

**NORTH AREA COMMITTEE**24 March 2011  
6.30 - 10.30 pm

**Present:** Councillors Nimmo-Smith (Chair), Ward (Vice-Chair), Blair, Boyce, Brierley, Kerr, Levy, McGovern, Pitt, Todd-Jones, Tunnacliffe, Znajek

**County Councillors:** Wilkins

**Other City Councillors in Attendance:** Bick, Reid and Taylor

**Other County Councillors in Attendance:** Brown

**Officers:** Patsy Dell (Head of Planning), Sarah Dyer (Development Control Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Yvonne O'Donnell (Environmental Health Manager), Declan O'Halloran (Technical Officer), Sara Saunders (Planning Policy Manager)

**Other Officers in Attendance:** Liz Bisset (Director of Customer & Community Services), Glenn Burgess (Committee Manager), Paul Connelly (Locality Manager), Jane Darlington (Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation), Eve Dziura (Community Development Officer), Mike Hosking (Director of Libraries, Learning and Culture), Joe Godwin (City Ranger), Jonathan James (Head of Customer Services), Andrew Limb (Head of Corporate Strategy), Christine May (Head of Libraries, Archives and Information), Eugene Minogue (Parkour UK), Mick Oakman (Area Manager Maintenance), Graham Saint (Strategy Officer) and Trevor Woollams (Head of Strategy and Partnerships)

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

**11/14/NAC Apologies for Absence**

**County Councillors:** Manning and Moss-Eccardt

**11/15/NAC Declarations of Interest (Planning)**

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr	11/16/NAC	Personal – Member of CAMRA which

McGovern	a	campaigns against pubs being turned into houses
----------	---	---

## 11/16/NAC Planning Applications

### 11/16/NACa 09/1200/FUL: Penny Ferry, 110 Water Street

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of five 4-bed houses (following demolition of former public house).

The committee received a representation in objection to the application from the following:

- Ms Göhler (representing Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
- Mr Bond (local resident)

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Any development should refurbish the existing building, which is worth preserving as part of the local history.
- (ii) Supported the idea of a mixed development.
- (iii) Raised objections to the loss of a local landmark and general loss of pubs in the City.
- (iv) Expressed objection to the application design, character and style; saying this was out of context with the neighbourhood.

Mr Proctor (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 3)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

1. The proposed dwellings by virtue of their height, scale, massing and location relative to Water Street would be a dominant and obtrusive form of development that would be out of character with the streetscene. In so doing the development fails to respond positively to the site context and constraints, would not result in the creation of an attractive built frontage which would positively enhance the public realm adjacent to the site and would generally not have a positive impact on its setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form and its impact on the streetscene. The development is therefore contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to advice provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.
2. The proposed dwellings by virtue of their height, scale, massing and location relative to the River Cam would be a dominant and obtrusive form of development that would be out of character with the open nature of the riverside setting and the sylvan character of the site itself. In so doing the development fails to respond positively to the site context and constraints, would not result in the creation of an attractive built frontage which would positively enhance the public realm adjacent to the site in terms of the River Cam and Stourbridge Common and would generally not have a positive impact on its setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form and its impact on the landscape and wider views. The development is therefore contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to advice provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.
3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, in accordance with the policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 5/14 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; and policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2006.

**11/16/NACb 11/0050/FUL: 412 Milton Road**

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a one 3-bed dwelling at rear of site.

Mr Reeve (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission

Reasons for Approval

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

East of England plan 2008: SS1, ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 4/13

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](http://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.

**11/17/NAC Declarations of Interest (Main Agenda)**

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr Blair	11/21/NAC	Personal Interest - Member of Friends of Arbury Court Library and Friends of Milton Road Library

