

**SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE**

15 July 2013  
6.30 - 10.45 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Ashton (Chair), Meftah (Vice-Chair), Blackhurst, Birtles, Dryden, McPherson, Pippas, Stuart and Swanson

**Area Committee Members:** County Councillors Ashwood and Taylor

Councillors Taylor left after the vote on item 13/38/SACd

**Officers:**

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Police Sergeant: James Stevenson

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

**13/29/SAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

The Committee Manager took the Chair whilst the South Area Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Blackhurst proposed, and Councillor Swanson seconded, the nomination of Councillor Stuart as Chair.

Councillor Dryden proposed, and Councillor McPherson seconded, the nomination of Councillor Ashton as Chair.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 4)** that Councillor Ashton be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Ashton assumed the Chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

Councillor Blackhurst proposed, and Councillor Pippas seconded, the nomination of Councillor Stuart as Vice Chair.

Councillor Ashton proposed, and Councillor Dryden seconded, the nomination of Councillor Meftah as Vice Chair

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 4)** that Councillor Meftah be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

### **13/30/SAC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Crawford.

### **13/31/SAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 9 May 2013 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

### **13/32/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes**

There were no matters arising.

### **13/33/SAC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Birtles	13/38/SACf	Personal: Lives in the same road as the application; and knows the Objector.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.
Councillor Pippas	13/38/SACj	Personal: Owns a property next to the Objector.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.

### **13/34/SAC Open Forum**

1. **A member of the public queried progress on a scooter park that had been requested for the Accordia development. Residents had been consulted on this proposal and now requested an update on progress.**
2. **Mr Weir also queried progress on the Accordia scooter park. He had been recently informed that the scooter park had not yet been approved by the council. Mr Weir asked SAC to champion the proposal in the next round of projects seeking developer contributions funding.**

The Urban Growth Project Manager provided an update that, since his report to SAC in May 2013, the Environment Scrutiny Committee in June had considered the process for the second priority-setting round of devolved decision making to area committees. Project ideas such as the Accordia scooter park proposal could be considered for s106 funding in the second round.

Councillor Stuart regretted how the Accordia scooter park had been handled. She had expected funding for it to be ring-fenced from developer contributions for projects around Accordia, but it was proposed slightly later than others and the developer contributions had by then been subsumed into the funds devolved to the South Area Committee.

The Urban Growth Manager clarified that the funding being referred to (the Newtown Community Development Capital Grant Programme) was specifically for the funding of community facilities, such as community centres and buildings. Proposals from Accordia, such as the scooter park, had not been eligible for this funding, but were eligible for the contribution types that had been devolved to SAC. These proposals could be considered as part of the second priority-setting round.

Councillor Ashton said that concerns from Cherry Hinton councillors and others about the developer contributions devolved decision-making process had been passed to officers by SAC. Officers had been asked to provide clearer details of the projects that had been prioritised in the first round and the funding available in the next priority-setting round.

Mr Weir mentioned that a petition from local residents and young people, in support of the Accordia scooter park proposal, had been compiled. He

hoped to be able to pass this to the Urban Growth Project Manager in due course.

- 3. Mr Carpen referred to the 2030 Vision and Shape Your Place documents. He asked how the City Council would put Shape Your Place and social media at the heart of its community development strategy.**

Councillor Ashton said that all City Councillors had received the County Council Shape Your Place document. This would be discussed by Council in future.

### **13/35/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods**

The Committee received a report from Sergeant Stevenson regarding the policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 9 May. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details). Previous priorities and engagement activity noted in the report were:

- i. Reduce the theft of pedal cycles in the South Area.
- ii. Combat the supply of drugs in the South Area.
- iii. Vehicle parking issues in Almoners Avenue and Mill End Road.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- i. Vehicle parking issues in Almoners Avenue and Mill End Road.
- ii. Cycle theft and abandoned cycles in Queen Edith's Ward.

