

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

14 April 2011
7.00 - 11.50 pm

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

County Councillors: Bourke, Harrison and Sadiq

Councillor Harrison left after the vote on item 11/19/EAC

Councillor Bourke left after the vote on item 11/22/EAC

Other County Councillors in Attendance: Brown

Officers: Peter Carter (Development Control Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Andrew Preston (Environmental Projects Manager) and Trevor Woollams (Head of Strategy and Partnerships)

Other Officers in Attendance: Glenn Burgess (Committee Manager), Sergeant Mark Cathro (Police representative), Jane Darlington (Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation), Eve Dziura (Community Development Officer), John Fuller (Community Engagement Officer), Lynda Kilkelly (Safer Communities Section Manager), Andrew Limb (Head of Corporate Strategy), Christine May (Head of Libraries, Archives and Information)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

11/12/EAC Re-Ordering Agenda

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.

11/13/EAC Apologies For Absence

County Councillor: Sedgwick-Jell

11/14/EAC Declarations Of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr Shah	11/19/EAC	Personal – Member of committee trying to increase usage of Mill Road Library.
Cllr Saunders	11/20/EAC	Personal and prejudicial – Member of Friends of Mill Road Cemetery. Withdrew from discussion and did not vote on Friends of Mill Road Cemetery funding application WEB 20060
Cllr Herbert	11/22/EAC	Personal – Lives next door to a member of the Scout group committee

11/15/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 10 February 2011 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

- (i) Item 11/3/EAC Matters Arising – Text concerning Ainsworth Street should start “Councillor Walker reported that she and Councillor Marchant-Daisley...”.

11/16/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **11/3/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes “Action Point: Follow-up Meeting re Hills Road Bridge - Member had an on site walk about and a follow up meeting will be arranged in the near future.”**

A Hills Road Bridge Working Group meeting was arranged with Alistair Frost (Project Manager) on 3 March 2011. This led to some amendments, but no substantial change to the cycle lane design.

The Project Manager had acknowledged there was an issue concerning materials for the cycle lane (not bright or distinct enough), but the cost would be prohibitive to alter. Therefore ways to mitigate the impact would be considered (such as relaying the white line on each side of the red surface).

The Project Manger reported that the option to ban cyclists from crossing from the new road to Brooklands Avenue had been reconsidered by the design team, but the resultant effect on traffic flow on the junction and local network would cause unacceptable delays. The additional crossing point outside the Earl of Derby pub had been incorporated to compensate for the movement.

The Road Safety Audit report raised some concerns, but the Project Manager signposted some remedial work to address these.

Action Point: Councillor Marchant-Daisley to follow up issues raised at EAC concerning Hills Road Bridge in conjunction with County Council Officers.

- (ii) **11/5/EAC Open Forum Action Point: Ward Councillors to take forward the issue of consultation process concerning St Barnabas Church in Mill Road tree felling in consultation with Mr Gawthrop.**

Councillor Walker has been in contact with Councillor Blair concerning St Barnabas trees. The Vicar is happy to enter into a dialogue concerning suitable alternative options post Easter. Councillor Walker will continue to monitor the situation.

The Committee discussed how resident associations could be kept informed of developments. Residents may wish to log into the City Council website for updates on specific planning applications, Councillor Brown suggested the Head of Planning may contact residents associations in future to offer training on how to do so. Councillors could also follow up issues when they attend meetings with resident associations.

- (iii) **11/5/EAC Open Forum Action Point: Long standing problems with the residents parking arrangements in the Guest Road Area.**

Councillor Harrison said that the County Council had agreed to review the policy concerning ARU parking in Guest Road.

Action Point: ARU parking in Guest Road to be revisited at a future East Area Committee (EAC) meeting.

- (iv) **11/5/EAC Open Forum Action Point: Mill Road between the swimming pool and the railway bridge is now becoming a road of**

hot food and hairdressers. A number of small, local outlets have been lost in recent months to be replaced with hot food shops. The area now lacks variety and this is against planning guidance.

