

**WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE**

14 November 2013

7.00 - 10.55 pm

**Present:** Councillors Kightley (Chair), Reiner, Bick, Cantrill, Hipkin, Reid, Rosenstiel and Smith

City & County Councillor Hipkin

County Councillor Nethsingha

**Officers present:**

Dave Prinsep: Head of Property Services

Toby Williams: Principal Planning Officer

Tim Wetherfield: Urban Growth Project Manager

Claire Tunnicliffe: Committee Manager

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**13/63/WCAC Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Tucker and County Councillor Cearns

Due to prior commitments, it was noted that Councillors Bick, would be arriving late.

**13/64/WCAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Smith	13/65/WCACb 13 /1280/FUL	Personal: Two of the objectors are known to her.
Councillor Rosenstiel	13/65/WCACc 13/1122/FUL	Personal: One of the objectors is known to him.

**13/65/WCAC Planning Items**

**3a** 13/1360 FUL - 89 Barton Road, Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of a bungalow and the erection of a new two storey dwelling.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Professor Smiley, speaking on behalf of local residents.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The proposed development would have a negative impact on the Lake which would be dominant and out of keeping with the rural setting.
- ii. The floor space of the proposed design is similar to the two immediate neighbouring properties.
- iii. Impacts on the amenity value of the lake.
- iv. Does not fit the context of the area.
- v. The proposal exploits the site and existing footprint.
- vi. The bungalow was built by architect Peter Lord and should be protected
- vii. Loss of privacy to surrounding properties
- viii. Loss of habitat.
- ix. The proposed design is too big and represents over development and a more modest building should be proposed.

The Committee:

**Resolved (5 votes to 2 )** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and subject to an additional condition relating to habitat protection as follows:

'The biodiversity mitigation measures set out within the submitted Applied Ecology Report of Nov 2013 shall be carried out prior to demolition and maintained during the development of the site. These shall include measures to minimise silt laden run-off entering the lake through the use of straw bales pegged onto the ground surface in a continuous line at the northern end of the back garden. The bales should be monitored and maintained as necessary for the duration of the demolition and construction or a similar system detailed within a construction method statement shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The garden area to the south of the bales should be off-limits to demolition and construction operations, including the storage of materials, in order to maintain a development free buffer zone between the construction area and the lake. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling, the biodiversity enhancement measures (bat boxes and brick swift nests) shall be incorporated into the east and west elevations of the proposed new dwelling and shall be retained as such.

Reason: In order that adequate provision is made to maintain and enhance

biodiversity in proximity to Bolton Pit Lake, a Local Nature Reserve, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/6.'

**3b** 13/1280/FUL- 50 Gough Way, Cambridge

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extensions to the existing property including a detached enclosed BBQ area in the rear garden and a detached bin/cycle store at the front.

The extensions were to the front, rear and side of the property.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Mr Scrase, speaking on behalf of the owners of No 52 Gough Way.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The proposal would be contrary to policy 3/14 and draft plan policy 58.
- ii. The application nearly doubles the size of the original house.
- iii. Would dominate the existing street scene.
- iv. The proposed garage would block the light in the sitting room window of No 52, which acquired a prescriptive right to light not later than 1984, twenty years after the house was built.
- v. The area had suffered serious flooding from Bin Brook in the past and the proposed plans would half the space available between the two houses for flood water to escape.
- vi. Location of the bin /cycle store is intrusive.

Mr Johns (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Hipkin proposed that the proposal in the Officer report be considered in two parts:

A) Works to include erection of a two storey front extension, part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension.

B) A separate cycle/bin store is also proposed within the design, located at the front of the dwelling. The cycle/bin store will also propose a new footpath to/from the existing public footpath.

The Committee **resolved unanimously** to agree to the split the proposal into two.

The Committee:

**Resolved (7 votes to 1 )** to grant the application for planning permission for the erection of a two storey front extension, part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension, in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer

**Resolved (1 Vote to 6, with 1 abstention)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve planning permission for a separate cycle/bin store, located at the front of the dwelling.

**Resolved (1 Vote to 6, with 1 abstention)** to refuse the application for a separate cycle/bin store, located at the front of the dwelling contrary to the Officer recommendations for the following reason:

1. The detached cycle/bin store, by reason of its siting within the front garden of the property, would appear overly prominent and out of character with the appearance of the street, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/12 and 3/14.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:**Additional Condition**

No development shall take place until details of flood proofing and resilience measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The flood proofing and resilience measures shall be:

Either ;

That floor levels within the proposed development are set no lower than existing levels AND, flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate.