**Action Point: Councillor Taylor to query cycle theft and abandoned cycle figures with city council officers.**

- iii. People from within and outside of the city visiting the open area known as 'the Lakes'. This is the area behind Spinney School. Residents in the surrounding area raised concerns regarding anti-social behaviour (ASB), pollution, traffic flow, vehicles obstructing the road, noise disturbance and safety of people visiting 'the Lakes' (generally without the land owners permission as the area was neglected).
- iv. ASB linked to scooter riders speeding in the Queen Edith's Way area.

The Committee **unanimously agreed** to discharge vehicle parking issues in Almoners Avenue and Mill End Road as a priority.

The following priorities were **unanimously agreed**:

- i. Reduce the theft of pedal cycles in the South area
- ii. Combat the supply of drugs in the South area.
- iii. Anti-social behaviour around the Spinney School area.

### **13/36/SAC Environmental Improvement Programme**

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP). The report outlined progress of existing schemes and new suggested schemes for 2013/14.

#### Existing Schemes: Progress

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager referred to progress on approved schemes as set out in his report.

#### New Schemes That Require Decisions

Members considered a number of 2013/14 schemes put forward for approval.

In response to Members' questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager answered:

- i. Pedestrian crossings were the responsibility of the County Council. SAC could allocate funding to implement these, but may prefer to allocate funding to other priorities.

SAC discussed the merits of requesting pedestrian crossings on Fendon Road and Fishers Lane.

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager said that delivery time for pedestrian crossing projects was likely to be one year, depending on county council actions. These would be a survey to evidence there was a need for a crossing, undertaking a consultation exercise then seeking Cabinet approval. The Cabinet could turn down the crossing schemes even if SAC felt they were a priority and had allocated funding to undertake consultation etc.

**Action Point: Councillor Ashton (as Committee Chair) to write to County Council requesting funding for a controlled crossing on Fendon Road.**

- ii. Funding from the War Memorial Trust was required to make Cherry Hinton and Trumpington War Memorial projects viable. So far, the Trust had declined funding for work on the Cherry Hinton War Memorial.
- iii. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager was awaiting details from the County Council regarding Langdale Close and Aberdeen Avenue Area (including Kingfisher Way) Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

Councillor Ashwood said a meeting was held 15 July 2013 to review issues around the TROs and requested £2,000 funding.

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)**:

- i. To allocate £63,000 of funding to the following list of proposed projects in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
  - Baldock Way – Verge Reinforcement
  - Bateman Street – New Tress and Improved Tree Pits
  - Babraham Road - Verge Reinforcement
  - Godwin Way - Amendments to Carriageway Layout
- ii. To approve the above projects for implementation, subject to positive consultation and final approval by local Ward Councillors.
- iii. To note the progress of existing schemes listed in Appendix C of the Officer's report.
- iv. To approve the delivery of the new minor traffic regulation orders listed in Appendix E of the Officer's report, at an estimated cost of £2000, funded by the remainder of the South Area Committee 2011/12 joint minor highway works budget.

### **13/37/SAC Re-Ordering Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

### **13/38/SAC Planning Applications**

#### **13/38/SACa 13/0310/FUL - Land between 2 & 3 Shaftesbury Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a three storey, detached dwelling with basement.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mrs Sennitt representing the BAARA Residents Association.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Accepted the principle of developing the site, but this application was not appropriate.
- ii. Expressed specific concerns regarding:
  - Over development of the site.
  - The design was out of keeping with the character of the neighbourhood and Conservation Area.
  - Height of the application, this would be taller than existing buildings in the street.
  - Overlooking.
  - Loss of parking area for existing residents and insufficient provision for parking in the application.

Objectors stated they had not been given correct information regarding the procedure for public speaking. The Committee adjourned for five minutes whilst the Chair ensured and confirmed everybody had received the correct information.

Objectors then asked if Councillors had any declarations of interest to make regarding this application. The Chair said Councillors had been asked if they wished to make any declarations of interest at the start of the meeting, but none had been declared (Members could of course do so as the meeting progressed). In response to the Objector's question, Councillor Stuart stated that she had no interest to declare.

