

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

16 December 2010

7.00 - 11.55 pm

Present: Councillors Herbert (Chair), Wright (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Brown, Hart, Marchant-Daisley, Owers, Pogonowski, Saunders, Smart, Walker, Harrison and Sadiq

Officers Present

Liz Bisset, Director of Customer and Community Services

Lynda Kilkelly, Safer Communities Manager

David Greening, Housing options and Homeless Manager

Peter Carter, Development Control manager

Toni Birkin, Committee Manager

Also present:

David Cupit, Addaction

Vicky Crompton, Drug and Alcohol Action Team Coordinator

John Fuller, Police Community Engagement Manager

Police Sergeant Mark Kathro, East Neighbourhood Policing Team

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

10/50/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 14th October 2011 were approved and signed as a correct record subject to minor corrections.

- Pages 4 CB1 Tenison Road additional wording: Further consultation will continue with Ward Councillors and residents.
- Page 6 Speedwatch question wrongly attributed to George Owers.

10/51/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Shah and County Councillor Bourke.

10/52/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

Stone Street and Fairsford Place

Councillor Walker: Yellow lines for the corners areas of Stone Street and Fairsford place are still being pursued.

Rustat Road Parking issues

Councillor Sadiq: A site visit had been conducted and the area had been agreed as a priority by Richard Preston. It is proposed that a working group be established to take this forward and to investigate funding sources. The County Council will be leading on this. Including a representative from the Railway Stations parking operator was suggested.

Action

Abbey Walk Junction

Councillor Wright was pursuing this.

10/53/EAC Declarations Of Interest

Name	Minutes Item	Interest
Councillor Wright	10/55/EAC	Personal: Member Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Walker	10/55/EAC	Personal: Member Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Saunders	10/55/EAC	Personal: Member Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Saunders	10/56/EAC 10/57/EAC	Personal: Works in the Wine Trade
Councillor Pogonowski	10/55/EAC	Personal: Member Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Cllr Brown	10/56/EAC 10/57/EAC	Personal: Member Campaign of Real Ale

10/54/EAC Open Forum

Q. Jon Green: Given the difficulties of the student hostel (at the Forum) the committee were requested to discuss the issue of the ARU business plan to attract foreign students, lodge 550 of them in CB1 (the station hostel). What guarantees has the Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) given on the behaviour of the student body, to ensure the amenity of the residential areas of Petersfield?

Councillor Harrison responded that part of the S106 agreement was a management plan agreed at the planning stage and written into the planning consent. The Chair requested that this be circulated to all members. Councillor Wright expressed concern about the number of hotels and hostels being proposed for the City.

Action

Q. Jon Green: ARU do not appear to take their responsibilities seriously. What will happen if they and the Cities language Schools continue to promote Cambridge as a brand?

Councillor Harrison responded. Students need accommodation and the City should support ARU. Liaison meeting with ARU had achieved results and members of the public could attend these meetings. The next meeting would be at the ARU Helmore Building at 6.30 on 11th May 2011.

Q. Roger Crabtree: Are Councillors happy with the gritting arrangements across the City and how do residents obtain grit to treat their own pavements?

The latest addition of Cambridge Matters gave detailed advice to residents on this matter. Residents are encouraged to take reasonable measures to clear snow. Grit is available to local groups for use on public footpaths. Ward Councillors could be contacted for more details on this.

Members discussed the gritting routes which had been amended to take account their concerns. Primary routes had been identified and would be treated. A quad bike would be used to treat cycle routes. The routes would be reviewed if the cold snap was prolonged.

Councillor Smart confirmed that City Council staff had been gritting key areas such as ramps and pavements at sheltered housing schemes.

Q. Janet Griffiths: By letter. Residents of Budleigh close are unhappy that their communal aerial will not be upgraded and they will have no service when the digital switch over takes place.

Councillor Smart confirmed that all City Homes residents had been informed and advised on what they needed to do next.

The Chair would follow up this matter as further action was needed.