Cllr Kerr	11/21/NAC	Personal – Member of Friends of Milton Road Library
Cllr Levy	11/21/NAC	Personal – Member of Friends of Arbury Court Library
Cllr Nimmo-Smith	11/21/NAC	Personal Interest: Member of Friends of Milton Road Library
Cllr Pitt	11/21/NAC	Personal Interest: Member of Friends of Arbury Court Library
Cllr Todd-Jones	11/21/NAC	Personal Interest: Member of Friends of Arbury Court Library. Is a professional librarian and member of Chartered Institute of Library Professionals
Cllr Levy	11/24/NAC	Personal and prejudicial – Member of Friends of Histon Road Cemetery Committee. Withdrew from discussion and did not vote on Friends of Histon Road funding application WEB 17950b
Cllr Pitt	11/24/NAC	Personal – Knows members of Friends of Histon Road Cemetery Committee (application WEB 17950b)
Cllr Ward	11/24/NAC	Personal – Knows members of Friends of Histon Road Cemetery Committee (application WEB 17950b)

### 11/18/NAC Minutes

The minutes of the 27 January 2011 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

### 11/19/NAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes

- (i) **11/6/NAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes “Action Point: Councillor Wilkins to respond to Mr Arnold concerning his matters arising question: Why did the Council see fit to dig up the area to create parking bays in Milton Road? What action will be taken against people who drive over the path/kerb to access the bays?”**

Councillor Wilkins has responded to Mr Arnold outside of the meeting.

- (ii) **11/7/NAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Wilkins to respond to Mr Arnold concerning his ‘open forum’ question: The County Council has made emergency repairs to a number of potholes. Has this led to a higher number of claims against the County Council?”**

Councillor Wilkins has responded to Mr Arnold outside of the meeting.

- (iii) **11/9/NAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods “Action Point: The Safer Communities Manager and Community Engagement Manager (Southern Division) will review, revise and update statistics in January 2011 Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods Report”**

Revised document published on committee webpage.

- (iv) **11/9/NAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods “Action Point: Sergeant Wragg to liaise with Councillor Pitt concerning anti-social behaviour connected to hostel in Victoria Road and efforts to tackle this”**

Verbal update expected at 19 May Committee.

- (v) **11/12/NAC County Council Library Service “Action Point: Councillor Nimmo-Smith to invite County Council Member/Officer to next North Area Committee meeting to discuss county library service”.**

Later agenda item for 24 March Committee.

- (vi) **10/58/NAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes “Action Point: Councillor Blair to update NAC concerning on-line Planning Public Access System six months post introduction”.**

Delegates were signposted to a report circulated at 24 March Committee and published on North Area Committee webpage. Councillor Blair and the Business & Information Services Manager can be contacted for further information.

### **11/20/NAC Open Forum**

1. **Mr Bond asked if the City Council could adopt a more proactive policy towards the provision of public toilets to ensure that they**

**were easily accessible by older and disabled people, plus parents with children? Preferably without payment for entry. The intention was to avoid having to negotiate lifts, escalators and stairs.**

**Action Point: Councillor Nimmo-Smith to respond to Mr Bond concerning his 'open forum' question.**

- 2. Mr Bond asked if the refuge outside the Co-op in Chesterton Road could be removed to avoid the necessity for large vehicles to use the west bound carriageway to pass vehicles unloading at the shop?**

Explanatory note: Unloading of delivery lorries is causing traffic to backup round the gyratory, hence the question as to whether the pedestrian island 'refuge' could be removed.

**Action Point: Councillor Tunnacliffe to respond to Mr Bond concerning his 'open forum' question.**

- 3. Mr Bond asked if the council could review its planning policy to recognise the need to retain pubs and shops as a matter of urgency? Especially those with parking provision in local centres around the city.**

**Action Point: Councillor Nimmo-Smith to respond to Mr Bond concerning his 'open forum' question.**

Members of the public also asked questions in item 11/21/NAC.

### **11/21/NAC Taking Library Services Forward in North Area**

The committee received a report from County Councillor Sir Peter Brown, the Director of Libraries, Learning and Culture and the Head of Libraries, Archives and Information regarding county Library service review.

The following strategy for the future of Library services in Cambridgeshire was agreed by the County Council at their meeting on 15th February:

- Externalisation of the service to a charitable trust from April 2012. The trust is anticipated to become a limited company that is independent of the County Council, with the flexibility to access additional resources.