Councillors Herbert and Smart arranged a meeting with the Head of Planning to follow up on planning concerns over Mill Road and the Broadway becoming an area of food outlets. It was proposed that councillors and a community representative would follow up issues in June 2011 prior to substantial work as part of a planning policy review.

- (v) 11/3/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes “Action Point: Tenison Road Mitigation Measures - Members have had a meeting with County Council officers and an open meeting would be arranged shortly. The first phase of the CB1 project has triggered the release of funding for mitigation works to begin.”**

Councillor Walker said that the County Highways Department had undertaken to look at other pots of funding.

- (vi) 11/5/EAC Open Forum Action Point: Residents of Budleigh Close were promised a follow up letter regarding their communal aerial and the digital switch over.**

Councillors Owers and Smart said that letters have been sent to City Homes tenants regarding the switch over.

- (vii) EAC thanked Councillor Walker for her committee work as this was her lasting meeting before she stepped down as a Councillor.**

11/17/EAC Open Forum

- 1. Mrs Mackenzie asked if it could be placed on record that County Council officers agreed in December 2008 to change the parking restrictions close to the junction of Stanley Road and Newmarket Road, and thereby improve safety.**

She asked if County Council officers could explain why this had not been achieved, and if the answer was lack of money, could Mrs Mackenzie requested the City Council’s East Area Committee make available the modest sums that the county officers had estimated would be needed:

a) To make this change.

b) To place a sign at the nearby junction of Mercers Row and Garlic Row/ Oyster Row, to discourage goods vehicles which were leaving Mercers Row turning right into Oyster Row. If effective this would reduce congestion and damage to vehicles, roadway and quality of life in Stanley Road.

Councillor Herbert answered that County Officers recently discussed these issues/concerns on site with Councillor Hart and members of the public.

The principle of restrictions were accepted in 2008, however at that time, (as it is now), it was not deemed a priority for County Council funding and no alternate funding was offered. In addition, any new restrictions would be subject to consultation and formal advertisement and objections could be raised.

The issue could be taken forward if third party funding was made available.

The cost of the statutory consultation process would come to an estimated £1000, and there would be no guarantee that the measures would be approved as any objections would need to be determined by the Area Joint Committee. If approved the third party would have to cover the actual costs of lining and signing work. (Estimates provided of between £1,000 - £3,000)

The provision of an advisory sign to influence lorry movements could also be provided if third party sums were available. Costs were estimated at £500. There may be different views on which route lorries should use when leaving the area so a degree of local consultation would be advisable before committing to this.

Councillor Hart suggested that a bid could be made for Environment Improvement Project funding.

Councillor Wright signposted issues such as traffic flow relating to a lack of space in Stanley/Newmarket Road, as the industrial estate was located near housing.

Action Point: Abbey Ward Councillors, Environmental Projects Manager and Stanley/Newmarket Road residents to review how to address traffic flow and no parking zone issues raised at EAC. Issues to be followed up at next committee.

2. Mr Dunn asked

- **When would the St Matthews garages get security gates like those on the East Road garage block?**
- **Why general maintenance and repair hasn't been done on the St Matthews garage block?**

Action Point: Principal Surveyor to respond to Mr Dunn's concerning his open forum question.

3. Mr Blencowe welcomed the new homes bonus being awarded to the City Council. He asked if funding from this or the climate change budget could be used to re-instate the green bus service that recently ceased.

The committee agreed that it was unfortunate that the bus service had been withdrawn, but the City Council could not take over service responsibility from the County Council. EAC would investigate alternative sources of funding for green bus service provision.

Action Point: Committee Manager to invite County Council representatives such as Richard Preston or Joseph Whelan to next EAC meeting to give a presentation on south and east corridor funds in order to explore options on how to re-instate the green bus service.

Members of the public also asked questions in items 11/18/EAC and 11/19/EAC.