Mr Race (Applicant) and Mr Poulson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 2 with 1 abstention)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:  
  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8;  
  
Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 4/11, 5/1, 5/14, 8/6, 8/10, 10/1;
2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, and the representations received relating to character, impact on the Conservation Area and residential amenity, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.
3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 31 October 2013, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste facilities,



waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2011) policy CS16 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

### **13/38/SACb 13/0518/FUL - 19 Worts Causeway**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Erection of one 3-bedroom one and a half storey house with car lodge and new access from Field Way on land to the rear of 19 Worts Causeway.

Mr Carroll (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Taylor (Queen Edith's Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 3)** to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendations in accordance with conditions delegated to officers.

### **13/38/SACc 13/0801/CAC - 46 Alpha Terrace**

The Committee received an application for application Conservation Area Consent.

The application sought approval for demolition of the existing detached two storey property and redevelopment of the site for residential development.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Bull.

The representation raised the following concerns:

- i. Loss of housing stock.
- ii. Intensification of site.
- iii. Impact on neighbour's amenities.
- iv. Anticipated disturbance from proposed construction work.

Mr Haysom (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

- 1 This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:  
  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003): P6/1, P9/8 P9/9  
  
Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/10, 3/12, 4/10 4/11, 5/1, 8/6 and 8/10
- 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.
- 3 In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

### **13/38/SACd 13/0800/FUL - 46 Alpha Terrace**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Demolish the existing building on 46 Alpha Terrace and build two new 3 and 4 bedroom semi-detached houses in its place.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Bull.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed specific concerns regarding the application relating to:
  - Planning Policy 3/10 character of the area.
  - Inadequate car parking space provision, which would exacerbate existing issues.
  - Design/appearance.
- ii. Suggested that conditions to control times when construction and demolition work could be undertaken would be ineffective if the application were approved.

Mr Haysom (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, plus the additional conditions as set out on the amendment sheet and below:

- 15: Large scale drawings of the construction of chimneys, plinths, cambered window heads, kneelers, quoins, decorative eaves & verge courses and other brickwork/stonework details to be submitted to the LPA and approved in writing. Development must take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

- 16: Full details of all lintels and sills to new/altered openings [for doors or windows, etc.] to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Development must take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

- 17: No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

- 18: No boiler flues, soil pipes, waste pipes or air extract trunking, etc. shall be installed until the means of providing egress for all such items from the new or altered bathrooms, kitchens and plant rooms has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Flues, pipes and trunking, etc. shall be installed thereafter only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11).

- 19: All new joinery [window frames, etc.] shall be recessed at least 50 / 75mm back from the face of the wall / façade. The means of finishing of the 'reveal' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation of new joinery. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

- 20: No new external joinery shall be installed until drawings at a scale of 1:20 of all such joinery (doors and surrounds, windows and frames and

balustrades, etc.) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

### Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003): P6/1 P9/8 P9/9

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/10, 3/12, 4/10 4/11, 5/1, 8/6 and 8/10

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.
3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the

period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 15 October 2013, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

### **13/38/SACe 13/0581/S73 12 Rosemary Lane**

The Committee received an application to vary planning permission.

The application sought approval to vary condition 2 of planning permission C/98/0601/FP (construction of two single storey extensions to offices and conversion of existing vacant unit into laboratories with associated (6 No.) fume extract flues) to allow B1a use.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

#### Reasons for Approval

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:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 4/13, 7/1, 7/2, 7/3, 8/4, 9/1, 9/4

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.

3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

### **13/38/SACf 13/0059/FUL - Parking Area Rear Of 66-68 Hartington Grove**

Councillor Birtles withdrew from discussion and did not vote.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Construction of two storey residential accommodation and single storey cycle store, following demolition of existing garages.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mrs Fabre.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Mrs Fabre was speaking on behalf of various neighbours.
- ii. Anticipated that student accommodation needs would be greater than what was provided for in the application.
- iii. Suggested implementing more measures to prevent anti-social behaviour.
- iv. Raised the following specific concerns:
  - Overbearing design.
  - Over development of site.
  - Proximity to neighbours.
  - Loss of light and over shadowing.

