

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

19 August 2010
7.00 - 11.10 pm

Present: City Councillors Herbert (Chair), Wright (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Brown, Hart, Howell, Marchant-Daisley, Pogonowski, Saunders, Shah, Smart, Bourke, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

Officers Present: Peter Carter – Principal Development Control Manager,
Wendy Lansdown – Neighbourhood Panel Liaison
Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council
Ken Hay – Head of Community Development
Andrew Preston - Environmental Projects Manager
Alastair Roberts – Safer Communities Manager
Toni Birkin – Committee Manager

Also Present: Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health,
Councillor Bick

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

10/31/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Walker and County Councillor, Cllr Harrison

10/32/EAC Minutes of the Meeting of the 17th June 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on the 17th June 2010 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

10/33/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

Residents who raised the following issues at the last East Area Committee have received follow up information.

10/25/EAC Budleigh Close Drains
10/25/EAC Digital Switch over
10/25/EAC Cherry Hinton village Centre

10/28 EAC Grant Funding

10/34/EAC Declarations Of Interest

Councillor	Agenda item	
Saunders	9	Personal Interest: Member Cambridge, Past, Present and Future
Pogonowski	7	Personal Interest: Lives next door to the Scout hut mentioned in the report
Sadiq	6	Personal Interest: Was the victim of a burglary by a drug user when living in the area

10/35/EAC Open Forum

Q. David Ousby Street Lighting and Parking Enforcement

What is being done about the lack of street lighting or parking enforcement in the Occupation Road area?

Commuter parking on the forecourt or street directly in front of Cambridge Woodworks is making it impossible to trade. Vehicle access is needed in order for the business to be viable.

A. Cllr Wright confirmed that development in this area, which on the boundary of the Abbey and Petersfield Wards, has been scrappy and uncoordinated. The area had been the subject of an Environmental Improvement project in the past. However, that was put on hold due to larger development discussions for the Eastern Gate Area. Suggestions for improvements could be fed into the Eastern Gate consultations.

Members suggested raising this at the Area Joint Committee and Cllr Bourke agreed to take this forward.

Action: County Cllr Bourke

Q. Catherine Slack Drug related issues in York Street

This issue will be covered later with the Safer Neighbourhood item.

10/36/EAC Safer Neighbourhoods

The Chair thanked Alastair Roberts, who is retiring shortly, for his service over the years. He praised his quiet effectiveness at tackling anti social behaviour issues.

The Safer Communities Manager introduced the item and Mr Fuller and Sgt Kay Stevens outlining the current position across the four wards. Seasonal trends were discussed. The summer months have again lead to an increase in problems parks and open spaces.

Tiverton house

Members discussed the previous priority of "*promotion of community cohesion in Tiverton Way in response to complaints of localised anti-social behaviour, focused around the Forum*". Members felt that many of the issues were unresolved and the problems may be being masked by the summer break. Residents plan to arrange a social event with students to involve them in the local community. A meeting with the Dean of Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) had proved difficult to arrange. However, members were pleased to learn of plans to employ evening staff and to instigate additional tenancy controls.

Q. Mr Green

The problems of Tiverton House could be seen as an indication of problems to come in the CB1 area unless an agreement can be reached with ARU about their responsibility for young people they house in the City.

A. The Chair supported this suggestion.

Q. Mr Bower

Can Ward Councillors be invited to any meetings with ARU?

A. This was seen as a good suggestion.

Cllr Benstead expressed concern about the removal of Tiverton House as a priority. If it is not identified as a priority when the new and returning students arrive in autumn there will be no resources to deal with any problems that arise. Members suggested that student accommodation across the City could be problematic. Cllr Howell stated that Tiverton House created more issues due to it's inappropriate location in a quiet residential area. Student parking continues to cause problems with ARU reluctant to deal with students who bring cars to the City in contravention of the university rules. The Student union was suggested as a means of engaging the students. Members felt that this priority should be reinstated.

Speed Reduction

Limited action has been taken in relation to the speed reduction priority and this project needs to be re-invigorated. Implementation will be challenging. However, a recent speed survey in Coleridge Road shows a marked improvement on the figure of twelve months ago. Details of the survey are available if members would like to see them.