11/18/EAC Safer Neighbourhoods

The committee received a report from Sergeant Cathro regarding policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 16 December 2010. The current emerging issues for each ward were also highlighted (see report

for full details). They covered drug-related anti-social behaviour in York Street and adjoining streets; ASB and criminal damage at Romsey Recreation Ground; tackling crime, anti-social behaviour and promoting public confidence in the area of Barnwell Road shops and the Peverel Road estate; engagement activity (Operation Henry – Petersfield 04/01 – 07/01/11) and emerging issues/neighbourhood trends.

The committee discussed the following policing issues:

- (i) Anti-social behaviour affecting Peverel Road Estate and surrounding area.
- (ii) Anti-social behaviour and criminal damage at Romsey Recreation Ground.
- (iii) Anti-social behaviour, drug and alcohol use affecting Mill Road Cemetery.
- (iv) Summer time anti-social behaviour affecting open spaces in general (thematic rather than geographic focus).
- (v) Anti-social behaviour and general criminality affecting Thorpe Way and Wadloes Road.
- (vi) Parking issues in Radegund Road, and possible link to local school traffic.
- (vii) Anti-social behaviour at Coleridge Recreation Ground and Lichfield Road.
- (viii) Anti-social behaviour affecting Cherry Hinton Road.
- (ix) Anti-social behaviour affecting Mill Road.
- (x) Anti-social behaviour affecting Whitehill Close.

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

1. Mr Gawthrop asked how anti-social behaviour in Mill Road Cemetery would be addressed.

EAC debated the merits of including this as a priority to be adopted.

The Safer Communities Manager said the Housing Team had undertaken work to address anti-social behaviour, such as walking around estates close to Romsey Recreation Ground in order to gain public feedback.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

- (i) Continuation of watching brief on issues in Thorpe Way.
- (ii) Continuation of watching brief on issues in Wadloes Road.
- (iii) (New priority) Anti-social behaviour affecting Mill Road Cemetery and surrounding area.
- (iv) (New priority) Observe and monitor anti-social behaviour in open spaces during the summer time, with implied focus on known crime hotspots

11/19/EAC Libraries

The committee received a report from County Councillor Sir Peter Brown 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. It was anticipated that the trust would become a limited company 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 was 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 would 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 wanted libraries to be multi-agency community hubs. There was also scope for other organisations to use library buildings when libraries were closed.

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

13 libraries had been selected for priority consideration for the review of the network, following an initial assessment of community need and library performance.

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

- (i) Sought clarification on how a quality service will be maintained given the substantial budget cut, effectiveness of self-service to reduce staff/resource costs, other options considered for saving funding (eg lobbying to make libraries exempt from rates) and impact of cuts on stock levels.
- (ii) Sought clarification on whether volunteers would be qualified to replace trained professional staff.
- (iii) Sought clarification on criteria for assessing library catchment areas and performance.
- (iv) Queried impact on communities who lost library and bus services.
- (v) Queried make-up of the Trust Board.

- (vi) Queried if savings from other budgets could be fed into the Library service to reduce the budget cut.
- (vii) Felt the last library review led to library closures and asked if this review would also lead to closures by implication. Sought clarification on impact of review on growth areas that needed Library services when these were under threat.

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

- (i) A one-off investment for self-service facilities was required from the County Council's capital budget, which would lead to on-going revenue budget savings. Self-service was viewed as generally effective and a way of mitigating lower staffing levels.

Attempts to lobby Government on making libraries exempt from rates were unsuccessful. The Library service should make cost savings through becoming a charitable trust.

Some small savings were expected on the stock fund, but it was considered adequate and would continue at the same level from 2012.

Suggestions were welcomed on alternative options for providing the Library service on a reduced budget.

- (ii) 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 did now, only in greater numbers.

Volunteers would not replace trained frontline staff. Self-governing libraries would have the option to buy in professional staff.

