EAST AREA COMMITTEE 23 June 2011
7.00 - 11.40 pm

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

County Councillors: Bourke, Harrison, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

Councillors Bourke, Harrison, Pogonowski, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell left after the vote on item 11/34/EAC

Officers: Peter Carter (Development Control Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager) and Andrew Preston (Environmental Projects Manager)

Other Officers in Attendance: Eve Dziura (Community Development Officer), Andrew Limb (Head of Corporate Strategy), Richard Preston (Head of Parking & Road Safety – County Council) and Joseph Whelan (Head of New Communities Service – County Council)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

11/25/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.

11/26/EAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2011/12

Councillor Owers proposed, and Councillor Benstead 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 Councillor Herbert at this point.

Councillor Pogonowski proposed, and Councillor Moghadas seconded, the nomination of Councillor Wright as Vice Chair.

Resolved (unanimously) that Councillor Wright be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

11/27/EAC Apologies For Absence

None.

11/28/EAC Declarations Of Interest

None.

11/29/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 14 April 2011 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

(i) 11/16/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes – 11/5/EAC Open Forum Action Point should refer to Councillors (not Councillor) Owers and Smart.

(ii) 11/18/EACvi Safer Neighbourhoods – should refer to Radegund Road not Radegunds Way.

(iii) 11/18/EACvii Safer Neighbourhoods – should refer to Coleridge Recreation Ground not Colleridge Recreation Ground.

11/30/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

(i) **11/16/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes "Action Point: Councillor Marchant-Daisley to follow up issues raised at EAC concerning Hills Road Bridge in conjunction with County Council Officers."**

Councillor Marchant-Daisley has followed up issues raised at EAC concerning Hills Road Bridge in conjunction with County Council Officer Alistair Frost (Project Manager).

It was recognised that the cycle lanes had safety issues, but the cost of making changes to areas such as the red surfacing would be difficult to justify.

The Road Safety Audit report raised some concerns, but the Project Manager signposted some remedial work to address these. Any pertinent issues would be followed up through future safety reports.

(ii) **11/16/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes "Action Point: ARU parking in Guest Road to be revisited at a future EAC meeting."**

Councillors Brown and Harrison will lead on this items.

Action Point: Item to be added to agenda for 18 August 2011 EAC.

(iii) 11/16/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes – 11/5/EAC Trees at Saint Barnabas Church, Mill Road.

A meeting would be held 25 July 2011 between planning and resident representatives.

(iv) 11/17/EAC Open Forum "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."

Item addressed under item 11/32/EAC of the agenda.

(v) 11/17/EAC Open Forum "Action Point: Principal Surveyor to respond to Mr Dunn concerning his 'open forum' question concerning St Matthews garage block in East Road."

The Principal Surveyor has responded to Mr Dunn outside of the meeting.

The Principal Surveyor expected to meet with local residents and garage tenants on 29 June 2011 to answer any queries concerning the garage block.

(vi) 11/17/EAC Open Forum "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."

Councillors Herbert and Reid held a meeting 28 April 2011 to discuss the bus service.

Richard Preston and Joseph Whelan were invited to attend 23 June EAC. Report covered under item 11/32/EAC of the agenda.

(vii) 11/23/EAC Environmental Improvements Programme Update "Action Point: Environmental Projects Manager to circulate menu of costs for minor works (eg painting railings) to EAC so councillors can draw up a list that can 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."

Environmental Projects Manager has circulated notes and requested EAC submit projects to him by 31 May 2011.

Environmental projects report covered under item 11/33/EAC of the agenda.

(viii) Committee Manager requested to circulate new EAC City Neighbourhood Policing team contact.

New area Sergeant is Jamie Stenton. He replaces Mark Kathro.

11/31/EAC Open Forum

1. **Mr Green raised the following points:**

(i) Expressed concerns about County Council democratic functions.

(ii) Expressed concerns about on street parking charges.

(iii) Suggested that the County Council had not consulted residents about parking charge increases.

(iv) Suggested a unitary authority could handle the matter more effectively and asked EAC about their views on the likelihood of a unitary authority coming into existence.

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell referred to a change in the County Council constitution that transferred decision making powers to the Cabinet.

Councillor Wright signposted the Joint Development Control Committee as a mechanism to bring local authorities together for cross boundary working.