Cllr Smart asked if the monitoring had identified a real problem that warranted the resources being expended on this issue. Cllr Bourke suggested that quantitative data was needed. Cllr Howell expressed frustration at that a plan had been agreed but not implemented. Enforcement had been promised but not delivered and it was now necessary to refocus and to push ahead with initiatives that would make a difference.

Mr Fuller suggested that clear information was difficult to obtain. For Health and Safety reasons, officers carrying out enforcement work were highly visible which allowed driver to slow down to avoid sanctions. Members agreed that reducing the inner city speed limit to 20 miles per hours would be a good idea.

The impact of national cuts to the Road Safety Budget was discussed. Cllr Sadiq asked if resources had been forthcoming from the County. Cllr Harrison had been taking the lead on this and in her absence no update was available.

Anti-Social Behaviour York Street

A growing number of complaints have been received about anti-social behaviour in the York Street area.

Q. Catherine Slack Concerns over Drug Dealing

Ms Slack raised residents' concerns about drug taking and drug dealing of class A drugs in the East Area. She explained that she was a member of two neighbourhood watch groups and attended the Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) annual meeting where she had heard concerns from local residents about drug dealing. She told the committee that she had witnessed drug deals and drug taking in broad daylight and was aware of other crime associated with the drug use occurring. She said she was aware some action was being taken as a mobile CCTV camera had been installed in one location where dealing had been taking place. She asked if this had relocated the problem to neighboring areas. She suggested that children were finding needles in play areas.

A. Sgt Stevens encouraged anyone with information to come forward and report it as this was an identified priority and the resources could be directed to the situation.

PCSOs and Neighbourhood Policing Team Officers were aware of the problem and had been seeking to disrupt activity through both high visibility and plain-clothes patrol, including stop and search of subjects and vehicles. Limited success had been achieved. As Ms Slack stated, many of the problems are thought to be related to a single individual. Outreach teams are seeking to engage drug users and Streetscene have increased litter picks in the area.

Anti-Social Behaviour Thorpe Way and Jack Warren Green

Cllr Hart asked how much information was needed if a crack house was suspected. All concerns of this kind should be reported. Cllr Wright was concerned that any action took a long time and the public perception was that nothing was being done. Sgt Stevens confirmed that all reports are taken seriously and the more information gathered, the easier it is to establish what is happening and to take action.

Joint working with Registered Social Landlords was discussed and agreed to be producing results. The Problem Solving Groups was also suggested as a way forward.

Cllr Pogonowski was concerned that the report was lacking in specific information. Sgt Stevens is happy to give members additional information or to meet with them to discuss concerns.

Q. Mr Green Section 30

The report does not contain an update on Section 30. Why?

A. As reported at the last East Area Committee, consultation is on going in licensing issues. There is currently a low level of reporting regarding street drinking related problems.

Mr Fuller agreed to circulate any proposed changes to the Cumulative Impact Zone.

Cllr Pogonowski proposed a minor amendment to the wording of the priority for Thorpe way and Jack Warren Green adding the words in bold and to read as follows:

- Youth related anti-social behaviour, **drug misuse** and criminal damage in the public areas of the Thorpe Way estate and Jack Warren Green.

This was agreed unanimously.

The recommendations for Neighbourhood Priorities were considered.

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- Youth related anti-social behaviour, drug misuse and criminal damage in the public areas of the Thorpe Way estate and Jack Warren Green.
- Anti-social behaviour in the York Street playground and adjacent streets linked to drug misuse.
- Promotion of community cohesion in Tiverton Way in response to complaints of localised anti-social behaviour, focused around the Forum

Cllr Wright proposed that the following recommendation be abandoned as it was a poor use of resources:

- Continue with Speed reduction plan.

Cllr Howell requested a named vote on this issue.

Following clarification on eligibility to vote, the following supported abandoning the speeding priority:

Cllrs Wright, Smart, Brown, Saunders, Shah, Hart and County Cllr Sedgewick-Jell.

Those in favour of retaining the speeding priority:

Cllrs Howell, Herbert, Pogonowski, Benstead, Marchant-Daisley and County Cllrs Bourke and Sadiq.

The Chair used his casting vote and the priority was retained.

RESOLVED (7 votes to 7 and Chairs casting vote)

- To continue with Speed reduction plan.