- (iii) Criteria for assessing library catchment areas and performance would be published on the County Council website in future.
- (iv) The aim was to avoid closing libraries by implementing a strategy to provide a service within the resources available. It was unfortunate that the Big Society coincided with the current economic situation, but bus services were outside the remit of the library service. The situation would be monitored and used to refine assessment criteria scores.

- (v) An advert to recruit an interim Chair and 10 trustees would be published in the near future. These would be voluntary unpaid positions.
- (vi) The County Council makes political decisions on how to allocate budget funding to reflect its strategic priorities. Funding was unlikely to be transferred between budgets.
- (vii) Re-iterated the intention not to close libraries. Libraries were closed under the previous review on efficiency grounds.

The County Council Cabinet would make the final decision concerning Library services in September 2011.

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

1. Mr Hughes made the following points:

- **Sought guarantees that Barnwell Road Library was safe from further cuts/closure.**
- **Queried the impact of cuts and use of voluntary library staff on performance, and asked if these would lead to further cuts on efficiency grounds if performance appeared to decline. Sought clarification on how to protect against this.**

The Head of Libraries, Archives and Information responded:

- The County Council aims to avoid closing libraries. A 5 year budget plan was in place that assumed all libraries would remain in place for five years. The County Council has undertaken to staff libraries during full opening hours through charitable trust volunteers, albeit staff likely to be reduced in numbers. Volunteers would be trained to give an effective service.
- Barnwell Library was not one of the 13 libraries under review. Whilst no guarantees could be given in the current economic climate, the County Council had set out a 5 year budget plan and officers were working to this. Quality of service will be maintained by paid staff operating during set opening hours; volunteers would be effectively trained and managed. 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.

2. A member of public asked if housing developers could provide funding for libraries.

The Head of Libraries, Archives and Information responded that developers paid a tariff that contributed to Library services.

The Head of Libraries, Archives and Information summed up by saying the intention was for the Library service to work in partnership with other organisations (such as adult education) to provide shared services. Members of the public were welcome to forward questions to the following email address:

christine.may@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

11/20/EAC 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 Officer's report. The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation responded to member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

Councillor Owers formally proposed an amendment to change the grant offered to TJ Kidds from £500 to £1,500 to be used for capital expenditure. This amendment was lost by 8 votes to 3.

Resolved (11 votes to 0) to approve the grant allocations as listed below for Friends of Mill Road Cemetery.

Resolved (unanimously) to approve the grant allocation as listed below TJ Kidds.

Councillors Saunders withdrew from the meeting for the Friends of Mill 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	Offer

			£	by CCF from East Area Committee Fund £	from other CCF funds £
WEB 20060	Friends of Mill Road Cemetery	To run an open day in the cemetery in July 2011.	450	450	0
WEB2 0475	TJ KIDS Home from Home	To provide new equipment and resources.	£5,414	£500	
			Total	£950	0

11/21/EAC Community safety, anti-social behaviour, racial harassment and community cohesion

Item withdrawn from agenda.

11/22/EAC Capital Projects Update

The committee received a tabled amended report from the Head of Strategy and Partnerships regarding community development capital projects in the East Area.

The officer's report set out three applications for consideration by the East Area Committee. The first application of £120,000 was from the 28th Cambridge Scout Group for improvements to the Flamsteed Road Scout Hut.

The second application of £120,000 was from the St Martins Church who were seeking a contribution towards the costs of improving their main community hall and for initial costs towards the creation of community meeting spaces in a new first floor.

The third application was from Squeaky Gate Studios who requested £19,000 to complete refurbishment of their premises at 47-51 Norfolk Street.

Area Committee agreed unanimously to advise the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health that the following applications were

suitable for funding from resources allocated to Community Development Capital Project Grants for the East Area:

- (i) A capital grant of up to £120,000, subject to compliance with the Council's legal agreement, to the 28th Cambridge Scout Group for the repair and improvement of their premises at Flamsteed Road.
- (ii) A capital grant of up to £120,000, subject to compliance with the Council's legal agreement, to the St Martin's Church for the redevelopment and improvement of their community hall.
- (iii) A capital grant of up to £19,000, subject to compliance with the Council's legal agreement, to Squeaky Gate Studios for the refurbishment of premises at 45-51 Norfolk Street.