A number of councillors expressed their support for a unitary authority.

2. **Mr Taylor asked what is the current status/progress towards a Conservation Area in Riverside.**

Councillor Wright answered that a Conservation Area was already established in Riverside, there was a consultation currently on how far to extend it.

3. **Mrs Deards asked if restaurants and cafes have permission to put tables, chairs and advertising boards on footpaths in the city centre as they obstruct people passing who then have to walk in the road.**

Councillors observed that advertising boards hindered all pavement users. They referred to an exercise where councillors took to the streets in wheelchairs to gain an insight into the problems faced by disabled people. The group was led on a tour by members of the Cambridge Forum for the Disabled.

Richard Preston (Head of Parking and Road Safety – County Council) said that the Highways Agency and City Council were working together as permission was required from both to set out advertising boards in central City areas. The Highways Agency and City Council would investigate complaints made to establish if advertising boards/street furniture was appropriate and take enforcement action as required. The Head of Parking and Road Safety said that mixed messages had previously been received from councillors concerning removal of boards, as this could sometimes be seen as hindering traders. However, he noted a clear message from EAC Councillors and members of the public present supporting proactive intervention to review the placement of

advertising boards on pavements and the clearing of them where possible (the County Council could take enforcement action where advertising boards were on the public highway).

Councillor Brown suggested asking for a report at Area Joint Committee on how to pursue action concerning advertising boards on pavements.

Resolved (by 13 votes to 0) that East Area Committee in principle want all boards removed from the public highway.

The Head of Parking and Road Safety undertook to feedback to County Council Cabinet/Portfolio Holder East Area Committee's request to follow up on advertising boards obstructing the pavement as a priority.

4. **Mr Ousby made the following points:**

(i) The planning application for 6 Hooper Street (11/0441/FUL) was similar to previous ones.

(ii) A Development Control Forum had been requested by residents who had concerns about development of the site.

(iii) Sought clarification as to why an application could be brought back multiple times for consideration. Mr Ousby wanted to register his dissatisfaction concerning this.

The Development Control Manager undertook to discuss issues with Mr Ousby outside of the meeting if desired. The Development Control Manager said that the Council had to consider all submitted planning applications. These can be similar to each other and submitted/withdrawn multiple times until they became vexatious. Repeat applications need to have some identifiable changes, even if these are only minor amendments.

5. **Mr Gawthrop said that members of the Glisson/Tenison Area Residents Association (GTARA) were very concerned about the rise in residents parking charges planned for 1 August 2011. They believed the charges were disproportionate and did not reflect the principle of the charges being based on the cost of provision. His questions to the committee were:**

(i) Would the members of the East Area committee condemn this outrageous attitude to residents in this area?

(ii) Would EAC join with GTARA in demanding the charges are withdrawn and levied at a rate that reflects inflation?

Councillor Harrison said that she had addressed residents' concerns about year on year charge increases to the County Cabinet.

Councillors Brown, Bourke and Sadiq had been present at the Area Joint Committee where parking fees were considered. They felt that the County Cabinet had overruled Area Joint Committee views concerning parking charges by discounting concerns expressed by Councillor Harrison and residents.

Resolved (unanimously) that East Area Committee condemns the County Council treatment of residents concerning the imposition or parking permit increases without consultation, and in defiance of the original scheme.

Resolved (by 14 votes to 1) that East Area Committee joined with Glisson/Tenison Area Residents Association in demanding the charges are withdrawn and levied at a rate that reflects inflation.

6. **Mr Gawthrop said that at some point in April 2011 a huge tree in Devonshire Road, close to the junction with Mill Road, was cut down. This appeared to have been at the same time, or just before, the submission of a planning application to redevelop the site to the rear of 114 Mill Road (11/0355/FUL). He had contacted the City Council to enquire if the tree should have been removed, but had not received a satisfactory response. His questions were as follows:**

(i) Is the Council scheme for the protection of trees really based on a telephone system where there is no actual documentation?
(ii) Residents wanting to remove trees have to go through a protracted system of application for tree works. Why is this contractor exempt?
(iii) Why do the officers attempt to justify the actions of the tree surgeon after the event when there is no evidence, since it has been removed?
(iv) Why, when a beautiful tree has been removed illegally, is not the person who carried out or authorised the work being prosecuted?
(v) Why are the officers of the Council, who are charged with protecting trees, using every excuse available to take absolutely no action?