Agreed Priorities:

- Youth related anti-social behaviour, drug misuse and criminal damage in the public areas of the Thorpe Way estate and Jack Warren Green.
- Anti-social behaviour in the York Street playground and adjacent streets linked to drug misuse.
- Promotion of community cohesion in Tiverton Way in response to complaints of localised anti-social behaviour, focused around the Forum

- Continue with Speed reduction plan.

10/37/EAC Community Facilities in the East Area

Cllr Bick (the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health) introduced the item. Cllr Bick considered it appropriate that the Area Committee should be consulted and involved in the scrutiny of proposals to invest the available resources as they had a better idea of where the money should be used to create the biggest impact.

The purpose of the report was to enable members of the Area Committee to consider options for funding improvements to community facilities in the east of the city. Also, to recommend to the Executive Councillor a preferred approach to the scrutiny of potential projects and to the allocation of the funds from planning obligations on developers, also known as Section (s)106 contributions.

£800,000 was available for investment in community facilities. This money has come from developers of new housing projects and was required to mitigate the impact of their developments. An initial trawl for suitable community projects in which to invest had identified five potential schemes. Members have also indicated that each ward, all of which have experienced growth, should benefit from investment.

Before answering questions on the report, the Head of Community Development responded to questions submitted by Geri Bird some of which related to the report on community facilities.

Q. Gerrie Bird on behalf of the Cambridge Forum of Disabled People and Friends with Disabilities

Has the promised review been done?

A. The report being considered by the Area Committee represented the launch of the review.

Q. Can 106 money be used for improvements to community centres for disabled people?

A. A minimum requirement for all schemes would be compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and this is built into the criteria for grant aid. However, applicants are encouraged to go further than compliance and to

seek best practice. In addition all relevant planning applications are considered by a DDA panel.

Q. Can we stipulate its no good without the viewing of disabled people – viewing inside of premises under the DDA.

A. When designing community facilities the City Council tries whenever possible to have the direct involvement of people with disabilities from the outset and we would encourage other organisations to do the same. If either the Forum or Friends Groups wished further involvement we would be happy to discuss this with them.

Q. Has there been a review by Cambridge City Council on the contract of SLM at Cherry Hinton Village Centre?

A. The review process for the award of the contract for 2013 has started under the leadership of Debbie Kaye, Head of Arts and Recreation. A meeting to discuss issues with the Village Centre and the Friends Group has been organised for 1st September at which there would be an opportunity to ask Debbie for an update.

The Head of Community Development outlined the proposed projects and spending split in the report.

Q. David Ousby

Petersfield Area Community Trust had been working with Ken Hay and the Development Trusts Association (DTA) on identifying development opportunities for a community facility for Petersfield but to-date they had not been able to identify a suitable community centre for investment. The report from the DTA would be available in the autumn. Mr Ousby suggested that commuted sums should be rejected in future in favour of on site provision of community facilities.

A. The Head of Community Development explained that it was not always possible or desirable to seek the provision of community facilities on small to medium sites as it tended to result in the delivery of facilities with limited scope and space. The general practice was to consider an onsite option for developments of 100 units and above, and to undertake an option appraisal to see if improving existing community facilities would provide a better and more comprehensive solution – essentially treating each development on its merits. Nevertheless, finding land or buildings in which to invest in or near to the city centre was extremely difficult.

Members discussed problems with the spending split. Deprived wards, such as Abbey, could fall further behind while areas such as Petersfield could be generating a lot of funding without reaping the benefits due to a lack of space and projects with investment potential. However, the DTA consultant's report was expected shortly which could highlight opportunities in the Petersfield area. Cllr Pogonowski suggested that neighbouring wards could be considered together to arrive at a better result. The Chair suggested that Petersfield's needs could be addressed with the next phase of spending.

The Head of Community Development explained how the proposals had been arrived at and members agreed the recommendations.

RESOLVED (10 votes to 0) to recommend the following to the Executive Councillor

- £400,000, subject to project appraisal, to be made available for:
 - a) Improvements to the Flamsteed Rd Scout Hut.
 - b) Refurbishment of the St Martins Centre, Suez Road.
 - c) Refurbishment of the Stansfield Rd Scout Hut in Abbey.
 - d) Community facilities at the Emmanuel United Reformed Church, Cherry Hinton Rd.
 - e) Community facilities at the refurbished and modernised St Philips Church, Mill Rd

- The remaining £400,000 to be allocated as set out in the table below:

Ward	Total Accrued Contributions/ £	% Split	Proposed Split after top-slice/ £
Abbey	130,000	16.25%	65,000
Coleridge	230,000	28.75%	115,000
Petersfield	356,000	44.50%	178,000
Romsey	84,000	10.50%	42,000

The Executive Councillor agreed the decision.

