

**SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE**

18 August 2014

7.00 - 9.26 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Birtles (Chair), Meftah (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Avery, Blackhurst, Dryden, Moore and Pippas

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

Councillors Crawford and Taylor left after the vote on item 14/50/SAC

**Officers:**

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally

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

**14/44/SAC Filming of Committee**

The Chair gave permission for Mr Carpen and Mr Taylor to film the meeting. It was confirmed with Mr Carpen and Mr Taylor that the filming would take place from a fixed position and cease if members of the public or speakers expressed a desire not to be filmed. Members of the public were given an opportunity to state if they did not want to be filmed.

**14/45/SAC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashwood and McPherson.

**14/46/SAC Declarations of Interest**

No declarations were made.

**14/47/SAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 23 June 2014 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment to question 2 in 14/36/SAC Open Forum (struck through text to be deleted and replaced by new bullet points 2 and 3):

**1. Mr Woodburn raised the following issues:**

- **Asked for speed limits to be enforced and suggested this could be a police priority for the south area. Mr Woodburn raised concerns that people were speeding in the city and that speed cameras may not be operating in some areas. He asked the Police to do speed checks Friday and Saturday nights to catch motorists who had been drinking.**
- ~~**Pedestrian and cycle access to the busway is not in place as agreed from the Kaleidoscope site, Long Road, Hills Road or Shelford Road. Previous access routes are now blocked.**~~
- **Pedestrian and cycle access to the busway from the Kaleidoscope development has still not been provided as required by the Kaleidoscope planning application. Mr Woodburn queried when this would be provided. He asked that all future planning applications have pedestrian and cycle access routes in place before first occupancy, just as car routes have to be.**
- **There was still no access from Hills Road bridge. Access from Long Road and Shelford Road involves a long diversion. Good, direct access is urgently needed in all three cases.**

**14/48/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Minutes**

**14/35/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Ashton has written to Netherhall School to ask how South Area Committee and the community can support the school to improve following a recent inspection.**

**Councillor Birtles to follow this up as no response has been received from Netherhall School.”**

Councillor Birtles when she took up Chair wrote to Netherhall and still awaits a reply. She said she might ring when term restarts.

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Birtles to follow this up as no response has been received from Netherhall School.**

**14/36/SAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Ashton to query the progress of the Cherry Hinton High Street traffic calming scheme with**

**County Council Officers. Response to be fed back to South Area Committee and member of public who raised the query.”**

Councillor Ashton to liaise with member of public who raised the query outside of South Area Committee (SAC).

**14/7/SAC Developer Contributions Devolved Decision-Making: 2nd Round Priority-Setting**

Councillor Ashton gave an update on s106 funding for Cherry Hinton Baptist Church as discussed at SAC 13 January 2014. SAC allocated £63,000 to refurbish the family centre. The vision for the project then changed to improve it, so WREN allocated an additional £35,000. This led to a shortfall of £10,000 between what the architect proposed and funding in place. The Head of Community Development or Community Funding & Engagement Officer undertook to approach the SAC Chair, Vice Chair and Cherry Hinton Ward Councillors with a project appraisal to allocate the additional £10,000.

**14/49/SAC Open Forum**

- 1. Mr Bower raised concerns regarding the traffic calming scheme in Cherry Hinton High Street. He asked if there been any progress on plans for the High Street this Autumn, as September was rapidly approaching. Mr Bower said the County Council had not been forthcoming about the nature of the options to be presented or about any past consultations. He asked for clarification from SAC.**

Councillor Ashton said the County Council had met with City Councillors 26 June 2014 for an s106 workshop, resident's concerns had been discussed. County Councillor Bates had guaranteed a consultation exercise would occur in September 2014. Councillor Bates also undertook to respond to resident's concerns raised at the 26 June meeting. Councillor Ashton would liaise with Mr Bower when further details were known.

- 2. Mr Woodburn referred to the 26 June s106 meeting, and action point from 23 June SAC. He asked when cycle and pedestrian access would be in place between the Kaleidoscope development and busway.**

Councillor Blackhurst said he had not raised the issue of access from the Kaleidoscope development at the 26 June workshop as he thought (from the SAC minutes) the issue was access from Hills Road.