(vi) What message does this give to those considering similar action regarding 'inconvenient' trees in the way of planning applications?

EAC Councillors supported Mr Gawthrop's concerns concerning the tree issue and asked for Tree Team Officers to attend a future EAC to discuss general issues.

Action Point: EAC Councillors to follow up and seek Officer response from Green Space Manager to Mr Gawthrop concerning his 'open forum' question concerning a tree in Devonshire Road.

Action Point: Committee Manager to invite Green Space Manager and Tree Officers and Councillor Ward as Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport to discuss tree issues and Tree Protection Orders at next EAC.

7. Mr Kavanagh sought councillor's views on developments affecting private gardens in Cambridge.

The 1 June 2011 Planning Committee had received a paper concerning 'garden grabbing' and had approved its recommendations as new policy.

Cases of garden development would be reviewed on a case by case basis.

In conclusion, it is very difficult for the local planning authority not to be seen as unreasonable if it does other than consider all applications submitted.

11/32/EAC Presentation on South and East Corridor Funds

The committee received a report from the County Council Head of Parking & Road Safety plus Head of New Communities Service regarding south and east corridor funds.

Cambridgeshire County Council, in partnership with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, has drawn up four development-related transport plans. They cover the whole of the Cambridge City area, and some of the necklace of villages surrounding the city which lie in South Cambridgeshire.

The Officer's report set out examples of East and South Corridor Area Transport Plan funded projects.

In response to members questions the Head of Parking & Road Safety plus Head of New Communities Service confirmed the following:

(i) The green bus service was not in place at present, but would be reviewed in future.

(ii) Current Corridor Area Transport Plan boundaries reflect historic ones, and will be reviewed in future to ensure they were still suitable. The Officer noted Member's comments that historic boundaries were not always suitable, and their suggestion that the scheme consider the Cambridge area as a whole, instead of dividing it into areas.

(iii) Noted that Members expressed various suggestions for projects. The Corridor Area Transport Plan had a number of general headings that projects could be submitted under. This was to ensure flexibility over time so that different projects could apply. Too rigid criteria would act as a barrier to projects bidding for funding from the scheme.

(iv) Noted member's request for further details on how the scheme would operate and how projects could bid for funding.

Action Point: Head of New Communities Service (County) to send Councillor Wright details on cycleway projects supported by East and South Corridor funding.

Action Point: Head of New Communities Service (County) to bring future reports to EAC for review of potential projects that could be supported by East and South Corridor funding.

Councillor Blencowe read a briefing note to East Area Committee stating that Cambridge City Council has prepared a draft development framework for the Eastern Gate area. The purpose of this document was to provide a clear framework to co-ordinate and guide future redevelopment. The area covered by the framework stretched from the Crown Court on East Road and the Elizabeth Way Roundabout to the beginning of the Cambridge Retail Park on Newmarket Road.

The draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) follows on from the Eastern Gate 'Visioning Document', which identified issues and opportunities in the area.

A six-week consultation period on the draft Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD is taking place from 13 June to 25 July 2011.

Suggestions and comments received from the local community, members, developers and key stakeholders will be considered and used to inform and revise the final version of the framework to be completed in Autumn 2011.

11/33/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The committee received a report from the Environmental Projects Manager regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme.

Existing Schemes: Progress
The Environmental Projects Manager referred to progress on approved schemes as set out in his report.

The Environmental Projects Manager referred to suggestions passed on or not feasible as projects:

(i) Ashbury Close/Golding Road.
(ii) Barnwell Road Bus Stop Pole.
(iii) Rayson Way Parking Facilities.

The Environmental Projects Manager recommended Stanley Road/Garlic Row rat-running as a feasible project, contrary to details in his report. He also observed that the City and County Councils now have a £25,000 joint budget, which requires match funding split equally across the four Area Committees. This will provide the Committee with further funding of £6250 towards highway projects, which would be subject to Cambridge Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee approval.

Existing Schemes That Require Decisions
Members considered a number of schemes put forward for consideration, a number of which required approval.

