

**WEST / CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

26 April 2012  
7.00 - 11.00 pm

**Present:** City Councillors: Smith (Chair), Kightley (Vice-Chair), Bick, Cantrill, Hipkin, Reid, Reiner, Rosenstiel and Tucker,  
County Councillors: Nethsingha and Whitebread  
Also present: The Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport, Councillor Ward.

**Officers:**

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams  
Project Delivery and Environment Manager: Andy Preston  
Safer Communities Manager: Lynda Kilkelly  
Committee Manager Toni Birkin

**Also in Attendance:**

Head of Road Safety and Parking Services, Cambridgeshire County Council: Richard Preston  
Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation: Jane Darlington  
Police Inspector: Steve Poppitt  
Police Sergeant: Andrea Gilbert  
Police Community Engagement Manager: John Fuller  
John Varah (Same Sky)

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**12/21/WAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from County Councillor Brooks-Gordon and Councillor Hipkin (Absent for planning items only).

**12/22/WAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)**

No interests were declared.

**12/23/WAC Planning Applications**

**12/24/WAC 11/1578/FUL: 37 City Road**

The committee received an application for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide three residential units.

Rick Leggatt addressed the committee on behalf of himself and the residents of neighbouring properties. He made the following points in objection to the application:

- I. The proposal is contrary to the Local Plan.
- II. Neighbours would suffer loss of privacy.
- III. Rear views would be lost.
- IV. The size and mass of the proposal is out of keeping with the area.
- V. There would be considerable and intrusive overlooking of 34 and 35 City Road.
- VI. Neighbours to the North West would be presented with a blank wall.
- VII. Parking would be problematic.

The applicant, Clair Downham addressed the committee in support of 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 increases in massing, scale and footprint, the introduction of new residential uses into a relatively quiet rear garden area, the intensification of use that three residential units would create, 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 adequately respond 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).

**12/25/WAC 11/1579/CAC: 37 City Road**

The Officer's recommendation for the application for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide three residential units was

amended to that of refusal following the decision above. Item 4.11 of the Local Plan was applied, as there was no valid application in place.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) to approve the Officer's recommendation to reject the application.

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

### **12/26/WAC Declarations of Interest (Main Agenda)**

No interests were declared.

### **12/27/WAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

### **12/28/WAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**

There were no matters arising from the last meeting. However, the feasibility of painting street signs onto the road surface remains outstanding from the meeting of the 5<sup>th</sup> January 2012. This issues will be addressed later in the meeting when the Police are in attendance.

### **12/29/WAC Open Forum**

**(Q1) Noel Kavanagh**

**Was a piece of land, part of Midsummer Common given to Midsummer House Restaurant? If so, when did this happen? Who was responsible for the decision? Is there a formal record?**

Councillor Cantrill responded. In 2006, Midsummer House requested the use of a piece of land in order to provide access for a member of staff with a disability. Permission was granted and has been reviewed periodically. This was currently under review. The restaurant building was originally council property and the adjacent pound remains council owned.

**(Q2) Bev Nicholson**

**Would it be possible for rubbish bins to be installed along Huntingdon Road as the footpath is well used and there is no bin until you reach the Shire Hall bus stop?**

Councillor Cantrill responded. Funds had been allocated for additional bins and for the refurbishment of existing bins. Consultations on design and locations would happen in the near future and residents are encouraged to make suggestions.

**(Q3) Richard Taylor**

**There is currently a consultation on a Conservation Area that is relevant to this committee. Why is it not highlighted on this agenda?**

Members agreed that highlighting such consultations would be a good idea for the future. Social media could also be used to keep residents informed.

**(Q4) Richard Chatterton**

**When will the results of the traffic survey carried out in relation to the Travel Lodge, Newmarket Road, be made public?**

This matter would be investigated.

**Action**

**(Q5) Hugh Kellett**

**What is the status of the 20 mph scheme in Cambridge, specifically regarding the timing of consultation and implementation stages. Who or what body is in overall control of the scheme and the funds? Who, or which consultants, is/are involved strategically in ensuring a "joined up" thinking approach, perhaps based on other cities' experiences? There appear to be many excuses for the lack of action and meanwhile 40% of all vehicles exceed the limit.**

Councillor Ward (Executive Councillor of Planning and Sustainable Transport) responded. A City-wide 20mph limit would be a long term aspiration. To date there had been limited progress. A two year timeframe would appear to be

reasonable. A project lead would be appointed. The City would be in charge and would be funding this. The County Council would support the project and would lend their expertise. Lessons learnt in other areas, such as Portsmouth (the first City to introduce such a limit), would be considered.

Richard Preston, Head of Road Safety and Parking Services, added that the County Council was only able to fund safety measures that could demonstrably prevent accidents. A 20 mph limit was easy to introduce but hard to enforce.

**(Q6) Bev Nicholson**

**Why are the Police reluctant to enforce the limit?**

Inspector Poppitt stated that the Police are not reluctant but that enforcement was only part of the solution.

**(Q7) Public Question**

**Cycle provision continues to be inadequate at the railway station. When will this be addressed? How has the station ended up with a 'not fit of purpose' bridge and when will this be resolved?**

Councillor Bick responded. Network Rail were aware of the problems and were keen to address them. The station builders were not used to designing for such high volumes of cyclists as those found in Cambridge. The additional cycle racks had been delayed by the slow down in the construction industry which was regrettable. Councillor Reid confirmed that the new station operator was keen to make improvements.

**(Q8) Public Question**

**Using Parkside as a coach station appears to be moving towards being a permanent arrangement. How much longer will this situation last?**

Councillor Rosenstiel responded. The Kiosk had been given temporary planning consent and this had been extended for a further period. It would not be further extended. In the long term the coach boarding locations would be an operator decision although it was hoped that these would be in the area of the railway station.