Action

10/55/EAC Hills Road Bridge improvements and cycle lane arrangements

Councillor Marchant-Daisley introduced this discussion item. As the works on Hills Road approach completion, several issues have arisen which require reviewing/addressing.

- 1 Motorists having to cross cycle lanes to turn left, a major concern for many cyclists and motorists alike.
- 2 Right-turning cyclists accessing the station (or areas beyond – Mill Road, ARU etc), will have to make a right turn across traffic coming from town or dismount and use the toucan crossing via the Earl of Derby. Additionally, a proposed island where buses and cyclists can “pool” to turn right at the junction of Brooklands Avenue, Station Approach & Hills Road will be hazardous with very poor visibility for cyclists.
- 3 Colour of the cycles lanes: not bright or distinctive enough.
- 4 Cyclists banned from crossing from New Road to Brooklands. It seems likely that many will do so anyway, putting themselves at risk.

There are possible solutions to these problems, which, if implemented without undue delay, could result in benefits including the following:

- i) ease congestion on the bridge
- ii) prevent the necessity for motorists to cross the cycle lanes
- iii) provide cyclists with a quick, safe and convenient access to the Station and the areas beyond
- iv) relieve pressure on the toucan crossing
- v) improve safety at the junctions and on the bridge as a whole

James Woodburn of Cambridge Cycle Campaign expressed general support for the scheme and had no concerns about the right turns. However, he had concerns about the central cycle lane, the creation of pinch points and material used for the cycle lane. He suggested that there were newer materials on the market, such as glass beading, which produce a reflective and durable surface.

He further suggested that the ban on cyclists turning right into Brooklands Avenue was foolish and dangerous and the instruction would be ignored. A short light phase could be used to resolve the problem. The bridge historically had a high accident rate and the Cycle Campaign had high hopes that the new layout would improve this. In London the repeater signs in the cycle lanes are

frequent, highly visible and durable resulting in greater awareness. Alternative ramps and routes have not been fully considered in this design.

Roger Crabtree

Councillor Marchant-Daisley's points capture the problems. Forcing cars to cross cycle lanes is a big cause for concern. The six-month trial period did not result in joined up thinking. Hill's Road bridge is a different case to other bridges in the City. Changes to the traffic light phases will not resolve the problem.

Jon Green

Suggestions have been made to improve the layout. Traffic was being forced to the right and most of this traffic will not be allowed to turn into the station. If the traffic were aligned to the left it would resolve some of the conflict. Consultation had highlighted this issues. The design could be improved by incorporating a link directly to the new railway platform. Currently it is a poor design.

Councillor Harrison stated that the bridge design was creative and imaginative and had been arrived at following extensive consultations with the public and interested parties. There was no simple solution for this area. At some point either cars have to cross the cycle lane or cyclist have to cross the car lane. There may be initial problems with the new arrangements, however, major changes are neither practical nor affordable. There had been no accidents during the major works undertaken. A limited review of signage may be possible.

Councillor Brown stated that the consultation had highlighted safety concerns about the old design. The new layout would encourage motorists to modify their behaviour. Councillor Sadiq stated that officers had taken great care over the design and future projects of this scale would be very difficult to fund.

The committee resolved unanimously to:

- I. Form a working group to take this issue forward.
- II. Membership of working group would be Councillors: Harrison, Bourke, Sedgwick-Jell, Sadiq, Marchant-Daisley and Brown

10/56/EAC Support Services Tackling Street-based Anti-social Behaviour

The committee received a report from the Housing Options and Homeless Manager.

David Cupit of Addaction, outlined the services his organisation provide. Since July they have been commissioned by the PCT to deliver adult services in the community. This service picks up troubled individuals earlier than previous schemes and is based on forward thinking and joint working.

Q. Roger Crabtree. Is Cambridge different to other Cities in the way that it attracts incomers?

Housing Options and Homeless Manager stated that other cities with a similar population, such as Brighton, have similar problems.