Details of any flood proofing / resilience and resistance techniques, to be included in accordance with 'Improving the flood performance of new buildings' CLG (2007)

Or;

Floor levels within the extension will be set 300mm above the known or modelled 1 in 100 annual probability river flood (1%) or 1 in 200 annual probability sea flood (0.5%) in any year. This flood level is the extent of the Flood Zones

This must be demonstrated by a plan that shows finished floor levels relative to the known or modelled flood level. All levels should be stated in relation to Ordnance Datum. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To mitigate any adverse impact from flooding (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7 and 4/13)

**3c 13/1122/FUL - 6 John Street Cambridge**

The Committee received a revised application for full planning permission.

The application sought consent for the erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Mr Epps, owners of 22 Grafton Street speaking on behalf of local residents.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The application is virtually the same as the previously rejected application.
- ii. None of the concerns from the last application seem to have been addressed.
- iii. Goes against the Local Plan.
- iv. The application would create a precedent.
- v. The property already has a two storey extension.
- vi. The proposed dimensions could be reduced.
- vii. The design and size of the extension is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

Mr Virdee (Applicant) spoke in support of this application.

County Councillor Nethsingha addressed the Committee on this application:

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Inappropriate development.
- ii. The height has only been reduced by 500mm.

- iii. The mass of the building would visually dominate the existing street scene.
- iv. Would destroy a small but green open space.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 Vote to 3)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 5 Vote to 3)** to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendations for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its width and proximity to no.36 Grafton Street, would unreasonably visually dominate the residential amenity of the occupants of no.36 Grafton Street contrary to policy 3/14(b) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

**3d 13/1174/ADV** - The Co-Op, 3 Grantchester Street, Cambridge  
The Committee received an application for advertisement consent.

The application sought approval of the installation of an externally illuminated fascia sign and non-illuminated wall sign.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for advertisement consent permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**13/66/WCAC      Chair's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed Dave Prinsep, Head of Property Services, to his first meeting. Mr Prinsep had replaced Deborah Simpson, Head of Human Resources as the Lead Officer for West / Central Area Committee.

**13/67/WCAC      Matters and Actions arising from the Minutes**

Update on Outstanding Issues:

**13/58/WCAC: Status of the Commemorative Bin on Parkers Piece:**

Mr Prinsep, Head of Property Services, informed the Committee that the bin had been a trial of a new design, with consideration given to using the bin for sharing information about the site where the bin stood. The bin shared information relating to the history of Parkers Piece hence the reference to the Football Association rules. It was not intended to be commemorative but informative.

The placing of this bin and the plaque relating to the FA rules coincided with discussions about public art to commemorate the FA rules, these were not linked, although the timing may have suggested they were. – **CLOSED**

**13/58/WCAC: Why had the University Sports Centre been opened without an approved management plan?:**

Councillor Cantrill advised that the matter had been taken up with Officers and a letter had been sent to the University in relation to the breach of its condition (a copy of the letter is attached to the original set of minutes to this meeting).

The University was currently putting together a proposal for consideration for the pay and play access to the gym / fitness area and introduction of concessionary rates. It was hoped that an agreement would be reached within the next month and the new arrangements in place in the New Year.

Councillor Cantrill reminded the committee that there was a condition under s106 that if an agreement could not be reached for the West site the Council could insist that indoor facilities should be provided on the North West site. - **ONGOING**

**13/68/WCAC Declaration of Interest (Main Agenda)**

No declarations were made on items on the main agenda.

**13/69/WCAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 5 September 2013 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments of item 13/61/WCAC (replacement underlined and original ~~struck through~~).

**13/61/WCAC: Developer Contributions Devolved Decision-Making: 2nd Round Short-Listing for West/Central Area**

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project

Manager regarding short-listing proposals for the second round of developer contributions devolved decision-making.

The report provided an update on the availability of devolved developer contributions, examples of project costs such as community facilities grants in the region of £80,000 to £125,000 and feedback from the recent 'refresher' consultation on local project ideas.

Members were asked to identify their short-listed options with the Urban Growth Project Manager advising that a follow-up report to the Area Committee in November would assist Members in prioritising around four of the short-listed options.