- A shared approach to the delivery of library support and specialised services. The intention is to share some services with other library authorities in the East of England to gain economies of scale and make savings.
- Redesign of service structure and management. For example, moving towards customer self service. This would also include rationalising opening hours and would mean an overall reduction in staffing.
- Encouraging much greater community participation (involvement in service provision and decision making). Extra capacity will be sought through volunteers, such as encouraging communities to run libraries on a voluntary basis.
- A review of the library network physical structures to make savings whilst ensuring a comprehensive and efficient service. For example, sharing premises with other services such as Citizens Advice Bureau or the Post Office was proposed. The County Council want libraries to be multi-agency community hubs. There was also scope for other organisations to use library buildings when libraries are closed.

The County Council is consulting on Library service provision at present, although the strategic decision was taken in February to turn the service into a charitable trust. Representatives were attending public meetings to seek views from the public. 5,600 responses have been received to date through the consultation process. The future service provision strategy would be based on consultation responses, and refined throughout the year as further responses are received.

The Council committed to providing a high quality library service within existing budget constraints (£3.2bn needs to be saved out of a budget of £6.6bn).

13 libraries have been selected for priority consideration for the review of the network, following an initial assessment of community need and library performance. In the north area of the city, Arbury Court Library and Milton Road Library were affected by this strategy.

The committee made the following comments in response to the report.

- (i) Sought a response to the Chartered Institute of Library Professionals' query on how a quality service will be maintained given the substantial budget cut.
- (ii) Sought clarification on options considered for future Library service provision.



- (iii) Sought clarification that if libraries closed, would the County Council allow the community a right to buy option using the Localism Bill.

Councillor Sir Peter Brown, the Director of Libraries, Learning and Culture and the Head of Libraries, Archives and Information responded:

- (i) The trust would have a specification/contract with the County Council to maintain and manage the Library service. The trust would be held to account by the County Council who would retain statutory responsibility, but contract out the service.

Volunteers to help staff and manage the Library service were currently being sought through a recruitment campaign. Volunteers would work alongside permanent members of staff as they do now, only in greater numbers.

- (ii) Various options had been considered and legal advice obtained for future Library service and adult education provision, but a charitable trust was considered the best way forward.
- (iii) Community right to buy libraries were not the preferred way forward. The County Council wanted to retain an integrated network of libraries that could interchange stock across the county. A group of small independent libraries would not have the same flexibility.

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

**1. Mr Marais made the following points:**

- **Keep library buildings and services as they were currently where possible.**
- **Queried the level of support libraries would get for access points.**
- **Sought clarification on how cost savings would be achieved.**
- **Queried the effects of library clustering on staff.**

The Director of Libraries and the Head of Libraries responded:

- Library access point provision would be guided by consultation responses.
- Cost savings would be achieved through tax exemptions, accessing new funding streams and reductions to bureaucracy/management overheads, as the trust would be independent of the County Council.

- Libraries would be managed from a hub. This may require some traveling for some staff, but not all would move between libraries.

**2. Mr Bond asked if there would be a tender process for Library service provision, and if so, could the County Council guarantee that another organisation would not get the bid instead of the proposed charitable trust.**

The Director of Libraries responded that there was no tender process for Library service provision as the Council has already taken the decision to transfer responsibility to a charitable trust. The County Council would be responsible for monitoring quality of service delivered by the trust. This arrangement may change if issues arise, but currently the trust delivery option was the preferred way forward for the next 10 – 15 years; assuming quality of service was maintained.

Members of the public in attendance were invited to complete feedback forms concerning the future of the Library service. Results of table discussions were as follows:

- (i) Concerns were expressed over the use of volunteer staff.
- (ii) Clarification was sought on how meaningful community involvement could be achieved through consultation when the County Council had already made a strategic decision concerning service provision.
- (iii) Clarification was sought if the County Council could work in partnership with other organisations to provide shared services.
- (iv) Clarification was sought on whether the decision to hand Library service provision to a charitable trust could be reversed if the trust failed.
- (v) The capacity and capability of community groups to run libraries was questioned.
- (vi) The possibility of seeking sponsorship to fund Library service provision was suggested.
- (vii) Clarification was sought concerning what was clustering and how it would work.

**Action Point: Feedback forms concerning the future of the Library service from the 'community forum' to be summarised by Strategy Officer and forwarded to County Council, plus noted in North Area Committee minutes for reference.**

### **11/22/NAC Parkour Presentation**

The committee received a presentation from the Technical Officer and Eugene Minogue (Parkour UK) regarding Parkour (Free-running).

The presentation covered:

- What is Parkour / Free-running.
- Parkour history.
- Parkour development and establishment in the UK.
- Parkour UK, the National Governing Body.
- Short video clip. The Jump\_Westminster DVD is available on request through Parkour UK.

The committee made the following comments in response to the presentation.

- (i) Sought clarification on types of Parkour facilities that could be provided.
- (ii) There have been several incidents of illegal free running across private property in the city. Clarification was sought on whether provision of facilities encouraged further incidents of anti social behaviour.
- (iii) Sought clarification on the need for facilities where people could practice Parkour. Queried if this went against the spirit of free running.

Mr Minogue responded:

- (i) 4 types of Parkour facilities could be provided, each would provide more of a challenge to users than the one before:
  - Free to access.
  - School facilities.
  - Managed facilities.
  - Mobile facilities.

- (ii) The Parkour Governing Body and Police have made a joint statement concerning acceptable behaviour – trespassing over private property was not free-running.
- (iii) Quality facilities would attract people to use them. Facilities could be customised to people's needs ie beginner through to expert level. Purpose built facilities would provide a safe environment to develop people's sports skills and discourage anti social behaviour. This in turn would have health benefits.

### **11/23/NAC Localism Bill and Planning**

The committee received a presentation and briefing report from Councillor Blair and the Planning Policy Manager regarding Localism Bill and Planning.

Members of the public in attendance were invited to complete feedback forms concerning the Localism Bill and Planning.

**Action Point: Feedback forms concerning the Localism Bill from the 'community forum' to be summarised by Strategy Officer and forwarded to Councillor Blair for inclusion in her Localism Bill response paper, plus noted on North Area Committee webpage for reference.**

### **11/24/NAC Awarding Community Development and Leisure Grants**

The committee received a report from the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation regarding Community Development and Leisure Grants.

Members considered applications for grants as set out in the report. The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation responded to member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to discount Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground project as it should be considered by West/Central Area Committee.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to approve the grant allocations as listed below for Kings Hedges Family Support Project and Meadows Children and Family Wing.

The Committee decided that the two funding request figures highlighted in the Officer's report concerning Friends of Histon Road Cemetery should be voted on and recorded separately.

The Committee **resolved** by 10 votes to 0:

- (i) To approve the grant allocation of £450.
- (ii) To approve a grant allocation of £700, with the additional condition that the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (or a nominated officer) would provide details of a separate bid later in the year as the Committee requested more information to justify the need for the remainder. That is, why so much funding was required, had other methods for obtaining funding been explored, and greater detail was sought on the management plan.

Councillors Levy and Ward withdrew from the meeting for the Friends of Histon Road Cemetery project discussion and did not participate in the decision making for this item.

Community Development current applications.				Available: £ tba		
CCF ID	Group	Project	Requested £	Recommended from Area Committee Grants £	Offer from other CCF funds £	NAC Funding Approved £
WEB 17950b / 22764	Friends of Histon Road Cemetery	1) to run an open day in the Cemetery in July 2) running costs	1,645 (450 + 1,195)	1,450	0	1,150 (450 + 700)
WEB1313 2b	Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground	to hold a one day community event in July	1,680	1,500	0	0
WEB 1916 8	Kings Hedges Family	to pay for an additional	900	700	200	700

	Support Project	play worker to enable more children to attend drop in sessions during the holidays				
WEB 19167	Meadows Children and Family Wing	to pay for an additional play worker for one year	890	690	200	690
<b>Total</b>			5,115	4,340	400	2,540

### 11/25/NAC Draft Statement of Licensing Policy for Sex Establishments

The committee received a report from the Environmental Health Manager regarding Draft Statement of Licensing Policy for Sex Establishments.

The Environmental Health Manager confirmed that the proposed policy was based on counsels' advice and that a small number of responses had been received to date since the policy had been published for consultation.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to note the consultation.

The meeting ended at 10.30 pm

**CHAIR**