

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE3 March 2014
7.00 - 10.15 pm**Present**

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

Area Committee Members: County Councillors Ashwood and Taylor

Councillor Taylor left after the vote on item 14/20/SAC

Councillor Ashwood left after the vote on item 14/21/SACa

Councillor Pippas left after the vote on item 14/21/SACc

Officers:

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams

Senior Planning Officer: John Evans

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers in Attendance:

Cycling Projects Team Leader (County Council): Mike Davies

Police Sergeant: James Stevenson

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**14/11/SAC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Birtles, Crawford and Dryden.

14/12/SAC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Pippas	14/21/SACd	Personal and prejudicial: Lives in the same road as the application. Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.

Councillor Swanson	14/21/SACd	Personal: Knows the applicant.
--------------------	------------	--------------------------------

14/13/SAC Minutes

The minutes of the 13 January 2014 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

14/14/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.

14/15/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes

- i. **14/5/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Taylor to discuss issue of safety on shared cyclist / pedestrian pavements with County Council Highways Officers.”**

Councillor Taylor has liaised with Councillor Crawford and the County Council Cycling Team. Proposals for schemes are being worked on currently.

- ii. **14/5/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Ashton (as Committee Chair) to write to local schools and colleges to invite students to attend future South Area Committee meetings.”**

Letters have been written to the Principals of Long Road College, Hills Road College and Netherhall School. To date, only acknowledgements of receipt have been received.

- iii. **14/9/SAC Consultation on Draft Community Safety Partnership Priorities 2014-15 “Action Point: Liz Bisset to signpost details regarding immobilize.com.”**

Details were circulated to South Area Committee (SAC) Members and will also be published on the Community Safety webpage.

iv. 14/7/SAC Developer Contributions Devolved Decision-Making: 2nd Round Priority-Setting “Action Point: Tim Wetherfield to check if multi-use games areas are located in each city ward.”

MUGAs can be found at: Nightingale Ave Rec, Trumpington Rec, St Alban's Road Rec, Nuns Way, Romsey Rec and Thorpe Way. There is also a half-size MUGA at Kathleen Elliot Way and a junior MUGA is to be installed at Coleridge Rec this spring.

It may also help to know that there are basketball courts at: Trumpington Rec; St Matthews Rec; Romsey Rec; Nun's Way; Green End Road; Ditton Fields and Coldham's Lane.

14/16/SAC Decisions Taken Regarding S106 Projects

14/16/SACa SAC RoD - Cherry Hinton Recreation Play Area Improvements

The decision was noted.

14/16/SACb SAC RoD - Improvements to Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground Skate Park

The decision was noted.

14/17/SAC Open Forum

1. Dr Harris informed SAC about progress regarding the pedestrian bridge across Hobson's Conduit:

- The outline planning application was approved in November 2012 for a bridge to link two communities across the waterway.
- The Hobson Conduit Bridge Group has been constituted as a not for profit group. They are seeking a licence from the City Council to construct the bridge. A consultation is required before work can occur. The consultation is due to start 1 June 2014.
- Asked for clarification on the consultation purpose and process.
- Asked SAC to help take the bridge proposal forward.

Councillor Ashton referred to the response from Adrian Ash (Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces) sent immediately prior to

this SAC meeting. There were legal matters that needed to be addressed before the bridge could be taken forward. Councillor Ashton responded on behalf of SAC to say that the Committee would be happy to support the bridge proposal, but had to be mindful of the legal issues raised in the Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces' email.

ACTION POINT: Councillor Ashton to discuss with Councillor Reiner (Executive Councillor for Public Places) and Adrian Ash (Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces) how to expedite issue of Hobson Conduit bridge to implement it as quickly as possible.

Councillor Stuart said that SAC were aware the project aimed to bring communities together. She had been advised by officers that a consultation was required in June 2014 as it may raise different issues to one held previously. As a land owner of one of the river banks where the bridge would be located, the City Council felt duty bound to ensure people have an opportunity to make their views known.

- 2. Mr Weir said the Hobson Conduit Bridge was an important issue to the County Council, officers supported the proposal. Mr Weir suggested that both the City and County Councils may wish to adopt the bridge.**
- 3. Mr Cray asked City and County Council Councillors and Officers to support the Hobson Conduit Bridge proposal.**

14/18/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods - South Area Committee

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

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 4 November 2013. 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:

- Reduce the theft of pedal cycles in the Newtown area.
- Combat the supply of drugs in South area.
- Tackle vehicle parking offences around school premises across the South area and in Mill End Road.