Individual Members spoke in support of their preferred projects. In considering the possibility of making the £50,000 community facilities grant to Great St Mary's Church an immediate priority for devolved funding, it was noted that the project would benefit local residents and was 'ready to go'. ~~This would not reduce the number of priorities available in the second round, leaving £250,000 of devolved community facilities contributions for prioritising other community facility projects in the second round. In this regard, Members also highlighted the particular local importance of proposals at St Augustine's Church Hall and St Mark's Church Hall, albeit that these projects were not yet 'ready to go' and that more details would be needed. Further information would be provided in the priority-setting report in November.~~

~~The possibility was discussed of making the grant to the project at Great St Mary's Church conditional on confirmation of funding, at the same time for the projects at St Mark's Church Hall and St Augustine's Church Hall, although this was not formalised by a resolution.~~

### The Committee:

#### **Resolved (unanimously) to:**

- i. prioritise the following project ideas straight away (without the need for a follow-up report), given their immediate and easy deliverability, subject to project appraisal (as appropriate):
  - No 3: Great Mary's Church Development subject to the Community Facilities funding having been allocated as set out below and thus securing funding for these projects.
  - No 12: Better signposting of footpath to Grantchester from Lammas Land car park.



ii. Short-list the following project ideas to be considered in more detail in the priority-setting report in November 2013, noting that the Community Facilities funding allocated subject to project appraisal and as set out below.:

### Community Facilities

- No 1: Upgrade kitchen / storage at St Augustine's Church Hall — funding allocated of £ 100.000 subject to project appraisal.
- No 4: Kitchen extension and lobby at St Mark's Church Hall — funding allocated of £150.000 subject to project appraisal.

### Open Spaces

- No 7 & 8: Noticeboards, seating and nesting boxes for Histon Road and Trim Trail at Histon Road Recreation Ground.
- No 15: Lighting ~~where paths cross in the middle of the~~ across Lammas Land path and ~~LED lighting~~ on the Driftway.
- Explore whether it would be possible to provide an electricity supply for Jesus Green and Parker's Piece.

### Play Areas

- No 20: Add a climbing frame and other play equipment at Histon Road Recreation Ground.
- No 21: Add a rope pulley at Lammas Land.
- No's 22 & 23 combined: New play area for North Newnham including Wilberforce / Adams / Clerk Maxwell Roads area, possibly at Cockcroft Place.

### Sports Facilities

- No 24: Sport facilities with a teenage focus in the Area, possibly using some of the ideas brought forward in the report but subject to a thorough review.
- Sports facilities with a Newnham focus – proposals to be developed possibly taking into account ideas Nos 26,28 & 29.
- ~~Sports facilities with a Newnham focus – proposals to be developed taking account of current ideas Nos. 26, 28 & 29 (resurface Lammas Land tennis court and add basketball hoops; learner pool at Sheeps Green & floodlights for multi-use games area at Newnham Croft School).~~

iii. To refer the following project to the strategic list of project ideas for city-wide funding:

- No 11: New Open Spaces Centre on Jesus Green or Midsummer Common.

### **13/70/WCAC Open Forum**

#### **1) Mr Mark Reader -**

**Wished to advise the Committee of the following:**

- **St Augustine's was deemed a thriving community hub, used by a wide variety of community groups of all ages.**
- **The Church was seeking a grant of £100,000 to provide further meeting and event space, upgrade the existing kitchen, enhance storage, remodel the entrance and provide a disabled accessible toilet.**
- **The improvements would allow the Church Hall to meet the increased demands that the Darwin Green development would have on community facilities in the area and help provide additional activities for the elderly.**
- **The development proposed was a staged process dependent on the success of funding; in addition to the £100,000 grant, £25,000 would be provided by the Church, leaving £175,000 to be raised to complete the entire project.**

A) Councillor Kightley

The matter would be discussed in detail under item 9 of the agenda.

#### **2) Mr Gattiss**

**Would the Committee consider instructing Officers to undertake a safety study of the cycleway/ footpath between Warwick Road and Windsor Road?**

**There is a blind spot when exiting the Warwick Road end due to the installation of a five foot wooden fence. Mr Gattis stated that he would like to see the City Council replace the fencing with a low level open paling wooden fence and pedestrian right of way signage at both ends of the passage way.**

A) Councillor Kightley

Andrew Preston, Project Delivery & Environmental Improvement Manager had sent an e-mail to Mr Gattiss providing details of safety recommendations.