Issues had arisen because what had originally been anticipated as an ancillary thoroughfare for the busway had become the main transport link. This needed to be reviewed.

There was a delay in providing cycle and pedestrian access between the Kaleidoscope development and busway due to a third party landowner. It was hoped this could be overcome.

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Blackhurst to query the progress of pedestrian and cycle access to the busway as this is not in place from the Kaleidoscope site as specified in the planning application. Response to be fed back to South Area Committee and member of public who raised the query.**

3. **Mr Carpen asked if the “Shape Your Place” part of the County Council website could be upgraded to make it compatible with different software packages such as vimeo and soundcloud.**

**ACTION POINT: Councillors Crawford and Taylor to look into feasibility and funding for upgrading County Council Shape Your Place webpages.**

4. **Mr Carpen signposted the “Be the Change Cambridge” event 13 September 2014. This would be facilitated by Anglia Ruskin University and Cambridge Ahead. It would be a single day community action event to bring together people from across Cambridge’s diverse communities. The City Council Mayor and Leader were expected, plus Mr Julian Huppert MP. Mr Carpen invited Councillors and members of the public to attend.**

SAC Councillors offered to put up posters on community noticeboards.

5. **Mr Watson made the following points:**
  - **Church End and Rosemary Lane were rat runs for traffic at peak times. This led to safety concerns. Residents had strong feeling regarding this long term issue.**

- **Councillors Crawford and McPherson had met Highways Officers for a site visit in response to Mr Watson's e-petition.**
- **Various solutions were being looked at such as pinch pints to reduce traffic. Visits to sites around the city were taking place to gather ideas, such as the wooden bollards in Storey's Way.**
- **Mr Watson proposed to look at indicative ideas from Church end and Rosemary Lane residents for quick wins. Closing the roads to traffic had been proposed.**

Councillor Ashton said that Councillor McPherson was aware of the situation.

Agreement had to be obtained from residents before a road could be closed to traffic.

Councillor Ashton thanked residents for their efforts to date and said the traffic issue was being addressed.

Councillor Crawford said residents should not feel obliged to propose their own solutions, Councillors and Officers would work on their behalf.

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Ashton to liaise with Councillor McPherson and member of public who raised the issue of closing Church End and Rosemary Lane to traffic.**

**Councillor Crawford to raise a Local Highway Improvement request upon receipt of petition text.**

6. **Mr Sherlock said that closing roads to traffic in the Gwydir Street and Hooper Street area had improved resident's quality of life. He expected residents to support roads to traffic in Cherry Hinton, as proposed by Mr Watson.**

**Mr Sherlock went on to say a petition had been submitted for double yellow lines in Neath Farm Court.**

7. **Mr Carpen suggested raising the issue of traffic problems at the "Be the Change Cambridge" event 13 September 2014 so issues could be addressed in a joined up approach, instead of on a piecemeal basis.**

**14/50/SAC Frequency of SAC Future Meetings**

Mr Bower asked how much each cost to hold a SAC meeting. The Committee Manager said this could vary between circa £400 - £600 per meeting, depending on venue and PA system costs.

SAC **unanimously agreed** to keep to the current schedule of meetings September 2014 – May 2015 as follows:

- 13 October 2014.
- 8 December 2014.
- 2 February 2015.
- 30 March 2015.

The situation would be reviewed in New Year 2015.

### **14/51/SAC Planning Applications**

#### **14/51/SACa 14/0208/FUL - 38 Almoners Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to demolish the existing dwelling and garage, and erect two detached four bedroom houses with ancillary parking.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to a pre-committee amendment to the recommendation (set out on the amendment sheet):

Approve as per the conditions on main report and s106 agreement to be completed by the new date of Friday 5th September.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Dr Livesey.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. SAC had requested a shadow study when considering this application 23 June 2014.
- ii. No progress had been made in the subsequent two months.
- iii. Took issue with shadow study information and raised the following specific concerns:
  - Information was incomplete.
  - SAC concerns had not been addressed.