10/38/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The Environment Projects Manager introduced the report and gave an update on current projects as per the report.

The location of the crossing on Perne Road has been changed and is now much closer to the original location. The two bus stops will also be relocated and further consultations will be needed. It is possible that there may be objections and residents may not want a bus stop outside their house. A Road Safety Audit will also be required to be carried out by the County Council.

The officer gave an update on Staffordshire Street and explained the increase in the expected costs.

Members agreed to proceed with these schemes as per the officer's recommendations at an estimated cost of £85,000

New Schemes to be Implemented

The Environment Projects Manager asked for guidance on which projects from Section 5.0 of the report should proceed for implementation subject to positive consultation.

The Chair suggested that the committee should approve all of the smaller projects. This suggestion was rejected.

Cllr Wright was concerned that there was very little on offer for the Abbey Area and suggested investigating alternative sources of funding.

Members discussed the kerbs, verges and corners in the Abbey area which have suffered considerable damage. A recent report had looked into the problems but some of the solutions suggested were undeliverable.

The Environment Projects Manager reminded members that verges are the responsibility of the County Council as the Highway Authority. Timber knee rail fencing had been proposed as a solution, but was rejected, as the County Council would not accept the future maintenance liability. The Environmental Improvement Programme can only cover capital costs and not on-going maintenance costs.

The high cost of minor projects was discussed and Cllr Howell asked for a sample detailed breakdown to be available for the Perne Road project. It was noted that much of the cost of implementing new traffic regulation orders was

due to the legal requirements to advertise planned changes carried out by the County Council. Members agreed to take an active role in promoting schemes.

Members approved consultation on all projects with, Highway Verges (5.1 of the report), being the highest priority. The remaining schemes are all to be seen as a priority. However, 5.6 Ashbury Close and Golding Rd Cycle Route will only be implemented if funding is available following completion of the other projects.

RESOLVED (unanimously) to support all projects as below:

1. Staffordshire Street

Agreed to implement the improvement scheme at an estimated cost of £85,000 and agree to the County Council developing a residents parking scheme for Staffordshire Street.

2. Perne Road

Agreed to carry out public consultation and present the results to the next Area Committee, once a new location is agreed with the promoting Councillor.

FURTHER RESOLVED (by 4 votes to 2) to implement the following subject to positive consultation in the following order of priority.

First Priority (Item 3)

3. Highway Verges

The current estimated costs for implementing these improvements are as follows:

Abbey Ward

Rayson Way - £3,000

Rawlyn Road - £8,500

Galfrid Road - £6,500

£18,000

Romsey Ward

Greville Road - £16,500

Coleridge Ward

Birdwood Rd & Chalmers Rd - £59,000

TOTAL ESTIMATED SCHEME COST - £93,500

Second Priority (Item 4 to 8 are of equal priority)

4. Yellow Lining

The proposed waiting restrictions for Stone Street and Fairsford Place. The current estimated cost of implementing these waiting restrictions is £3500.

5. Rustat Road Footpath

A design has been developed and discussed with Cycling Officers and the County Council, which is attached in Appendix 5 of this report. The current estimated cost for this scheme is £10,000.

6. Mill Road Cemetery

The current proposed grant is £5000.

7. Romsey Planting

The estimated cost of the repairs to the edging and bollards is £12,000 and the cost of refurbishment of the planting including topsoil improvement, replanting where necessary, mulching and maintenance would be £10,000.

8. Burnside Toad Crossings

The lowering of the kerbs and sloping of the adjacent verge at four points along Burnside is estimated to cost £2500.

Third Priority (Item 9)

9. Ashbury Close to Golding Rd Cycle Route

Implementation of this project will be subject to sufficient funding being available on completion of the above projects.

The estimated costs for each option are as follows:

Option 1 - Cycle Only route through green space - £34,500

Option 2 - Widened 4m segregated route - £47,500

10/39/EAC Planning Applications

The Councillors present for the consideration of planning applications were Cllrs, Benstead, Brown, Hart, Herbert, Saunders, Shah, Smart and Pogonowski.

These minutes and the appendix should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment

Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown.