Q. Councillor Smart asked what progress had been made to address the problem of ex street dwellers failing to sustain a tenancy.

A. The specialist tenancy sustainment team is achieving very good results in this area. However, this group is no longer a priority for Supporting People services.

In response to member questions Mr Cupit outlined the good work done by the Community Psychiatric Nurse attached to his team. This post is funded until 2011 and alternative sources of funding are being explored to make up any shortfall in future. Match funding is under discussion and Cambridge Access Centre might be able to offer some funding.

Other challenges to the work being done were discussed. The team would be pro-active in working with revenues and benefits to identify those at risk of losing their homes as a result of benefit cuts. Julian Huppert has contacted Lord Freud, a Minister of State in the Department of Work and Pensions, to make the case for Cambridge to be recognised as an area with very high market rent levels. The Homelessness Grant is due to increase in the near future to address increased need. Councillors Owers and Pogonowski felt that this approach was a false economy and not logical.

In response to member questions the Housing Options and Homeless Manager outlined how services were moving away from walk in shelters to Assessment Centres which would offer users a more effective service. Assessments would look at needs, skills and risk mitigation strategies. The focus would be on existing street sleepers and would be targeted at those with local collections. Individuals would need to engage with services in order to access shelters.

Councillor Walker asked about the numbers of street sleepers with no recourse to public funding. This number is small but rising and is a particular problem for those from the accession countries. The situation would be monitored.

Members discussed alcohol pricing, off licence sales and underage drinking. The Council is working with traders to address problems and gave the issue higher priority from time to time if it appears to be a problem.

The Drug and Alcohol Action Team Coordinator suggested that the last five years had seen a move towards joint working of support and enforcement services. Prison leavers with local connections are offered support. Those without local connections might still arrive in the City but would not be offered housing. There is MEAN (Making Every Adult Matter) funding for a pilot joint working project.

Begging was agreed to be an on-going problem in the City. Anti-social behaviour legislation is sometimes used to address the problem. However, most approaches result in only short term solutions with the problems returning. Alternative giving schemes had not produced good results. The nature of Cambridge means that there are always students and tourists who are willing to give to beggars. This should be discouraged as it does not help and feeds addiction problems.

The Chair thanked the speakers and officers for a useful debate.

10/57/EAC Cambridgeshire Community Safety Partnership Plan 2011 - 2014

The committee received a report from the Director of Customer and Community Services regarding the Cambridgeshire Community Safety partnership plan 2011 – 2014. She outlined the five draft priorities under consideration. These were selected as areas where partnership approaches could produce the best results. The committee was asked to consider the priorities and advise the Partnership where they felt the focus of attention should be. The Chair reminded the public that they could also contribute to the priorities selected via the consultation process.

In response to member questions the Director of Customer and Community Services confirmed that future funding was uncertain. Funding for 2010/11 was about £80,000. Examples of projects funded to tackle Alcohol Related Violent Crime in partnership were: marshalling of taxi queues, monitoring of off licence sales to underage people, patrols by street pastors.

Members raised the following issues:

- I. It was good to see reducing repeat victims of domestic violence on the list and even a small reduction in this would be worthwhile.
- II. Would a set list of priorities allow a quick response to shifting patterns of crime.
- III. Concerns that alcohol is a contributory factor in all issues on the list.
- IV. Concerns that the first suggested priority applied across the City and should not be applied just to the City Centre.
- V. Concerns that consultees would be self selecting and not necessarily representative.
- VI. Concerns that anti-social behaviour was a precursor of more serious offending and deserved attention.

In response to questions the officer confirmed that City Centre crimes impact on the entire City as, , the victims of those crimes could come from any area.

Members questioned what weighting would be given to the different strands of the consultation process. The Officer said that the consultation responses would be analysed by the County Research Team and this analysis would be considered by the Community Safety Partnership Board who would make the decision on the final three priorities.