In response to members questions the Environmental Projects Manager confirmed the Stanley Road/Garlic Row rat-running project covered all specifications requested. However, he would be happy to include further options such as a waiting restriction and signage on Garlic Row, subject to consultation to develop the scheme.

Following discussion, members determined the schemes as follows:

1. Ditton Walk/Newmarket Rd Planting

Introduction of a planting area at the junction of Ditton Walk and Newmarket Road as per the drawing attached in Appendix 1.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £14,000.

2. No waiting & 1hr Parking Restrictions

To introduce 'no waiting at any time' restrictions at the junction of Birdwood Road/St Thomas' Road and Coleridge Road/Brackyn Road to prevent obstructive parking.

Measures to prevent commuter parking in Corrie Road, Rustat Road and Davy Road.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £10,000.

3. Riverside Railings Refurbishment

Refurbishment of the railings along Riverside, a 100m continuation of the current refurbishment being carried out at part of the Riverside EIP scheme.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £250 per linear metre

4. Silverwood Close and Whitehill Road Estate Verge Parking

The introduction of a verge parking prohibition.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £8,000

5. Tree Planting on Chalmers Rd & Greville Rd

Planting of 7 trees on Greville Rd and 5 on Chalmers Road, as suggested by residents on Chalmers Rd and to supplement the new bollards on Greville Rd.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £5,000.

6. Brooks Road / Perne Road Verge Parking Prohibition

The prohibition of verge parking on Brooks Road and Perne Road, including renovation of verges in particularly poor condition.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £7,500.

ANY OF THE ABOVE SCHEMES THAT ARE WITHIN THE HIGHWAY WILL REQUIRE APPROVAL BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL AS THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY.

7. Stanley Road/Garlic Row Rat-Running

The issue of HGVs using Stanley Road is difficult to resolve. A weight limit could be introduced, but this would require enforcement and would be subject to Highway Authority approval. The attraction to HGV traffic is their ability to turn right from Stanley Road into Newmarket Road, which is not possible when exiting from Garlic Row. This matter should be raised with the County Council to determine whether there are any feasible options.

Agreed (unanimously) to approve the scheme for implementation subject to positive consultation at an estimated cost of £4000.

Action Point: Environmental Projects Manager to circulate a suggestions sheet for cycleway schemes for prioritisation for delivery through the City/County joint cycleways.

11/34/EAC Appointments to Outside Bodies

Councillor Owers proposed the nomination of Councillor Hart as the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre.

Councillor Pogonowski proposed the nomination of Councillor Wright as the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 2) that Councillor Hart be the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre for the ensuing year.

Councillor Owers proposed the nomination of Councillor Hart as the representative for Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee.

Councillor Wright proposed the nomination of Councillor Pogonowski as the representative for Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 3) that Councillor Hart be the representative for Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee for the ensuing year.

11/35/EAC Planning Applications

11/35/EACa 11/1045/FUL: Land to Rear of 163-165 Coleridge Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of three 3-bed dwellings to form terrace with off street parking.

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

- Mr Kavanagh

The representation covered the following issues:

(i) Residents had collected a petition in objection to the proposal.
(ii) Expressed concerns about traffic flow and parking, it was felt these existed already. For example, refuse lorries were affected by parked cars obstructing the road on occasions.

Dr Jopling (Applicant) addressed the committee in support of the application.

Tariq Sadiq (Coleridge Ward County Councillor) addressed the committee about the application to support the concerns of residents concerning pressure on highways and parking issues.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 3) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

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

   East of England plan 2008: Policies SS1, T1, T9, T14, ENV7 and WM6;

   Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: Policies P6/1 and P9/8;

   Cambridge Local Plan (2006): Policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/12, 4/9, 4/13, 5/1, 5/14, 8/2, 8/6, 8/10 and 10/1;

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

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.

11/35/EACb 11/0337/FUL: 4 Adkins Corner Perne Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for proposed change of use of Class B1(a) offices and surplus storage/welfare accommodation into 6no residential units.

At the meeting Committee was updated and advised that parking provision could be made available on site and it was suggested that a further condition could be added.