11/23/EAC Environmental Improvements Programme Update

The Environmental Projects Manager reported on the progress with approved schemes:

- Riverside conflict reduction and environmental improvement scheme.
- Cherry Hinton Road Shop Forecourts.
- Perne Road.
- Staffordshire Street.
- Romsey Planting.
- Greville Road Verges.
- Birdwood/Chalmers Verges.
- Rawlyn Road Verges.
- Galfrid Road Verges.
- Rustat Road Footpath Extension.
- Burnside Toad Crossings.
- Mill Road Cemetery.
- Mill Road/Cavendish Road.

It was noted that the outturn of the current financial program should lead to an expected saving of £38,000. Thus £20,000 could be carried over into the new programme giving a budget of £76,000.

Following discussion, members proposed drawing up a list of minor works to be taken en masse as one project. Councillors undertook to talk to ward

residents to ascertain issues to address in proposed spring and autumn projects.

Action Point: Environmental Projects Manager to circulate menu of costs for minor works (eg painting railings) to EAC so councillors could draw up a list that could be undertaken en masse as 1 project. Environmental Projects Manager to circulate environmental improvement project submission deadlines. Issues to be followed up at next committee.

Resolved (unanimously) to note the officer's report.

11/24/EAC Planning Applications

11/24/EACa 10/1113/FUL: 1 Ferndale Rise

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing garage and single storey extension and erection of 2 bedroom dwelling.

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

The Committee:

Resolved (by 10 votes to 1) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda but with the addition of the word "dormers" after the word extensions on the fourth line of condition 7:

"...modification), no extensions, dormers or additions or garages shall be...."

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: policy ENV7

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, 5/1,
5/14, 8/6

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.

11/24/EACb 10/0642/FUL: 152 Stanley Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a second storey extension above existing single storey part of the house, works to include installation of new windows in existing side elevation.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, 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: ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4 and 3/14

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.

11/24/EACc 10/1211/FUL: Emperor Public House, 21 Hills Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective application for a smoking shelter in the garden.

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

- Mr Gawthrop

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Concerns about engaging buy-to-let residents in the community.
- (ii) The smoking shelter was located near to neighbouring housing.
- (iii) Concerns about detrimental impact on local amenities

Jonathan Hughes (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 11 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, 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: ENV6, ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/11

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.

11/24/EACd 11/0096/S73: 41 Mill Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for S73 application to vary condition 2 of planning permission reference 10/0559/FUL to allow the coffee shop at 41 Mill Road to open to customers between 07:00 - 19:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 19:00 on Saturdays and 08:00 - 18:00 on Sundays.

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

- Ms Carpenter

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Concerns about adequate public notification of the application.
- (ii) Signposted Environmental Health Officer concerns.

- (iii) Concerns about impact of Costa Coffee users dropping litter in Mill Road. Other businesses were taking steps to minimise the impact of their packaging.
- (iv) Concerns over change to opening hours.

Councillor Smart proposed amendments that:

- (i) Condition 1 should be deleted
- (ii) An informative should be added to the officer's recommendations.

These amendment were carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 10 votes to 2) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission, but with condition 1 deleted and, in line 3 of condition 2 which becomes the new condition 1, the word "seize" replaced by the word "cease".

"...shall cease to operate..."

An informative to be added too to read:

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that there is concern locally that a great deal of litter is being deposited in Mill Road and surrounding streets which on the basis that much of it is carrying Costa related logos would suggest that it is likely to be from 41-Mill Road. The applicant is asked to do what it can to encourage clients not to deposit litter in the streets and to undertake a sweep once or twice a day in the locality, to pick up litter emanating from the premises.

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, 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, ENV6 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 4/2, 4/6, 4/11, 4/13 and 6/10

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 11.50 pm

CHAIR