Debate followed on if and how the committee would agree priorities. Councillor Owers suggested that no priorities be selected. The committee agreed, on a show of hands, to select two or three priorities. Based on the discussion, the Chair suggested:

- Reducing repeat victims of domestic violence
- Reducing re-offending

Councillor Pogonowski suggested the addition of:

- Reduce repeat incidents of anti-social behaviour

The committee resolved by 9 votes to 2 to recommend the following:

- I. Reducing repeat victims of Domestic Violence
- II. Reducing re-offending

10/58/EAC Safer Neighbourhoods

The committee received a report from the Safer Communities Manager regarding the Safer Neighbourhoods priorities. Police Neighbourhood Sergeant Mark Kathro, introduced the report .

Speeding Priority

Members agreed that the speeding priority had required a lot of time and effort for limited results. This priority would be discharged. However, dialogue would continue regarding the introduction of 20pmh limits.

Thorpe Way and Jack Warren Green

Tackling youth related anti-social behaviour in Thorpe Way and Jack Warren Green had been a priority for some time and the officer suggested that as the situation is currently calm this priority be discharged. Councillor Pogonowski suggested that the priority should be retained as it was achieving its goal. It was agreed that the situation be monitored and included in future reports although no longer a priority.

York Street

Drug related issues in York Street area were discussed. Residents' frustration with the perceived lack of action was discussed. The officer explained that firm evidence was needed in order to issue a warrant and work with the community was on-going. Keeping people informed was agreed to be the way forward. and the sergeant agreed to provide better feedback to those providing information and E.cops will be used to supply more general information to the affected communities. The Safer Communities Manager said the City Anti-social Behaviour Team has been advising the residents on how to collect evidence and to keep dairies to assist the police with information gathering. No further information was available on the impact of the use of CCTV in the area.

Romsey Rec

Problems with youth related anti social behaviour and vandalism on Romsey Rec were discussed. The individuals involved are not thought to be local and a joined up approach was needed to avoid simply moving the problem on to another area. This issue would be referred to the ASB team problem solving group as the City Anti-social Behaviour Team have been meeting with residents to find solutions

Barnwell Road

Councillor Hart raised emerging problems in the area of Barnwell Road shops. The youths concerned were believed to be local. Councillor Wright also

suggested that there was an under reporting of incidents in the Peveral Road area and residents may have lost confidence and were questioning whether it's worth reporting issues. The suggested problem area was a triangle encompassing the shops, the toilets on Barnwell Road, the underpass and the area outside McDonalds.

Cambridge Leisure Park

Cambridge Leisure Park was discussed. Sunday afternoons and promotional evenings were creating problems. The area will be monitored.

Councillor Owers questioned how useful the process of area committees agreeing priorities was to the Police. The officer confirmed that the Police welcome this approach as the community then had ownership of the priorities. However, the Community Engagement Manager suggested that agreeing these priorities earlier in the evening would allow more members of the public to participate

Alternative tools to deal with problem areas were discussed such as Section 30 (Dispersal) orders. Committee priorities produce the easiest way to monitor and report back on problem areas.

The committee resolved:

By a vote of 6 to 4 that the priority of tackling youth related anti-social behaviour and drug misuse and criminal damage in the public areas Thorpe Way and Jack Warren Green be discharged.

Agreed Priorities:

Agreed Unanimously:

- I. Barnwell Road ASB issues in an area defined as Barnwell Shops and surrounding area, Peveral Road underpass and McDonalds forecourt area.
- II. Continue to address concerns of drug misuse and supply of drugs in the York Street Area,

Agreed by 6 votes to 4

- III. ASB issues on Romsey Rec

10/59/EAC Meeting dates 2011-12 and provisional dates 2012-13

The following dates were agreed for 2011 –12

23rd June 2011, 18th August 2011, 27th October 2011, 15th December 2011, 9th February 2012 and 12th April 2012.