However the City Council were not responsible for the public highway but there could be an opportunity of possible partnership working with County Council to resolve the issue. No doubt Mr Preston would be happy to discuss the matter further.

Councillor Nethsingha

There was a County Council Officer responsible for safe routes to school and she would pass on the relevant contact details to this particular Officer - **ACTION**

**3) A member of the public.**

**Could Councillors give an update of the ranking system on St Andrew Street which was reported at the last meeting that equipment would be installed in November 2013?**

A) Councillor Rosenstiel

The equipment would be in by the end of March 2013 although work had started at Drummond Street. It was likely that the delay was due to the production of the technology and that a precise finishing date for delivery should be obtained from Cambridgeshire County Council – **ACTION**.

**4) Martin Lucas – Smith (Chair of Cambridge Cycle Campaign).**

**Will the Committee give continued support to the LIT (Lights instead of Tickets) cycle scheme, and what action should the Police take on other problems like speeding vehicles and parking on cycle lanes, so there is not a misconception that the Police are only focusing on one type of vehicle.**

A) Councillor Kightley

A letter would be sent to Police Inspector Steve Poppet, who would be present at the next meeting of the West / Central Area Committee, to enquire on the progress of the scheme, although there seemed to be no improvement and questioned if a stricter penalty should be enforced – **ACTION**.

Councillor Cantrill

The Police Commissioner when he last attended a West / Central Area meeting spoke in support of the 20mph speed limit in the City and he should be contacted to enquire what steps were being taken for enforcement on other vehicle users – **ACTION**.

**Q5) Jon Lawton (Chair of the Brunswick Resident's Association).**

**Would the Committee consider in advance of the next West / Central Area meeting when Police priorities will be set, adding enforcement of the 20mph speed limit specifically in Maids Causeway, Newmarket Road, but also, not limited to adjoining streets such as Jesus Lane and Emmanuel Road?**

**A) Councillor Kightley.**

The Comments would be taken into consideration when setting the Police priorities at the next meeting.

**Q6) Mr Richard Taylor**

**Would like to suggest to the Committee that when the toilets on Jesus Green are refurbished that they are built in a robust matter to ensure that they can stay open later. There is a lack of public toilets which remain open late in the City.**

**A) Councillor Rosenstiel**

It was not just an issue of robustness to have extended opening times of public conveniences but there were other issues that needed to be addressed. People using licenced premises at night should use the licenced facilities unlike members of the public who are out shopping during the day and have access to the public facilities.

**Councillor Bick**

Refer the matter to Councillor Swanson (Executive Councillor for Environment & Waste Services) regarding the operational times of the public conveniences in the City Centre and ask why some of the public facilities should shut early afternoon as stated by Mr Taylor – **ACTION**

**Q7) Mr Richard Taylor**

**Would the Committee consider in advance of the next West / Central Area meeting when police priorities will be set, asking the Police representatives the following:**

- **Could they include in their report how, when and where are Tasers being used in Cambridge?**
- **Why did the Police try to recruit a Cambridge University student to spy on those students who are members of the Student Union?**

**A) Councillor Rosenstiel**

There is possibly more to the situation than has been described.

## **13/71/WCAC S106 Proposals of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Plan**

The Committee received a report from Dan Clarke, Capital and Funding Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council, informing Members of the process for allocation Corridor Area Transport Plan (CATP) s106 funding.

Mr Clarke advised that he welcomed the views of the Committee on the range of proposed projects highlighted in the report and their proposals for additional schemes for future consideration and assessment for funding.

Mr Clarke asked for proposals to be e-mailed direct to himself -**ACTION**

Councillor Knightley noted that although 3.1 of the report stated that the Madingley Road Cycleway Improvement was complete, this was not the case. This meant that that the spending of the total funding from s106 was complete. Mr Clarke confirmed that there were various funding avenues where the remainder of the monies could be obtained from to complete the project.

Councillor Reid requested further detail on the on-going ring road signage project which Mr Clarke agreed to send on.

