

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

13 May 2010
Times Not Specified

Present: Councillors Blackhurst (Chair), Sanders (Vice-Chair), Al Bander, Dryden, Newbold and Stuart

10/17/SAC Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were recorded from City Councillor Amanda Taylor and County Councillors Carter, Heathcock and Shepherd.

10/18/SAC Declaration of Interest

10/21/SAC - Cllr Newbold declared a personal interest as Secretary of Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall.

10/21/SAC - Cllr Dryden declared a personal interest as a member of the committee of Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall.

10/25/SAC - (Planning Application – 10/0171/ADV) Cllr Sanders declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a mortgage holder with the Cambridge Building Society.

10/19/SAC Minutes of the meeting held 11th March 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th March 2010 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

10/20/SAC Open Forum

There were no questions in the open forum.

10/21/SAC Cherry Hinton Hall Improvement

The Green Open Spaces Manager and Green Open Spaces Officer introduced the report seeking approval to consult on the master plan for the re-development of Cherry Hinton Hall.

Mr Andrew Varley addressed the committee on behalf of a collective seeking to develop a City Farm within the city, and requested that the committee consider the inclusion of a City Farm option within the consultation process. The Green Open Spaces Manager confirmed that the City Council were keen to assist with the proposals, but that some difficulties may arise because it hadn't previously been identified as a potential option for the site. Cllr Newbold advised that the consultation to be undertaken by the Friends of Cherry Hinton would include a City Farm option.

Mr Varley asked a supplementary question seeking clarification on the relationship between the consultation processes being undertaken by the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall and the City Council. The Green Open Spaces Manager advised that the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall would be consulting with their membership, and that the City Council would be consulting with the wider public. It was further explained that at the conclusion of the consultation process the City Council and the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall would jointly consider the responses.

The committee expressed thanks to the officers and Robert Miles Associates for the excellent work undertaken to date. The committee agreed that the outputs of the consultation could go directly to Community Services Scrutiny Committee without further consultation with the South Area Committee.

The committee **Resolved** to

- a) Agreed the proposals and timescales as laid out within this report, and
- b) Instructed officers to proceed with wider public consultation on the Masterplan.

10/22/SAC Planning

10/23/SAC 10/0201/FUL - 2A Scotsdowne Road

a.	10/0201/FUL
Site	2A Scotsdowne Road
Proposal	Erection of 3no 2bed terrace dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow.
Recommendation	APPROVE

Public Speakers:	Mr William Norfolk – Objector
Decision:	<p>REFUSED (against Officer recommendation) by 4 votes to 3 votes on the Chairs casting vote, on the basis that the proposal was out of context and therefore contrary to Local Plan policy 3/4.</p> <p>Committee heard the criticisms of neighbours about the proposal, which was considered to be out of keeping, likely to cause traffic and parking issues and to constitute overdevelopment; and the views of the officer who expanded on why the proposal related appropriately to the buildings opposite and those in Alpha Terrace. Having debated the issues for some time Committee took the view that the site was part of the Scotsdowne Road and the bungalows and semi-detached houses in that road and not closely enough related to the buildings opposite and in Alpha Terrace, and was therefore out of context. On that basis only the application was refused</p> <p>REASON The introduction of the proposed terrace of three, 2-bedroom houses onto this site, where the bungalow 2A Scotsdowne Road currently stands, is unacceptable because such a built form is entirely alien to the character of Scotsdowne Road of which 2A is a part. A terraced form here cannot be seen to have drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of Scotsdowne Road, which is an essentially suburban street of detached bungalows and semi-detached houses. The development will not therefore be well integrated with the locality or contextually appropriate. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), and policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).</p>

10/24/SAC 10/0215/FUL - 39 Shelford Road

b.	10/0215/FUL
Site	39 Shelford Road
Proposal	Erection of 3 four-bed dwellings (following demolition of existing dwelling).

Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	None
Decision	<p>APPROVED (Unanimously) as per recommendation, subject to the completion of the section 106, - but with the variation of the reason for condition 2 given above; and additional condition, requiring agreement as to the siting of the garages and foundations of the garages to safeguard trees outside the site. Wording of the condition delegated to officers; the reason being to safeguard the wellbeing of trees outside the site in accordance with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL Condition:</p> <p>Notwithstanding the position of the proposed garages for plots 2 and 3 shown on the submitted drawings, that siting is not agreed and the development of the garages for the two bungalows to the rear of the plot may not proceed without the prior written agreement of the local planning authority regarding the siting of the said garages, their proposed foundations and a report on the implications of the foundations for nearby trees.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the nearby trees outside the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)</p>

10/25/SAC 10/0171/ADV - 23 High Street, Cherry Hinton

c.	10/0171/ADV
Site	23 High Street, Cherry Hinton
Proposal	Installation of 1 free-standing sign (non illuminated).
Recommendation	REFUSAL
Public Speakers:	None
Decision:	REFUSED (3 votes to 2 on the Chairs Casting Vote) in accordance with the officer recommendation.

10/26/SAC 10/0295/FUL - 11 Kinnaird Way

d.	10/0295/FUL
Site	11 Kinnaird Way
Proposal	Erection of two storey front and rear extensions.
Recommendation	APPROVE
Public Speakers:	Mr Robert Shepherd – Objector Mr Don Proctor – Agent
Decision:	APPROVED (Unanimously) subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report.

10/27/SAC 10/0262/FUL - 23 Kelsey Crescent

e.	10/0262/FUL
Site	23 Kelsey Crescent
Proposal	Erection of a part 1800mm, part 1200mm fence, enclosing existing grass verge area and change of use from public amenity space to private garden.
Recommendation	REFUSAL
Public Speakers:	Claire Desborough – Applicant
Decision:	APPROVED (against the officer recommendation) by 5 votes to 0 for the following reason; Having heard the explanation of the applicant as to why the fence had been erected in the position it had been and the reasoning of the officers as to why the development was considered unacceptable, and following discussion about the appearance of the development and its impact upon the wider area, Committee came to the view that the fencing is not out of context and does not have an adverse impact upon the open and spacious character of the estate and is not therefore in conflict with: East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 - Quality in the Built Environment; or Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/4 - Responding to Context

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 only of the debate leading to the grant of planning permission.

As the application is retrospective no conditions are required.

10/28/SAC 10/0249/FUL - 44 Kelsey Crescent

f.	10/0249/FUL
Site	44 Kelsey Crescent
Proposal	Erection of a close-boarded fence.
Recommendation	REFUSAL
Public Speakers:	Janine Ruby – Applicant
Decision:	<p>APPROVED (against the officer recommendation) by 5 votes to 0 for the following reason;</p> <p>Having heard the explanation of the applicant as to why the fence had been erected in the position it had been and the reasoning of the officers as to why the development was considered unacceptable, and following discussion about the appearance of the development and its impact upon the wider area, Committee came to the view that the fencing is not out of context and does not have an adverse impact upon the open and spacious character of the estate and is not therefore in conflict with:</p> <p>East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 - Quality in the Built Environment; or Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/4 - Responding to Context</p> <p>The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which</p>

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 only of the debate leading to the grant of planning permission.

As the application is retrospective no conditions are required.

10/29/SAC 10/0254/FUL - 113 Kelsey Crescent

g.	10/0254/FUL
Site	113 Kelsey Crescent
Proposal	Retrospective application for erection of a fence.
Recommendation	REFUSAL
Public Speakers:	
Decision:	<p>APPROVED (against the officer recommendation) by 5 votes to 0 for the following reason;</p> <p>Having heard the explanation of the applicant as to why the fence had been erected in the position it had been and the reasoning of the officers as to why the development was considered unacceptable, and following discussion about the appearance of the development and its impact upon the wider area, Committee came to the view that the fencing is not out of context and does not have an adverse impact upon the open and spacious character of the estate and is not therefore in conflict with:</p> <p>East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 - Quality in the Built Environment; or</p> <p>Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/4 - Responding to Context</p> <p>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.</p>

As the application is retrospective no conditions are required.

The meeting ended at Time Not Specified

CHAIR