

**WEST / CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

1 November 2012

7.00 - 10.10 pm

**Present:** Councillors Reiner (Chair), Kightley (Vice-Chair), Bick, Cantrill, Reid, Rosenstiel, Smith, Brooks-Gordon, Nethsingha and Whitebread

**Officers:**

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams

Operations and Resources Manager: Jackie Hanson

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**12/55/WAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Tucker and Councillor Hipkin.

**12/56/WAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)**

No interests were declared.

**12/57/WAC Planning Applications**

**3a** 12/0684/FUL 99 Grantchester Meadows Cambridge CB3 9JN

The Committee received an application for the demolition of existing single side extension and replacement with a three storey side extension, third storey including loft conversion plus single storey rear extension.

Mr Ken Neale addressed the Committee on behalf of himself and the residents of neighbouring properties. He made the following points in objection to the application:

- i. Concern that infill of gaps was changing the streetscape.
- ii. The extension would have an impact on access for neighbouring properties.
- iii. Neighbours would be faced with a blank expanse of brick.
- iv. Windows appear to be in random locations.

- v. Building hard onto the boundary would result in overlooking.

Mr Tom Hinton addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant in support of the application.

**RESOLVED** (by 4 votes to 2) to accept the officer recommendations and to approve the application for the following reasons:

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 ENV7 Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1 3/7 3/11 3/14 4/11

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.

### **12/58/WAC Declarations of interest (Main Agenda)**

No interests were declared.

### **12/59/WAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2012 were approved and signed as a correct record subject to a minor correction to the numbering in item 12/51/WAC Open Forum.

### **12/60/WAC Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**

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 stated that the work to-date on Midsummer Common had not required planning permission. Discussions were ongoing with the planning

department regarding planned changes to the gates. Councillor Cantrill would report back to this committee at a later date.

**Action**

## **12/61/WAC Open Forum**

### **(Q1) Richard Taylor**

**John Lawton had made an FOI request for the release the agendas, papers and minutes for the Cambridge Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) meeting. This was rejected and the strange reason given for this was that it would result in adverse publicity. Can the Councillor comment?**

Councillor Bick stated that he was aware of the situation. The decision was taken by the Council's Monitoring Officer. The NAG is an enabling and deployment group and does no set policy. Members were concerned that intrusive press coverage could constrain free and open debate.

### **(Q2) Emma Ching**

**When purchasing a new build property in a resident only parking area Miss Ching was informed that she was not entitled to a residents permit but could purchase visitor parking permits on a weekly basis. The Parking Authority now state that this an abuse of the system and has said that her car will be targetted for enforcement action. Miss Ching has a garage but this is used for storage.**

Councillor Rosentiel stated that this was County Council Policy. New build properties are not entitled to resident parking permits and visitor permits cannot be used in this way.

County Councillor Whitebread stated that the key issues appeared to be the advice given pre-purchase and who gave that advice.

Councillor Rosenstiel added that a case could be made to the Ombudsman if there was evidence of misinformation.

Councillor Kightley agreed to look into this matter and to assist Miss Ching.

**Action**

### **(Q3) Richard Taylor**

**Would the committee invite the Police and Crime Commissioner to the next West Central Area Committee?**

Members agreed that this was a good idea.

**Action**

**(Q4) Richard Taylor**

**The video advising Cambridge freshers on how to behave in Cambridge still contains suggestions that students are targeted in the City.**

Members thought this matter had been addressed.

**(Q5) Richard Taylor**

**Victims of harassment and intimidation are being advised to report serious crimes to the Council and not the Police. This will result in the Police having an incomplete picture of offences across the City.**

Councillor Bick stated that he had worked with the Police on a carefully crafted flyer. There had been no suggestion that residents report serious crime to the the Council. However, there are some issues such as environmental issues and estate or area based problems that are more appropriate for Council action.

**(Q6) Diana Forsyth**

**Gough Way residents are pleased to see improvements to Penarth Play equipment listed as a possible scheme for developer contributions funding and delivery in the short-term. The total cost of the scheme has been estimated by officers to cost around £75,000. To clarify, the list of play equipment submitted by residents was listed in order of importance, not necessarily expecting the full list to be funded. Any improvement to the play area would be very welcomed.**

**(Q7) Chris Wagner**

**The kitch upgrade at St Mark's church is listed as a longer-term project. What happens next? What additional information would be needed and what percentage of the project would be funded?**

The Urban Growth Projects Manager clarified that a report on longer-term projects would be presented to the Area Committee next February. More details on the next steps in the process, ahead of the report, will be communicated to ward councillors and workshop participants.

Councillor Cantrill suggested that the workshop had highlighted a number of projects across the area and those projects were at different stages of development. Ward Councillors would be asked to work with organisation to progress schemes.

### **12/62/WAC Community Development and Leisure Grants**

The Committee received a report from the Operations and Resources Manager regarding the allocation of Community Development and Leisure grants.