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Ms Turpington raised the following issues:

- **She works with Camsight and RNIB.**
- **Raised concerns regarding obstructions on the pavement.**
- **Suggested there was a lack of pavement space in the south area when construction workers were undertaking road works/resurfacing.**
- **Parking on the pavement forced people to walk in the road.**
- **Safety signs placed on pavements were hazards as people could fall over them.**

Sergeant Stevenson said that parking on pavements was only illegal when it caused an obstruction. He asked members of the public to report any incidents on the Police 101 telephone number. The Police were particularly interested to know if deliveries were being made to specific premises, so that the Police could talk to premises owners and delivery drivers.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- i. Pavement parking in the south area of the city.
- ii. Issues relating to Balfour Beatty streetlight replacement work. SAC were advised concerns should be reported to the County Council or Balfour Beatty out of hours number to be addressed.
- iii. Motorists encroaching on premise's/people's driveways or 'H' lines in front of driveways when parking.
- iv. Parking in front of schools obstructing residents and other drivers. The inconvenience caused could be described as anti-social behaviour. Traffic Wardens were asked to ticket obstructive drivers if this was discharged as a police priority.
- v. Thefts from motor vehicles in the Queen Edith's and Trumpington areas. Specifically vehicles parked on construction sites. This was less of an issue in Queen Edith's as construction sites were smaller and in residential areas, which provided less chances for opportunist thieves.
- vi. The supply of drugs in the south area.
- vii. The number of burglaries in the Queen Edith's area affecting commercial and domestic buildings.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

- i. Combat the supply of drugs in the South area.
- ii. Target the increase in dwelling burglary in the Cherry Hinton area.
- iii. Target the increase in thefts from motor vehicles in the Trumpington area.

Sergeant Stevenson reiterated that members of the public could report any incidents on the Police 101 number. This would allow the Police to build up intelligence on criminal activities.

SAC expressed their thanks to Sergeant Stevenson and team for all their hard work.

14/19/SAC Hills Road Traffic and Safety Scheme

The Committee received a report from the Cycling Projects Team Leader.

The report informed SAC Members about the proposal for traffic and road safety improvements on Hills Road, between Cherry Hinton Road and Long Road. The proposals aimed to improve conditions for pedestrians, bus users and cyclists. Public consultation for the scheme runs from 4 March to 7 April 2014.

The Cycling Projects Team Leader made the following additional points:

- i. Cambridge had successfully applied for Department for Transport Cycle City funding.
- ii. The intention was to make cycling a sustainable form of transport in Cambridge, together with walking and public transport.
- iii. People did not feel safe cycling, the project hoped to change this perception.
- iv. Three options would be consulted upon from 4 March to 7 April 2014.
 - Option 1 - Fully segregated cycle lanes.
 - Option 2 - Raised kerb (hybrid) segregated cycle lanes.
 - Option 3 – A combination of the fully segregated and raised kerb cycle lanes.
- v. The new segregated cycle routes would complement the City Council's rollout of 20mph zones and cycle parking, as well as other cycling projects in the city including The Chisholm Trail and the new station multi storey cycle park.
- vi. "Floating bus stops" would be included in the Plan, as used in London and Brighton.
- vii. Welcomed the views of SAC.

In response to Members' questions the Cycling Projects Team Leader said the following:

- i. Cyclists would have priority at floating bus stops. This would be monitored in trials and could be amended through the consultation.

- ii. The purpose of the Traffic and Safety Scheme was to upgrade facilities for bus and cycle users.
- iii. City and County Council Access Officers had been involved in the project to ensure the views of disabled, mobility and sensory impaired people were represented. Local schools and colleges had also been engaged to seek their views.
- iv. Officers were happy to engage with resident groups directly, or through the consultation process. This was available on the County Council website
<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CMSWebsite/Apps/News/Details.aspx?ref=1330>, or people could telephone 0345 045 5200 to make their views known.
- v. March - April public consultation materials would include a leaflet, photo-montages and coloured. Events are planned on the following dates:
 - 6 March, St John the Evangelist Church, 5:00 – 7:30pm.
 - 14 March, Addenbrooke's concourse, 11am - 2pm.
 - 26 March, The Perse School, 6:30 – 8:30pm.
 - In addition, engagement events are planned at Hills Road and Long Road Colleges.
- vi. Public exhibitions could include mocked up pavement areas using tape to give people an idea of dimensions.

14/20/SAC SAC Meeting Dates 2014/15

The committee approved the committee dates for 2014/15 as follows:

- 23 June 2014
- 18 August 2014
- 13 October 2014
- 8 December 2014
- ~~3 February 2015~~
- 2 February 2015
- 30 March 2015

14/21/SAC Planning Items

14/21/SACa 13/1742/FUL - 14 Barrow Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of new replacement dwelling.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Mr Khalil
- Dr Bullock

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Residents have applied for the road to be a Conservation Area.
- ii. Raised the following concerns:
 - The application sought to demolish and replace, rather than modernise the existing house. The existing house should be retained.
 - The design was out of character with the area. It was not a suitable substitute for the existing buildings' arts and crafts style.
 - Height, scale, mass, construction and materials of the proposed building.
 - The building would dominate and overshadow neighbours.
- iii. Took issue with details in the Officer's report relating to Local Plan policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/6 and 3/12.
- iv. Referred to representations in the Officer's report, including those from "expert" interested parties, and suggested these had not been given sufficient consideration.
- v. Asked for the proposal to be dismissed, or postponed pending the determination of the Barrow Road Conservation Area application, or receipt of independently commissioned expert architectural evidence.

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

Councillor Ashwood (Trumpington Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The existing building arts and crafts style should be protected.
- ii. Trumpington had become a concrete jungle.