- The Planning Officer should have pursued details further.
  - The shadow study showed the impact and loss of amenity on Dr Livesey and his partner.
  - No part of the plot was 7m from his boundary, it was 5m.
  - There was a lack of engagement from the Applicant.
- iv. Proposed the following:
- Undertaking a survey to establish his loss of amenity.
  - Reducing the proposed dwelling height.
  - Moving the proposed houses away from the boundary in accordance with the topography, to reduce the appearance of their height.
- v. The needs of the developer appeared to be prioritised over the impact on residents.

The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Mr Mead (Applicant's Agent) in support of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to points raised in Dr Livesey's and Mr Mead's representations at the request of SAC:

- Acknowledged it was difficult to interpret details of the shadow study in text form, hence the diagrams being submitted later.
- The shadow study was more comprehensive than normal. More information could be requested from the Applicant, but this may lead to an appeal based on non-determination, and a Planning Inspector may make a decision on (existing) information submitted.
- It was up to SAC to decide if they had sufficient information on which to make a decision.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to defer pending the submission of additional shadowing information, which should be at a larger scale, should take proper account of the topography, should provide information for dates other than the spring equinox, should provide a clear representation from the rear of No.36, and should avoid reproducing shadows over an aerial photo background.

**14/51/SACb 14/0675/FUL - 102 Glebe Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to amend the rear elevation ground floor windows to doors and make the building wider by 1 metre.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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.

**14/51/SACc 14/0287/FUL - 29 Fernlea Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey front extension, part single storey, part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

The Chair decided that the reasons for refusal should be voted on and recorded separately.

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

Because of the additional massing created by this proposal, the resulting building would respond poorly to existing features of local character and would be poorly integrated with the immediate locality, contrary to policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

The application does not provide appropriate car parking space on site, contrary to policies 3/14 and 8/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.



**14/51/SACd 14/1122/FUL - 18 Worts Causeway**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey side and rear extension.

The Chair referred to advice from one of the Council's Legal Advisors. The advice to SAC was that Mr Gibbs-Sier could speak to the Committee for 3 minutes. He could provide a brief written summary of what he would say in the allotted time, but not introduce any additional written material. The letter/submission in circulation cites parts of the law and extracts from a neighbours letter. The Legal Advisor recommended that this letter was disregarded at this stage not least because the neighbour has had no chance to respond. If an appeal were made because of a decision SAC made tonight, legal issues could be addressed then.

As part of his introduction the Principal Planning Officer referred to two emails he had received from Mr Gibbs-Sier. The emails were received after the deadline for questions/representations, but as they dealt with factual queries, the Principal Planning Officer sought Chair's approval to address them at this point. Chair's approval was given and the Principal Planning Officer did so.

Mr Gibbs-Sier's points were:

- i. That Para 8.5 of the Case Officer's report states "The proposed rear Extension projects approx.1.46m further back than the rear of the existing garage."

The Principal Planning Officer agreed that this should read 1m.

- ii. There is an implication in Case Officer's report (eg para 8.7) that the rear Extension will extend beyond the South wall of No. 20.

The Principal Planning Officer could not detect this implication in the report, but confirmed that the proposed extension would not so extend, and referred to the drawing attached as D1 to the application.

- iii. That the statement in Para 8.5 of the report: "The submitted shadow study illustrates the proposed extension will not cause significant additional loss of light to the neighbouring property." was somewhat disingenuous as the case officer had seen in March the shadow study

attached as M1 to the application, stating there would be an increase in sunlight.

The Principal Planning Officer indicated that he felt the details given in para 8.5 remained factually correct.

Mr Gibbs-Sier (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application. SAC allowed Mr Gibbs-Sier to make reference to Buxton and Hunter legal cases as these were pertinent to his representation.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Empathised that Mr Gibbs-Sier wanted to improve his property, but would prefer a single storey not a two storey extension.
- ii. Raised the following specific concerns:
  - The two storey development would be built right up to the boundary. It would overlook the landing window of number 20, be visually intrusive and reduce light.
  - Overshadowing the kitchen and living room of number 20.
  - There would only be a 3 – 4 foot gap between buildings at numbers 18 and 20 Worts Causeway at the narrowest point. This would also reduce light in the passageway and lead to a claustrophobic feel.
  - Queried the impact of the proposed development on the value of number 20.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

The meeting ended at 9.26 pm

**CHAIR**