Members welcomed the application from Centre 33 and questioned why the full amount requested was not being awarded. The Officer suggested that the Community Development budget could make up the shortfall if necessary.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to award the following grants:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Award</b>
Friends of Midsummer Common	Running costs and replacement of mower.	£500
Centre 33	To increase skills of 10 young volunteers and enable them to undertake their first project.	£3,528
Windsor Road Residents Association	Administration, communications, social activities and meetings.	£250
Christ's Pieces Residents' Association	To create a programme of two lectures a year.	£500

### **12/63/WAC Devolved Decision-Making and Developer Contributions: Update Following West Area Workshop**

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager summarising suggested needs and project ideas for new or improved local facilities arising from the recent consultation workshop in the Area. The report

also assessed those projects in terms of eligibility for developer contributions funding and deliverability in the short-term (by the end of March 2014). Councillor Kightley reported that a number of representations had been received from Residents Associations and from Councillor Hipkin in Castle Ward, broadly in support of the range of projects under consideration.

Recommendation 2.2 of the Officer's report was amended to read:

To identify which of the proposals that are deliverable in the short-term to prioritise for delivery, subject to project appraisal and identification of appropriate funding for any associated revenue and maintenance costs.

Members discussed the proposal for improvements to pathways on Jesus Green and Midsummer Common (longer-term project, M05). It was suggested that this project be reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee as a project of strategic/city-wide importance, alongside the proposal to drain Jesus Green (M06). Councillor Cantrill stated that some of the paths are classified as highways and therefore, are County Council responsibility. County Councillor Whitebread agreed to investigate County Council funding and would report back to the next meeting. Members agreed to ask officers to highlight the importance attached to this project by the Area Committee as part of the prioritisation of the city/county council joint Cycleways Programme.

### **Action**

Councillor Bick reminded the Committee that future, additional funding could not be guaranteed. Funding short-term projects now could result in insufficient funding for longer-term projects, which might be of greater benefit to the local community.

Members discussed the merits of proposals to improve two play areas in Newnham (N18 and N19). Residents of Gough Way had highlighted a deficit of play equipment at Penarth Place play area. However, Cockcroft Place play area also had a need for equipment as many properties in the area lacked gardens. Members suggested that it might be harder to design something suitable for Cockcroft Place due to the limited space and the level of traffic in the area caused by the nearby school and nursery. Members agreed that the two play areas served different needs and that both had merit.

Councillor Kightley reported that Windsor Road Residents Association, The Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground and Richmond Road Residents' Association had emailed to express satisfaction with the process to date.

The proposal to improve the entrances to Histon Road Recreation Ground (C04) were discussed. Members expressed a desire to do something more than repair and repaint the existing gates – the report had highlighted that the incorporation of public art in this project could extend the time needed for project delivery. The successful combined EIP and Public Art project recently delivered in Wulstan Way (South Area) was cited as an approach the Committee may wish to consider. The committee suggested that local artists be used for any public art element of the project.

Members made the following points:

- i. Members asked for more information on outdoor table tennis tables and were directed to the existing tables at the Abbey Pool play area. An external funding bid had been made, so alternative funding might be available for this project.
- ii. Strategic projects benefiting more than one area of the city would be considered at the January Community Services Committee for city-wide funding.
- iii. The costing for improved access to Midsummer Common orchard (M03) appeared to be over-stated and a clearer estimate would be investigated.

Members were reminded that, with the exception of applications for grant applications to other organisations which were ready to be processed, the Area Committee would need to limit their short-term priorities to three projects for delivery by the end of March 2014. Recognising that the other area committees would also be identifying their own short-term project priorities as well, it was important to make sure that the overall project delivery programme was realistic and achievable in the context of organisational capacity.

Members agreed that, should it be possible to deliver the priority projects sooner than March 2014, their next priority would be to consider one or both of the improvements to the play areas at Penarth Place and Cockcroft Place (N18 and N19).

All the projects being prioritised will be subject to project appraisal and local consultation in order to develop the details of the projects.

**Resolved to;**

- i. Note the summary of all consultation feedback arising from the West/Central Area workshop and related emails

- ii. Agree (on a show of hands) the following proposals that were deliverable in the short-term to prioritise for delivery, subject to project appraisal and identification of appropriate funding for any associated revenue and maintenance costs.

A01 Seats and benches in parks (Area-wide)

C04 Improved entrances to Histon Road Recreation Ground (Castle)

M03 Improved access to Midsummer Common orchard (Market)

In addition, the following project was agreed unanimously

M01 Community meeting room at Centre 33 (Market), as a community facilities grant which could be processed quickly.

- iii. Agree Table 2 of the Officer's report, with the addition of the eligible components of item M05 (Jesus Green and Midsummer Common pathways) as city-wide ideas from West Central Area Committee as possible uses of city-wide developer contributions funding to be reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in January 2013. Top priority projects were agreed to be M05 and M06.

The meeting ended at 10.10 pm

**CHAIR**