Councillor Herbert proposed an amendment that a planning condition should be added that not less than 4 car parking spaces should be tied to the flats prior to completion.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, but subject to completion of the section 106 agreement and with an additional condition to read:

4. Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved, not less than 4 car parking spaces shall be made available, in the area to the rear (the north) of the building, for the sole use of residents of the proposed flats. The car parking spaces shall thereafter remain available for the sole use of occupants while the flats here approved remain in residential use.

   Reason: In order to ensure that an appropriate level of parking provision is available for prospective occupiers, to avoid obstruction of the surrounding streets and in the interests of highway safety and convenience. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 8/2 and 8/10)

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: ENV7

   Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8

   Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 4/13, 5/1, 5/2, 8/2, 8/6, 10/1.

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the

officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

11/35/EACc 11/0409/FUL: Iceni House, 171 Coleridge Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use from guest house (C1) to student accommodation with warden control.

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

- Mr Kavanagh

The representation covered the following issues:

(i) Residents had collected a petition in objection to the proposal.
(ii) The application is occurring in a residential area, which neighbours felt was unsuitable for development.
(iii) Queried if a Warden would be located on site to address any noise/antisocial behaviour issues.
(iv) Expressed concerns about traffic flow and parking.
(v) Referenced Tipperton House issues and hoped these would not be repeated.

Mr Martin (Applicant) addressed the committee in support of the application.

Tariq Sadiq (Coleridge Ward County Councillor) addressed the committee about the application to support the concerns of residents relating to warden control and parking issues.

Councillor Blencowe proposed two amendments to condition 4 that:
(i) An on site warden should be added to the condition.
(ii) A contact number for the warden should be publicly available.

These amendments were carried unanimously.

<u>The Committee:</u>

Resolved (by 10 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, but with Condition 4 varied to read:

4. A resident manager/warden shall live in the building during its use for student accommodation. A contact number for the warden shall be displayed, in a prominent position and of a size to be agreed first in writing by the local planning authority, before the building is first used for student accommodation and shall be retained for so long as the building is in student accommodation use.

   Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbours (Cambridge Local Plan 4/13)

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, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 5/1, 5/2, 5/3, 5/4, 5/7, 8/2, 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.

11/35/EACd 10/0825/FUL: Land Adjacent To 19 Sleaford Street

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of one 3-bed house.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 3) to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The scale and proximity of the dwelling to its shared boundaries with residential properties on York Street to the east would result in an overbearing and unduly dominant built form that would overshadow and unreasonably enclose the rear gardens of these neighbouring dwellings. Located close to the boundary with No. 7 York Street, prospective occupiers would be able to look directly into the rear garden area of this neighbour at a distance of less than 5 metres and also into adjacent gardens, causing a loss of privacy and a diminution in the amenity that the occupiers should properly expect to enjoy. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SS1 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008) policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to government guidance contained within Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005). It follows that the proposal has failed to recognise the constraints of the site or to respond to its context and is therefore also contrary to policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste storage or monitoring, in accordance with policies 3/8, 3/12, or 5/14 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 2010, and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards
2010.

3. **In the event that an appeal is lodged against a decision to refuse this application, DELEGATED AUTHORITY is given to Officers to complete a section 106 agreement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy.**

11/35/EACe 11/0193/FUL: Costa Coffee, 41 - 43 Mill Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for installation of grill for A/C duct on external (side) elevation (retrospective).

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

- Reverend Widdess

The representation covered the following issues:

(i) The Trustees, the owners of the Cemetery including the Lime Avenue, were omitted from the list of Notified Neighbours, and therefore did not comment on the original Planning Application. This error has been rectified, but Trustees were anxious that planning applications relating to Mill Road Cemetery should not be passed by default without consultation with them. The Trustees, in consultation with the Council to whom the management of this closed Cemetery is legally devolved, are required to give permission for any activities and development on the site, and to question any encroachment on the land they hold in trust.

(ii) The Planning Application and the Planning Report recommending approval of the application appear to be based on a misunderstanding of the status of the Lime Avenue in relation to the Cemetery.

(iii) There is the danger that the present proposal, if approved, will establish a precedent for 'industrial' installations on this historic, conservation site.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment that a condition should be added establishing, in consultation with the Conservation Officer, the colour of the grill should be sympathetic to the existing building.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 2) 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: SS1, ENV6 and ENV7

   Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 4/4, 4/11 and 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 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 11.40 pm

CHAIR