- The life style of student residents would not match the neighbourhood. Noise disturbance was anticipated.
  - Loss of parking space would exacerbate existing issues.
- v. Requested a shadow survey be undertaken.

Mrs Barker (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The combination of the proposed building's large footprint and its height produces a bulky and visually dominant building. It is considered that the proposal would dominate the amenity of adjacent properties to the north and west of the proposed building, namely occupants of No.66 Hartington Grove and No.57 Rock Road. It would fail to comply with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Local Plan (2006).

**13/38/SACg 13/0286/FUL - 14 Fishers Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing property and construction of 3 x3 bedroom dwellings with individual parking spaces

Councillor McPherson noted considerate construction condition was included in the Officer's report (condition 10), but asked for the minutes to record that the contractor would be expected to comply with this.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral



undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9;

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 4/13, 5/1, 5/14, 8/1, 8/2, 8/3, 8/5, 8/6, 8/7, 8/10 and 10/1;

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.
3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 30th July 2013, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as

detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

### **13/38/SACH 13/0681/FUL - 4 Topcliffe Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a full width two storey front extension with a projecting bay in the north east corner close to number 6.

Mr Davidson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mrs Brearley.

The representation raised the following concerns:

- i. Significant impact on street scene.
- ii. Design out of character to the area. Suggested this contravened policy 3/14 of the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.
- iii. Mass and scale of development.
- iv. Visually dominant and overbearing.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 4)** to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 4)** to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendations in accordance with conditions delegated to officers.

### **13/38/SACi 13/0346/FUL - 3 Chalk Grove**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey side extension.

Mrs Atkinson (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

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:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/14 and 8/10

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.
3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

**13/38/SACj 13/0466/FUL - 33 Queen Ediths Way**

Councillor Pippas withdrew from discussion and did not vote.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the development of a three storey building comprising seven two-bed residential flats.

Mr Mitham (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 3 with 1 abstention)** to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development would by virtue of its poor quality design and close proximity to the eastern and southern boundaries of the site result in a form of development that is bland and without contextual merit on this prominent corner plot location. The eastern elevation is poorly articulated and in combination with its scale and contrived roof form would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining occupier. The proposed building is also reliant on existing offsite landscaping to mitigate its design and dominance from Queen Ediths Way. As a result, the proposed development would be contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/12, which require development to respond positively to the local character of the area and have a positive impact on the setting of the site in terms of scale, form and detailing.
2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 8/3 and 10/1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.
3. In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is

sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.

### **13/39/SAC Enforcement Items**

#### **13/39/SACa Planning Enforcement Report - 28 Almoners Avenue Enforcement Report 2013**

The Committee received a report requesting authorisation to take formal enforcement action.

Site: 28 Almoners Avenue, Cambridge  
Breach: Unauthorised Development

On 9 May 2013 South Area Committee considered a report detailing development that had taken place at 28 Almoners Avenue which was not in accordance with the approved plans (application reference 11/0781/FUL).

The Committee resolved as follows:

- i. To reject the officer recommendation that the Head of Planning Services be authorised to close the investigation into unauthorised operational development at 28 Almoners Avenue on the grounds that is not expedient to pursue the matter further.
- ii. That a report authorising enforcement action be brought back to the next South Area Committee for consideration.

The 15 July South Area Committee report recommended that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to issue an enforcement notice under the provisions of S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), for unauthorised operational development at 28 Almoners Avenue, Cambridge. Currently, it is expected that the enforcement notice would contain the wording set out in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4 of the Officer's report (with such amendments as may later be requested by the Head of Legal Services).

Mr Brown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in objection to enforcement action.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Took issue with council procedures and details in the Officer's report.

- ii. Gave a history of the application and stated work occurred in-line with the design submitted to the Council.

The Committee:

Resolved (**by 6 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions**) to accept the officer recommendation that that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to issue an enforcement notice.

The meeting ended at 10.45 pm

**CHAIR**