- iii. Nice-looking houses attracted people to Cambridge, which was good for the economy.
- iv. Supported the Barrow Road Conservation Area application.
- v. Asked for the proposal to be dismissed, or postponed pending the determination of the Barrow Road Conservation Area application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

Summary of Reason for Approval

In voting to endorse the officer recommendation for approval of the application, South Area Committee (SAC) were mindful of the significant number of objections/concerns from local residents, Cambridge Past, Present and Future, the Twentieth Century Society, English Heritage and the Council's Conservation and Design Team. In particular, it was noted that the existing Arts and Crafts house was an attractive example of a house from its period, that it complimented the character and appearance of an attractive road and that local residents had aspirations for Barrow Road to become a Conservation Area. Members of SAC were mindful that there was no evidence put forward by the applicants to demonstrate that, from sustainable and heritage perspectives, the house could not be retained and extended; acknowledging the recent approval of extensions to the property (13/0270/FUL).

It was acknowledged by SAC that the proposed house did not exhibit a number of features which would mean that it was a completely faithful replication of an Arts and Crafts house from this period; in particular the depth of the rear projection into the garden, the flat roofed element, the fenestration pattern and proposed symmetrical as opposed to existing asymmetrical design. However, SAC concluded that to a large extent the objections were seeking to require a refusal of planning permission on the basis of residents' aspirations for a Conservation Area and that the test for demolition in the first place should be higher and that demolition should not be allowed pending the assessment and likely endorsement of Conservation Area status.

SAC were mindful that the existing building was neither Listed nor Local Listed and was unlikely to merit either status in the future. Importantly, SAC noted that there was no formally designated Conservation Area encompassing

Barrow Road. On this basis, there were no reasonable grounds on which to resist the principle of demolition of the house, particularly as demolition of it would not require planning permission in its own right and was permitted development.

SAC took into account the fact that the proposed house was of a lesser width than the existing house at first floor to the road, that the ridge height was similar to the dwellings either side, that the front building line was in keeping with its neighbours and that the frontage landscaping would be respectful to the spacious and landscaped quality of Barrow Road. The increased depth to the rear was not determined to be necessarily out of keeping with other large extensions to the rear of properties along Barrow Road or that it would prejudice the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of enclosure, privacy or loss of light. Neither was it considered that, when viewed from oblique angles, the deeper footprint would be harmful to the street scene. The design of the proposed house was acceptable in its own right and was respectful and in keeping with its context.

Members of SAC had sufficient information upon which to determine the application and there was no reasonable basis upon which to defer a decision, especially as the applicants had the right to appeal against non-determination. Members of SAC were advised of the timescales for appeal and how this might/might not affect the Council's and appellants' case if the application was refused. In weighing up all of the merits for the application against the objections for its refusal, on balance Members of SAC considered the application to accord with adopted policy, particularly policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and that there was no sound planning reason for refusal.

14/21/SACb 13/1613/FUL - 6A Bentinck Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for to subdivide the plot to accommodate an additional two storey dwelling house (with additional accommodation in the roof) and reconfigure the curtilage of the host property. The single storey rear extension and side boundary wall which fronts Bentinck Street are proposed to be demolished.

The Principal Planning Officer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that permitted developer rights should be removed from the site.

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Miss Nettleship.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Bentinck Street was in a Conservation Area.
- ii. The design was out of keeping with the area.
- iii. The site was not a vacant plot as listed in the Design and Access Statement.
- iv. The Planning Officer's comments appeared to be rebutted by the Design and Conservation Officer regarding:
 - Roof design.
 - Window proportions.
 - Garden wall.
 - Fake chimney.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers and an additional condition:

‘Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions, or additions or garages shall be erected other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties, and to prevent overdevelopment of the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)’.

14/21/SACc 13/1836/FUL - Land to Rear of 1 - 8 Anstey Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of two semi-detached four bedroom houses.

The Principal Planning Officer advised SAC that the report contained typographical errors listing Objector's addresses as Anstey Way instead of Lingrey Court.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Felt the design and access statement photos were inaccurate.
- ii. Raised the following concerns:
 - The development was out of character with the area.
 - Design was imposing and unsympathetic to neighbours.
 - Overshadowing.
 - Impact on neighbour's amenities.
 - Over intensive development of site.
 - Road safety concerns.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to defer the application to allow further information and revised designs to come forward to support the case for the character and appearance of the building.

14/21/SACd 14/0020/FUL - 33 Queen Ediths Way

Councillor Pippas withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

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 (six two-bed and

one three-bed) residential flats. The proposal also includes seven car parking spaces, a lockable cycle store for fourteen cycles, and an enclosed refuse storage area located to the north of the building and amenity space to the south. A new cycle and pedestrian access would also be created in the front boundary.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ms Haigh.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Took issue with the application design, not development of the site in principle.
- ii. Queried the materials/colouring to be used. Suggested the design should reflect its location (character of area).
- iii. Referred to the grounds for appeal on the last iteration of the application.
- iv. Asked for the design to be scrutinised by the Design and Conservation Team.

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

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank