

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

19 June 2014  
7.00am - 11.16 pm

**Present:**

**City Councillors:** Blencowe (Chair), Owers (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Benstead, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, Moghadas, Roberts, Sinnott, C. Smart, Bourke, Walsh and Whitehead

**County Councillors:** Bourke, Walsh and Whitehead

**Officers:**

Head of Planning: Patsy Dell

Senior Planning Officer: John Evan

Planning Officer: Sav Patel

Capital and Funding Manager (County Council): Dan Clarke

Project Delivery and Environment Manager: Andy Preston

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

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

**14/33/EAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

The Committee Manager took the chair whilst the east area committee elected a chair.

Councillor Roberts proposed, and Councillor Owers seconded, the nomination of Councillor Blencowe as Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor Blencowe be chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Blencowe assumed the chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

Councillor Baigent proposed, and Councillor Johnson seconded, the nomination of Councillor Owers as Vice Chair.

**Resolved** (*Nem Com*) that Councillor Owers be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

**14/34/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Robertson and Kavanagh.

**Councillor Hart and Johnson left after the vote on item 14/40/EAC****14/35/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Bourke	14/39/EAC and 14/40/EAC	14/39/EAC and 14/40/EAC: Personal interests as Members of Cambridge Cycle Campaign and CAMRA
Baigent	14/39/EAC and 14/40/EAC	14/39/EAC and 14/40/EAC: Personal interest as Members of Cambridge Cycle Campaign

**Change to Published Agenda Order**

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.

**Request to Film the Meeting**

The Chair gave permission for Richard Taylor to film the meeting. It was confirmed that the filming would 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.

**14/36/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 10<sup>th</sup> April 2014 was agreed as a correct record.

## **14/37/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

### Speeding Camera on Cherry Hinton Road

Councillor Owers confirmed that the cameras were still in operation in the area.

### Visit to Coleridge College

Councillor Blencowe confirmed that some Members had attended recent events and further contact was expected in the future.

### 20mph Project Consultations: Wadloes Road

Councillor Roberts would continue to pursue this.

## **14/38/EAC Open Forum**

**1. A group of local children from Abbey Ward addressed the Committee about the park behind Abbey Pool. Luke, Katy and Samia said that the play equipment at the Abbey Pool site was boring. The splash pad was fun but more equipment was urgently needed.**

Councillor Johnson stated that the delays were unavoidable as permission was needed from the Secretary of State before any equipment could be installed on Common Land. In addition, local consultation had been required.

### **Why has it taken two years?**

Councillor Johnson shared the young people's frustration at the delays.

Councillor Blencowe stated that the East Area Committee had also supported a hogging path in this area and undertook to look into the progress of this proposal.

**Action: Councillor Blencowe**

**2. Nicky Shepard: Residents of Whitehill Road are suffering damage due to cracked Willow Trees in the Abbey Pool car park. The tree roots are causing damage and residents are unable to get house insurance. Having spoken to both City and County Council Officers about this matter over several years, the situation remains unresolved.**

Councillor Blencowe stated that as this was an ongoing claim against the City Council, in-depth discussion would be inappropriate.

Councillor Johnson suggested that that the City Council were awaiting evidence that the trees were causing a problem. He undertook to seek a response from the City Council's tree officers.

**Action: Councillor Johnson**

**3. Maureen Symonds stated that residents parking had been denied for the Riverside area due to the low number of households in the area and the cost of implementation. However, if the area was widened to include neighbouring streets, the costs would be viable. Can further consultation be undertaken?**

Councillor Whitehead stated that funding had been requested for this area and would be discussed later in the meeting.

**4. Maureen Symonds asked if any progress had been made regarding the bench requested for Stourbridge Common.**

Councillor Johnson stated that he had passed on this request to Councillor O'Reilly.

**5. Richard Harvey on behalf of PACT asked if there was any information available on possible development work at 140 Newmarket Road?**

Councillor Blencowe suggested a search of the City Council Planning Portal might provide the answer as no Members of the committee had any information on this matter.

**6. Sturton Street residents expressed their unhappiness at the planned closure of the Methodist Church and its associated community facilities. The failure of the Church to attract a large enough congregation to sustain it was regrettable. However, the community value the community facility and are seeking to register it as a Community Asset? Can the Committee suggest any further action?**

Councillor Smart suggested that Community Right to Buy might be an option. However, whilst this would allow a six month delay, raising sufficient funds would be difficult.

Councillor Walsh suggested that Cottenham Church had been successful with a Right to Buy application and might be willing to share their expertise.

A representative of the Methodist Church, the Rev Alison Walker, was present and confirmed that the Methodist Church Policy Commission had met recently and agreed that worship in this building would cease in August. Further meetings would take place shortly to agree the future of the building. The Church would be bound by Charity Commission rules regarding disposal of assets.

Councillor Blencowe undertook to enquire if representatives of the East Area Committee and a limited number of local residents would be able to attend that meeting and / or have a private meeting with representative of the Church. In addition, he also proposed a Ward meeting in the area to assess public opinion and agree a plan of action.

**Action: Councillor Blencowe**

**7. Louise Downham asked for an update on work to Barnwell Road and Ditton Lane pedestrian crossings. Five years ago a survey indicated there was a problem but no action has been taken. There have been a number of accidents at the crossings.**

Councillor Hart stated that the work had been in the works programme for some time awaiting funding. Major crossing refurbishment work was due to be completed over the summer school holiday period. Temporary crossing points would be installed while the installation of puffin crossings was undertaken.

**8. Heavy Goods Vehicles use Ditton lane as an access route for the A14. As many as 55 speeding lorries an hour have been counted. The Trading Standards department are not willing to take any action.**

Councillor Johnson responded. Funding was in place to address this issue and would be implemented once related works had been completed. Councillor Roberts undertook to write to the Trading Standards department regarding the problem.

**Action: Councillor Roberts**

**9. Martin Lucas-Smith praised recent improvements to cycle parking in the East Area and asked the Committee where they thought similar improvements could be made.**

Councillor Walsh suggested that there were areas of Romsey which would benefit from improvements. Further suggestions from the public were invited.

**10. Mr Harvey asked if any action could be taken regarding pavement parking in Kingston Street. Resident parking in the area is successful but there is insufficient spaces to meet demand.**

Councillor Walsh stated that around a third of Kingston Street was Pay and Display. Consultation would be taking place over the summer regarding an extension to residents parking in the area.

### **14/39/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme**

The Committee received as report for the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Environmental Improvements Programme. The Chair reminded Members that the budget was limited and there was a need to select realistic projects.

Members agreed that the hanging baskets in Mill Road were valued by the community and that they would continue to support them.

Members discussed the merits of the smaller projects and suggested that Silverwood Close, Oyster Row, Riverside/Stourbridge Common, Tenison Road and Glisson Road proposals could be delivered quickly and efficiently. It was noted that the proposal for Glisson Road had been amended to a bollard rather than a tree, due to space constraints.

Members expressed support for the Mill Road pinch point work and felt that the safety of cyclists was a high priority. However, concerns were expressed that the full costs of this could be much more than the £40,000. In addition, it could prove to be undeliverable due to the requirement to purchase private front gardens.

**Alan Smith questioned the delays in addressing the pinch point on Mill Road which had been under consideration for some time with no action taken.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded. The feasibility of the Mill Road project is one of a number under consideration. Once agreed, feasible schemes could only then be delivered when funding was available.

The Committee voted on projects considered viable and supported by Ward Councillors as follows:

**E4 Mill Road adjacent to Cutlacks Store rejected (by 1 vote to 9)**

E1 Oyster Row and E2 Riverside/Stourbridge Common parking scheme agreed (**by 9 vote to 0**) (officers will investigate economies of scale if these schemes are combined).

E7 Cherry Hinton Road / Perne Road, road sign agreed (**by 9 votes to 0**)

E18 Tenison Road noticeboard, E19 Glisson Road Tree (bollard option) and E6 Silverwood Close agreed (***nem com***).

The Chair reminded Members that the other projects still had the support of this Committee and would be retain on the list awaiting funding.

Councillor Whitehead stated that the County Council had a round of funding in the near future and suggested working with the City to identify suitable projects for her to champion.

### **RESOLVED**

To allocate funding of £10,890 for the annual provision and maintenance of 66 hanging baskets along Mill Rd.

To fund the following projects as detailed in the Officer's report:

E1 Oyster Row road narrowing - £23,500

E2 Riverside/Stourbridge Common parking scheme - £12,500

E7 Cherry Hinton Road / Perne Road road signs - £6,000

E18 Tenison Road noticeboard - £1,750

E19 Glisson Road Tree (bollard option) - £2,000

E6 Silverwood Close £500

These approvals lead to an over allocation of £725, which was agreed to be resolved by targeting savings across the Oyster Row road narrowing and Riverside/Stourbridge Common parking scheme project budgets.

## **14/40/EAC S106 Area Corridor Schemes**

The Capital and Funding Manager introduced the item as per the agenda.

**1. Martin Lucas-Smith stated that the Eastern Gate encompassed a lot of work. He asked if the Newmarket Road / Elizabeth Way roundabout could be given priority.**

Councillor Johnson confirmed that an Eastern Gate framework was being developed. A feasibility study was planned to establish what could be achieved.

Councillor Herbert asked for detailed information on deadlines. He requested a clear set of expected completions dates for the delivery of projects already in the pipeline.

Councillor Roberts asked for an update on the Chisholm Bridge. A previous meeting of the Committee had sent a request to the North Area Committee for a contribution. Councillor Blencowe undertook to raise this matter and the next Area Chairs meeting.

### **Action Councillor Blencowe**

Councillor Owers requested an update on the Leisure Park link bridge. The Capital and Funding Manager confirmed that this had been delayed by legal difficulties.

Councillor Smart suggested that Sainbury's be approached for a contribution towards the trial of an orbital bus route from the Marshall's site to Addenbrooke's Hospital. Concerns were raised that the proposed new bus route would impact on the existing 114 services. Councillor Bourke was concerned that this bus route, which serves vulnerable communities, might suffer cuts. However, other members suggested there was room for both services and that Abbey residents had raised a 1,000 signature petition in support of a direct route to the hospital.

Further details were requested on the entrance to Stourbridge Common proposals and the high figure suggested for this was questioned. The Capital and Funding Manager confirmed that the any underspend on the project would be returned to the pot for reallocation.

The timetable for delivery of an extension to the Tenison Road scheme was questioned. Officers confirmed that Tenison Road was to be regarded as a design template that could be replicated quickly in surrounding areas.



**2. Hester Wells stated that given that the consultation on the first stage of Tenison Road had yet to open it was too soon to consider funding extensions to the project.**

The Committee noted her comments.

Councillor Bourke asked if Eastern Corridor funding could be used for projects in Mill Road. Officers confirmed that this would be possible. The Capital and Funding Manager suggested that a meeting be arranged with members to discuss proposals. In addition, a budget allocation would be needed to allow scoping work and feasibility studies of any proposals to be completed.

Councillor Herbert reminded the Committee that additional funding might also be forthcoming from the City Deal.

### **Resolved (unanimously)**

The following four projects were approved from existing budgets:

5.1 Entrance to Stourbridge Common (£50,000)

5.2 Chisholm Trail (Bridge) (£50,000)

5.4 Bus Service from Newmarket Park and Ride to Addenbrooke's Hospital (£95,000) (subject to negotiations with Marshall's)

Funding to allow scoping work of Mill Road Projects (£20,000)

The following project was earmarked for approval in the future when funding becomes available.

5.3 Additional funding for Tenison Road (£500,000)

### **14/41/EAC Planning Applications**

#### **14/42/EAC 14/0308/FUL - The Seven Stars, 249 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing buildings and outbuildings and erection of a new 3 storey building for mixed use, including 7 flats and a restaurant and/or public house, with retention of existing facade

The Committee noted the amendment sheet recommendation regarding tree protection.

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.

#### **14/43/EAC 14/0399/FUL - 39 Thoday Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission. The application sought approval for construction of two storey studio unit.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 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.

#### **14/44/EAC 14/0513/FUL - 101A Gwydir Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the erection of single storey timber shed/store, replacement doors and windows and internal alterations installation of woodburner and external flue.

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

The representation covered the following points:

- i. Loss of storage space for other tenants of the property.
- ii. Currently occupies a small studio flat and has been using the shared space for 20 years.
- iii. Has had no consultation from the landlord regarding the proposal.
- iv. Would suffer from the fumes of the proposed woodburner.
- v. Extraction fan exit would also cause problems.

The Planning Officer confirmed that loss of storage space was a civil matter and not a planning consideration. He confirmed that the woodburner might be removed from the plan.

Councillor Smart expressed concern that the plans might be amended and that there appeared to have been a lack of consultation.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the application be deferred to allow appropriate consultation and consideration of a non-material amendment regarding the wood burner. Councillor Owers seconded the amendment.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to defer the application for planning permission.

**14/45/EAC 14/0461/FUL - 26 Priory Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use for the outbuilding annex at 26 Priory Road from ancillary residential use to an office for the business use of the charity, Afrinspire. The change of use will be to B1 Business/office class.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. A previous change of use application had been refused.
- ii. Using charity status to circumvent rules.
- iii. Neighbours object to change of use.
- iv. Intrusion into private space.
- v. Noise of business.
- vi. Additional increase foot fall to the rear of properties.

Dennis Whitefield, the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Members asked for further information on the application history of the site and questioned if this was a retrospective application.

The Planning officer confirmed that that the building currently had permission for unrestricted out building. He stated that there was no planning history to this unit.

The Committee was minded to refuse the application. Officers suggested 3/4 and 3/10 were the relevant policies. Officers would draft a refusal based on these policies to be agreed by chair and spokes. The Head of Planning agreed this approach.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 1 votes to 7)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

- 3.10 Impact on residential area
- 3.10 Out of character with residential area

**14/46/EAC 14/0452/FUL - 80 Ainsworth Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey rear extension to dwelling house.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Sarah Barrett

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Full two storey overshadowing.
- ii. Loss of light to bathroom, kitchen and patio of her property.
- iii. Loss of daylight.
- iv. The property could be extended sympathetically without obstructing light to neighbours.
- v. The site is large and alternatives are available.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 4 and on Chairs casting vote)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

- Overshadowing
- Lose of amenity

(Final wording will be agreed with the Chair and Spokes outside the meeting as agreed with the Head of Planning).

### **14/47/EAC 14/0444/FUL - 591 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Change of use of property from a residential dwelling (use Class C3) to a large house in multiple occupation (*sui generis*) (retrospective application).

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There are no other houses in multiple occupancy in the area.
- ii. The properties are very close together.
- iii. The rear annex building inches from the neighbours building.
- iv. The residents of the property were not all students.
- v. The kitchen is in a former garage and is very close to the neighbour's bedroom.
- vi. Noise and untidy bin area is a problem.
- vii. Car parking exceeds the 2 permitted.

Mr Brown, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Members suggested that the concerns of neighbours could be addressed with additional conditions.

The following conditions were proposed:

1. A Management Agreement to provide neighbours with contact telephone numbers.
2. Parking restriction.
3. A maximum occupancy number of 9.
4. No occupancy of the rear annex building

The conditions were agreed (*Nem Com*).

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 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.

**14/48/EAC 13/1644/FUL - 56 and 56A Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey rear extension and associated works (including changes to shopfront) to combine retail units 56 and 56A Mill Road and to create 6 self contained studio flats, 4 of which are new, following demolition of existing extensions and outbuildings.

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.

**14/49/EAC 14/0642/FUL - Coleridge Recreation Ground**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of a second hard tennis court on the Coleridge Recreation Ground near Davy Road, with a new 3 metre high mesh style fencing on the perimeter (including one single gate for pedestrian access and a small tarmac area for access with 3 cycle stands).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ms Teresa Barnes

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There had been 16 objections to the proposal.
- ii. Report summary had not adequately captured the objections.
- iii. Consultation 2012 had resulted in a recommendation to refurbish the court and provide an additional court.
- iv. Current court works well and a second is not needed.
- v. The Recreation ground serves many needs in the area.

- vi. The open space is valued.
- vii. A second court would erode the green space.
- viii. A peaceful area would be lost.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 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.

**14/50/EAC 14/0466/FUL - 4 Sunnyside**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of 4 Sunnyside and construction of 6 residential units comprising two three-bedroom houses and four two-bedroom houses.

The committee delegated a decision on 8.41 of the officer's report, Monitoring Fee of Planning Obligation Strategy (2010), to officers.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 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.

**14/51/EAC 14/0214/FUL - 3 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Single storey rear extension and two storey side extension with internal alterations. Conversion of two bed flat to two studio flats. Retrospective change of use from C3 dwelling house to Sui Generis HMO.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Further loss on amenity.
- ii. Adds to loss of garden space in the area.
- iii. Loss on open space.
- iv. The extension would cause bin storage to be moved to the rear of the building increasing rear access traffic.
- v. Application is inaccurate about the number of trees on the site. Bins would need to move to the space currently occupied by the trees.
- vi. Agreeing the application based on inaccurate plans would be agreeing something based on a false statement.

The Planning Officer confirmed that officers were fully aware of the trees and had consulted correctly on this matter.

Councillor Herbert proposed additional conditions and informatives as follows:

1. An informative regarding Fire Safety and a House in Multiple Occupancy License.
2. A requirement to produce a Management Agreement.
3. A maximum occupancy of 12 persons.

This was agreed (***Nem Com***).

Councillor Smart suggested that condition 7 was not detailed enough regarding the distances between the Sheffield Stand cycle storage.

The Committee delegated the detail of this matter to officers (***Nem Com***).

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 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 11.16 pm

**CHAIR**