Indicative dates for 2012 –13 were agreed

14th June 2012, 16th August 2012, 25th October 2012, 20th December 2012, 7th February 2013 and 11th April 2013

10/60/EAC Planning**10a 10/1045/FUL Land r/o 163 - 165 Coleridge Road, Cambridge CB1 3PN**

The committee received an application for the erection of a 3-bed dwelling to form a terrace with off street parking on land to the rear of 163-165 Coleridge Road.

The committee received objections to the proposal from Councillor Sadiq who spoke on behalf of local residents and raised the following points:

- There is a high level of through trips of pedestrians and cyclists in this street.
- Increased cars numbers would result in congestion
- Additional parking would impact of any future upgrades to the cycle path
- Disturbance during the building work
- Disabled parking might be lost.

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and approve the application for the following reasons:

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and following the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:
East of England plan 2008: Policies SS1, T1, T9, T14, ENV7 and WM6;
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:
Policies P6/1 and P9/8;
Cambridge Local Plan (2006): Policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/12, 4/9, 4/13, 5/1, 5/14, 8/2, 8/6, 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.

10b 10/0692/FUL - 15A Gwydir Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 2LG

The committee received an application for the erection of a first floor extension to 15a Gwydir Street.

The committee received representation from the applicant who raised the following points:

- Additional space is needed for growing family
- Local Plan supports extensions
- There had been only one objector
- Design had been modified to mitigate impact on neighbouring properties
- Refusal would be on unreasonable basis on the low level of objection.

Members discussed the problems of massing and loss of light.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 1) to accept the officer recommendations and refuse the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed first floor rear extension, because of its scale, its height and depth and its proximity to the common boundary with the neighbour to the north, 15 Gwydir Street, will result in a loss of light to and outlook from that dwelling and its rear garden. The proposed first floor extension will dominate 15 Gwydir Street from the south side causing the occupiers to suffer an undue sense of enclosure, to the detriment of the level of amenity that they should reasonably expect to enjoy. The proposal therefore fails to respond to its context or to relate satisfactorily to its surroundings. For all these reasons the proposal is contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008, policy 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to advice provided by Planning Policy.

10c 10/1090/FUL - Rose And Crown 110 Newmarket Road Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB5 8HE

The committee received an application for change of use from Public House with ancillary living accommodation to a 6-bed flat (1st and 2nd floors).

The committee received representations for the applicant's representative who raised the following points:

- This is a sensitive and appropriate use of the building
- The top floor flat is large and attractive.
- Applicants business will be in the building allowing the tenants to be well monitored
- The building has character and is a local landmark that deserved to be preserved.

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations and approve the application for the following reasons:

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and following the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies: East of England plan 2008: SS1, H1, ENV6, ENV7, WM6; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8; Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/8, 4/4. 4/12, 4/13, 5/1, 5/2, 5/14, 8/6, 8/10, 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. 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 or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

10d 09/1095/FUL - 274 Coldhams Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3HN

The committee received an application for the erection of one 2 bed roomed house on land adjacent to 274 Coldhams Lane Cambridge.

Members discussed road safety, window style and vehicle access.

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendations subject to additional conditions restricting the construction of further outbuildings and approve the application for the following reasons:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions or additions may be made to the house hereby approved, nor any building or enclosure or container erected or introduced to the curtilage of the new dwellinghouse (other than those expressly required by the permission) without the prior express grant of planning permission by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties and to ensure that the site is not overly developed on what is a prominent corner. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)

Prior to the first occupation of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, all existing vehicular access to Coldham's Lane, serving the existing house, 274 Coldham's Lane, and the site of the new planning unit, shall be closed, and fenced off in accordance with a scheme of fencing that is first submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of the safety of other users of the highway and in particular to ensure that, in the light of the new parking provision to be made to serve both dwellings off Vinery Way, there is not an excess of vehicular movements on to and off the highway close to the corner where there are a lot of pedestrian movements associated with the nearby primary school. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2)

The meeting ended at 11.55 pm

CHAIR