcome of the planning application.
- 2) Approve the deferral of the Rectory Lane project subject to the outcome of the developers plan.
- 3) Approve the inclusion of the proposed Clarendon Road/Shafsbury Road scheme for further investigation.

10/14 Wulfstan Way Local Centre – recommended improvements

The Joint Head of Urban Design addressed the committee and outlined potential options for the redevelopment of the local centre.

The committee and members of the public made the following comments;

- 1) The appropriateness of including steps within the design of the site due to the risk of trips and falls. Additional concerns were raised about the accessibility of the site for pushchairs and wheelchairs.
- 2) The need for the proposal to develop the whole site, specifically the area immediately opposite the shops.
- 3) Reference was made to the long history of limited or non-existent maintenance; the need to engage with all landowners and the need to ensure that there is sustainable funding to complete the scheme.
- 4) The importance of improving the “green” aspect of the site. Clarification was requested on whether the existing recycling facilities would remain.
- 5) The possibility of utilising the existing cycle racks and signage rather than replacing them was raised.
- 6) Clarification on whether the removal of railings on the boundary with Hullat Road would be appropriate in light of previous concerns regarding the illegal use of mini motors.
- 7) Criticism that the shopkeepers had not been specifically invited to the meeting in light of their previous involvement in the development of the project. The Joint Head of Urban Design noted the concerns raised, but explained that the proposals were still being developed and that more specific stakeholder consultation was planned.
- 8) It was noted that an existing 2hr parking restriction applied to part of the site, and the committee were requested to look at increasing the

number of available car parking spaces. Concerns were also raised about the potential for increased anti-social behaviour in the vicinity of the shops if the number of benches were increased. The Joint Head of Urban Design advised that a balance was required on the number of parking spaces provided on any scheme.

- 9) Concern was raised about the viability of businesses in the area, and the need to ensure that a range of businesses was supported in the local area.
- 10) Clarification was requested in light of previous issues in establishing funding streams for lighting projects. The Interim Environmental Improvements Project Manager advised that the availability of a revenue stream was dependent on whether there was an existing lighting scheme.

Members of the committee and the public thanked officers for the report and ideas.

Resolved (Unanimous) to

- 1) Allocate £101,000 funding from the Environmental Improvement Programme to the scheme.

10/15 Youth Summit 2009 – Outcomes and Actions

The Children and Young Peoples Service Manager introduced the report with the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health. The committee welcomed the report and asked the following questions.

In response to a question regarding potential outcomes for older children and teenagers, the Executive Councillor explained that the intention was to provide Cambridge Cards with a free upgrade to all year 7 and 8 children in the city.

The Community Engagement Manager from the Police welcomed the initiative particularly the suggestion of engagement activities involving young people and the Police. The representative of the County Council also welcomed the proposals.

Mr Richard Taylor asked why the City Council was seeking to fund a private sector company by supplying the cards, rather than providing the discounts directly. The Executive Councillor explained that the Council and the company had had a long-standing relationship, and that the basic card was freely available across the city.

The committee were asked for comments regarding the potential venues of sessions during the Easter Holidays. Following discussion it was agreed that due to ongoing works at Nightingale Avenue, George 5th and Cherry Hinton Hall were the most appropriate venues.

10/16 Planning Applications

These minutes and the appendix should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown in the appendix.

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those, which the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up.

a.	09/1129/FUL
Site	102 Glebe Road
Proposal	Erection of two dwelling (following demolition of existing dwelling).
Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	Mr Blyth – Objector Mr Chris Anderson - Agent
Decision:	REFUSED by 5 votes to 0 for the following reason The proposal is unacceptable in that the width of the site access adjacent to the junction with Glebe Road, at 4 metres, is insufficient to give adequate space for two vehicles to pass. In the absence of an access with a width of a minimum of 4.5metres for a distance of 10 metres from the boundary with the public highway, it is likely that cars will be forced to reverse out into the highway or stop abruptly on the highway, which will prejudice the safety of other users of the highway in an area where very intense on street parking on both sides of the street restricts visibility and space for manoeuvring. For this reason the proposal will have an unacceptable transport impact and is contrary to policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

b.	09/1048/FUL
Site	15 Colville Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire

Proposal	Erection of 2 two-bed flats including widening of existing vehicular access and provision of off-street parking.
Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	None
Decision:	APPROVED unanimously subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report.

c.	09/1182/FUL
Site	40 Hills Road, Cambridge
Proposal	Change of use to a coffee shop (A3)
Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	Natalie Jarman - Agent
Decision:	APPROVED unanimously subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report and as amended in the update sheet.

d.	09/1115/FUL
Site	1a Leete Road, Cambridge
Proposal	Conversion of existing dwelling into one 1-bed dwelling and one 2-bed dwelling & single storey side and rear extension.
Recommendation	1. APPROVE – Proposed extension 2. REFUSE – Subdivision of the property
Public Speakers:	Mrs Douglas - Applicant
Decision:	1. APPROVED the extension of the property unanimously subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report and as amended in the update sheet and the conditions agreed by the committee. 2. REFUSED the subdivision of the property 5 votes to 1 vote for the reasons outlined in the committee report and update sheet.

e.	09/1049/OUT
Site	The Cottage, Gazeley Road
Proposal	Outline application to sub-divide existing residential site to form a separate 1000 sq m site suitable for a single 5-bedroom residence.
Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	N/A
Decision:	APPROVED unanimously subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report and as amended in the update sheet.

f.	09/0889/FUL
Site	Trumpington Park and Ride
Proposal	Change of use to a coffee shop (A3)
Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	Natalie Jarman - Agent
Decision:	<p>APPROVED unanimously subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report and as amended in the update sheet. Two conditions were added by the committee as outlined below;</p> <p>1. The sui generis Car Boot Fair use hereby approved is for the period to the 31 March 2012 only, during which time the car boot fair shall operate on Sundays only, between 0700 and 1300 hours, but specifically excluding all Sundays in December 2010 and December 2011, with the site returned to its use as a car park by no later than 1400 hours on each Sunday that the car boot fair functions.</p> <p>Reason: To allow the local planning authority to assess the impact of the Car Boot Fair use and its implications for the provision of parking at this Park and Ride site, to ensure that it does not prejudice the wider parking needs of the City during a period of economic change, and to assess what if any implications it has for residents of the surrounding area (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 4/13 and 8/2)</p> <p>2. Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, the on-site storage facilities for waste generated by the development, including waste for recycling and the arrangements for the disposal of waste shall be submitted for the approval of the local planning authority, which is to be given in writing. The agreed provision and arrangements shall be adhered to thereafter, unless agreement to alternative arrangements are first agreed in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of other users of the site and residents of the surrounding area and in the interests of visual amenity (East of England Plan 2008 Policy ENV7 and WM6 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/13.</p>



Chair