**(Q9) St Andrews Street Taxi Ranks**

Members discussed concerns that had been raised by local residents about the proposal to move the taxi rank from St Andrew's Street. Concerns were

raised about the impact on those with mobility issues. Reinstating the shuttle bus was suggested.

### **12/30/WAC Police and Safer Neighbourhoods**

The committee received a report from Inspector Poppitt regarding the policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2012. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details).

#### **Existing Priority: Speed Enforcement in Support of the 20mph limit**

Members were in favour of retaining this as a priority with the long-term solution being, a cultural change with consistent limits across the City, improved signage and consistent enforcement. Operation guidelines were discussed as per the report. The absence of an ability to send offenders on speed awareness training for offences involving a 20mph limit was discussed. Cllr Bick suggested that the possibility of introducing a local course could be investigated. This would be income generating.

#### **Hugh Kellett**

**There would be no difference in a course for 20mph or 30mph offences. The Police have failed to act on a priority set by this committee.**

#### **Mr Bowen**

**The Police could be seen as holding the resolution of this committee in contempt in failing to act on this matter.**

#### **Barry Higgs**

**The wording of the report avoids the issue of poor signage.**

Richard Preston confirmed that the current signage is sufficient to allow for prosecution. Speed cameras could be considered but there was no funding for these centrally and the County would only consider funding them where there was a risk of fatalities.

#### **Mr Lawton**

**No progress on this matter in 18 months and the Police should be upholding the law. Speedwatch is ready to work with the Police on this matter.**

**Richard Taylor**

**I would not support local courses but would support introduction on national courses. Non-locals could be forced to travel long distances to attend local courses if introduced. However, does the number of people ignoring the 20 mph limit demonstrate that this speed limit is being pursued when there is not public support for it?**

Members discussed the introduction of a city-wide 20mph limit. Councillor Cantrill confirmed that budget allocated had been made for this.

Members expressed their wish to see the police continue to enforce 20mph limits. Inspector Poppitt reminded members that their priorities are recommendations and that the final decisions were made by the Neighbourhood Action Group. This group of senior managers would decide if this priority was an effective use of police resources given the absence of any other supporting solutions.

Councillor Bick responded. Almost all recommendations agreed by this committee had been adopted and it would be regrettable if this situation changed. Councillor Hipkin requested that the committee acknowledge the Police advice when making their decisions.

**RESOLVED** (by 10 votes to 0 with one abstention) to reject to recommendation to discharge this priority.

**Existing Priority:** To reduce alcohol and group-related anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the City and Grafton areas.

Councillor Bick thanked the police for their hard work in this area and the success achieved. Some concerns were raised that ASB was seasonal and could return in the warmer months. Fast tracking a S30 order was discussed. Members stated that they would not be in favour of this but would be happy to attend an emergency meeting to discuss this should the need arise.

**RESOLVED** (by 10 votes to 0 with one abstention) to discharge this priority.

**Existing Priority:** Address anti-social cycling and reduce the incidence of cycle thefts across the area.

Members agreed that progress had been made on cycle thefts and were content to discharge this priority. The Serious Crime Squad would address large-scale cycle thefts.

Work to address anti-social cycling by improved signage was on-going and meetings were planned with the EIP team to see what could be achieved.

Councillor Whitebread requested improved signage in the Christ's Piece area. Councillor Cantrill would look into this.

**Action: Councillor Cantrill**

### **RESOLVED**

Anti-social Cycling: Agreed (by 8 votes to 0 with three abstentions) to retain this as a priority.

Cycle thefts: Agreed (unanimously) to discharge as a priority.

### **Emerging issues**

The emerging problem of thefts of mobile phones from evening venues was discussed and members expressed support for adding this as a priority.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) additional priority of mobile phone thefts from City licensed premises.

### **Priorities agreed:**

- I. Speed enforcement in support of the 20mph limit.
- II. Anti-social cycling in the West Central area.
- III. Mobile phone thefts from City licensed premises.

### **12/31/WAC Community Development and Leisure Grants**

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

Councillor Cantrill encouraged local groups to apply for grants out of cycle for events such as Jubilee Celebrations or Olympic related projects.

Members considered applications for grants as set out in the Officer's report. The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation responded to



member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

**RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to award the following:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Award</b>
Cambridge and County Folk Museum	to work with community groups to create special bunting based on people's memories of street parties.	£1,000
St Augustine's Church	to help fund a full programme of talks, concerts and social events for the local community.	£2,000
Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground	to run a one day community event.	£2,261

### **12/32/WAC Community Olympic Public Art Commission**

The committee received a presentation from the Director of Same Sky (project artist company) and Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Community Olympics Public Art Project.

The presentation outlined:

- (i) Same Sky wished to work with local artists, schools and community groups as part of the event.
- (ii) Same Sky proposed to undertake public art and carnival projects to promote community cohesion.
- (iii) Same Sky wished to showcase the event through a free show (serving as a rehearsal for the Olympics event) at an earlier local event. Nominations for such an event were requested.

Councillor Cantrill encouraged young people to get involved in the project.

**Mr Cooper**

**Is developer S106 contributions being used to fund this project?**

Councillor Cantrill responded. The public art element of S106 funding was being used for this project.

Volunteers, suggestions for events that Same Sky can engage with, comments or queries should be addressed to:

Dan Lake  
Project & Production Manager  
Same Sky  
[www.samesky.co.uk](http://www.samesky.co.uk)

The meeting ended at 11.00 pm

**CHAIR**