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those that the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up.

9a 10/0562/CL2PD 89 Hobart Road

The committee received an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness under Section 192 for a proposed single storey rear extension, rear dormer window and two front rooflights.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendations and agree the Certificate of lawfulness for the following reasons:

That a Certificate of Lawfulness is Issued under Section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the erection of a single storey rear extension, an addition to the rear roof slope and the introduction of two rooflights to the front roof slope of 89 Hobart Road, Cambridge.

Reasons (to be included in Certificate)

It appears to the Local Planning Authority that the proposed single storey rear extension will not cover more than 50% of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original dwellinghouse) and will not exceed the limitations regarding size nor conflict with requirements regarding location for the enlargement, improvement or other alteration to a house outside a Conservation Area, set out in the legislation.

It appears to the Local Planning Authority that the proposed addition to the rear roof slope will not extend beyond the plane of the roof slope of a principal elevation or one that fronts a highway, will not exceed 40 cubic metres, will not exceed the height of the existing ridge.

Both additions will be built in materials to match the existing dwellinghouse.

It appears to the Local Planning Authority that the proposed rooflights will not exceed 150mm beyond the plane of the slope of the original roof when measured from the perpendicular with the external surface of the original roof or result in the highest part of the alteration being higher than the highest part

of the original roof.

For these reasons it is considered that the proposed rear extension, the addition to the rear roof slope, and the proposed rooflights all fall within the limitations set under Classes A, B and C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment)(No 2) (England) Order 2008 and will therefore be lawful for planning purposes.

FIRST SCHEDULE

The erection of a single storey rear extension, the addition to the rear roof slope and the introduction of two rooflights to the front roof slope.

SECOND SCHEDULE

89 Hobart Road, Cambridge, as identified outlined in RED on the location plan attached to this Certificate.

9b 10/0396/FUL 17 Norfolk Street

The committee received an application for change of use, conversion and extension of 15-17 Norfolk Street to form 3no residential dwellings with associated parking.

The S106 was completed on 16 August 2010, and therefore the recommendation should now read:

APPROVE, subject to the following conditions

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) a) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application and (b) to refuse the application both for the following reasons:

The proposed development is unacceptable in that the loss of the retail element from the ground floor of the building would have a detrimental impact on what is a cohesive block where retail frontages are an essential part of the short street frontage between East Road and the entrance to St Matthew's School. The loss from retail use of this important corner unit would erode the local context and what is an essential part of the local historical character. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 3/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

9c 10/0510/FUL 8 Montreal Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission. The application sought approval for the erection of chalet bungalow to the rear of 8 Montreal Road and demolition of outbuildings to side of 8 Montreal Road.

The committee received a letter from the applicant.

Resolved (5 to 2) to accept the officer recommendation and refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The introduction of the proposed chalet bungalow into this backland site is unacceptable, because instead of proposing a form that will have a positive impact, it introduces an alien built form, entirely out of keeping with the housing to the west in Mill Road and the housing of Montreal Road, which will detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The proposal has not therefore demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design in conflict with policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in Planning Policy Statement 1(2005).
2. The proposal has not demonstrated that it has adopted a comprehensive design approach to achieve good interrelations between buildings, routes and space, but instead prejudices the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms a part. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policies 3/6, 3/7 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
3. The proposal, because of its height and position, would be overbearing in its relationship with the neighbouring property to the north, causing occupiers to feel unduly dominated and unreasonably enclosed by the new building, with a consequent adverse impact on their amenity, particularly on the gardens, which occupiers should expect to enjoy. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005).

9d 10/0559/FUL 41 Mill Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission. The application sought approval to change of use to a Coffee Shop.

The committee received representations in support of the application from Natalie Jarman, the applicants agent.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to approve the applications for the following reasons:

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies: Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/11, 3/15, 4/11, 4/13,6/10 and 8/9.
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.

9e 10/0520/FUL 20 Seymour Street

The committee received an application for full planning permission. The application sought approval for subdivision of plot and erection of detached 4 bedroom house (following demolition of existing garage).

The committee received representations from Mr M Daines-Smith.

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation 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:
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: policies P6/1 and P9/8; Cambridge Local Plan (2006): policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 4/13, 5/1, 8/2, 8/6 and 8/10;
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.

The meeting ended at 11.10 pm

CHAIR