Initial suggestions were then put forward:

- i. Completion of Madingley Road cycle way to the Park and Ride site.
- ii. Improve cycling facilities on Queens Road.
- iii. Improve bus service for City residents.
- iv. Improve cycle access at the junction of Northampton Street, Castle Hill and Magdelene Bridge.
- v. Increase awareness of cycle priority in areas of the City such as St Andrews Street, Sidney Street and Downing Street.
- vi. Cycling improvements on the junction Mill Road, Trumpington Street and Fen Causeway roundabout.
- vii. A detailed study to determine how the inner ring road could be made safer for cyclists.
- viii. Improve and extend the scope of the Huntingdon Road cycle scheme.

Councillor Reid recommended viewing the cycle accident statics when scrutinising the projects for funding.

The following suggestions were put forward by members of the public present:

- i. Improve worn out pedestrian and cyclist signage in the city, such as that on Parker's Piece.
- ii. Improve pedestrian safety on Mount Pleasant and Shelly Road.
- iii. Extend the suggested study of the inner road from Newmarket Road to Newnham.

### **13/72/WCAC Developer Contributions Devolved Decision-Making: 2nd Round Priority-Setting for West/Central Area**

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager which invited Members to identify its priorities for the second round of developer contributions devolved decision making, which would be taken forward once the first round priorities had been completed.

Mr Wetherfield asked the Committee to confirm from the report the following priorities set below, and identify two other projects from the short listed options on table 2 of the report.

A: Upgrade kitchen/storage at St Augustine's Church Hall up to £100,000

B: Kitchen/lobby extension at St Mark's Church Hall, up to £150,000

Mr Wetherfield stated that he wished to update the Committee of the following:

- St Mark's Church had been successful in the tree appeal.
- The 'Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground' had advised that their preferred choice would be the climbing frame and additional play equipment, their second choice, the additional seating and bird nest boxes.
- With regard to electricity supply on Parker's Piece there could be possible opportunities for linking to the same lighting conduits. Any suggestions for an electricity substation, which might be needed to supply electricity for large events, would need to be considered in the context a conversation area.

Councillor Cantrill queried whether s106 community facilities grants would count towards the four second round priorities due to limited resource being used. Project delivery would be carried out by the grant recipients and suggested that three projects, not two, could be identified at the meeting.

Mr Wetherfield advised that it was important to make sure the overall programme of priority projects across the city was fair,

manageable and achievable, with a consistent approach being taken to all Area Committees. However if by next Spring it became apparent that some of second round priorities were straightforward to deliver, there may be scope for more second round priorities to be taken forward within available staffing capacity.

A member of the public, Mr John Lawton, suggested rather a substation on Parker's Piece the electricity supply could be found elsewhere and delivered by a cable.

Councillor Rosenstein responded that there was a substantial piece of land beside Hobson pavilion which could be used to place the substation. However this project fell under the Council's strategic City Wide events and was not appropriate for West / Central Area s106 money. Mr Wetherfield advised that the same could apply to Jesus Green.

Members of the Committee spoke in favour and support of their suggested projects.

Councillor Cantrill advised that he would wish to have minuted the lighting of the cycle path being discussed was that which runs from Newnham Road to Fens Causeway, starting at the junction of Newnham Road and Barton Road, going between the tennis court and the bowling green ending at Fens Causeway.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to prioritise up to £100,000 and up to £150,000 respectively of the available devolved community facilities contributions for improvements to St Augustine's Church Hall (Castle ward) and St Mark's Church Hall Newnham ward), subject to project appraisal, planning approval, community use agreements and other sources of funding needed for project delivery being secured.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to short list the following two options to prioritise from devolved developer contributions (taken from page 5 of the Officers report –(replacement underlined and original ~~struck through~~):

- i. Item C: Lighting / solar studs on along the diagonal cycle Driftway & ~~across the paths~~ on Lammas Land.

- ii. Items E & F (combined): Histon Road Rec improvements: ~~(1) noticeboard seating, nesting boxes and (2) a trim trail and climbing frame.~~

**Resolved (unanimously)** to instruct officers to explore the feasibility of specific options for play area provision in North Newnham, to be reported back to a future meeting of the Area Committee for consideration.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to instruct Officers to consult local councillors about options for sports facilities in the West/Central Area with a teen focus and sports facilities with a Newnham focus and to report proposals to a future meeting of the Area Committee for consideration subject to appropriate consultation and project appraisals.

The meeting ended at 10.55 pm

**CHAIR**