

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

15 December 2011

7.00 - 11.44 pm

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

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

Councillors Bourke and Harrison joined the meeting from item 11/69/EAC

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell left after the vote on item 11/71/EAC

Councillors Harrison and Sadiq left after the vote on item 11/74/EAC.

Councillor Bourke left after the vote on item 11/75/EACd

Officers: Tony Collins (Principal Planning Officer), Philip Doggett (Chief Property Surveyor), Sarah Dyer (City Development Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Lynda Kilkelly (Safer Communities Section Manager)

Other Officers in Attendance:

John Fuller (Community Engagement Officer), Andy Tregilgas (Police Constable), Joseph Whelan (Head of New Communities Service)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**11/65/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Councillors Brown, Hart and Pogonowski

11/66/EAC Declarations Of Interest

| Name | Item | Interest |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Councillors Bourke, Saunders & Wright | 11/70/EAC, 11/71/EAC, 11/72/EAC, 11/76/EAC | Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign |
| Councillor Herbert | 11/76/EACa | Personal: spoke as Ward Councillor in previous iteration of application. |

| | | |
|---------------------|------------|---|
| | | Did not participate in the decision making or vote. |
| Councillor Saunders | 11/76/EACd | Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present & Future, but did not fetter discretion to consider planning item |
| Councillor Wright | 11/76/EACd | Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present & Future, but did not fetter discretion to consider planning item |

11/67/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 25 and 27 October 2011 meetings were approved and signed as a correct record.

11/68/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **11/56/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: EAC Councillors to discuss proposed alternative future arrangements for EAC meetings.”**

Covered under item 11/73/EAC of the agenda.

- (ii) **11/56/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Blencowe undertook to liaise with Councillor Cantrill (Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places) to ask Sainsbury’s to reaffirm their intention to seek a loading bay before any public consultation was conducted on the matter.”**

Covered under item 11/72/EAC of the agenda.

- (iii) **11/56/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillors Blencowe and Marchant-Daisley undertook to clarify how the £55,000 and £164,000 payments in lieu of land provision in Petersfield ward would be allocated. That is, in a ward specific or general fund.”**

Councillor Marchant-Daisley said that £55,000 had been allocated to Petersfield ward specifically, whereas the remaining £164,000 had been allocated to a general fund. The Head of Legal Services had confirmed that this was in order, thus Petersfield would have to bid for funding from

the general pot with other wards. Councillor Marchant-Daisley undertook to pursue this issue further.

- (iv) **11/61/EAC Citizens Advice Bureau Kiosk Location “Action Point: EAC Councillors to suggest potential kiosk locations to the Advicehub Partnership Development Manager.”**

Councillors to suggest potential kiosk locations to the Advicehub Partnership Development Manager outside of the committee meeting.

- (v) **11/63/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme “Action Point: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to add Ainsworth Place, Fairsford Place and Stone Street EIPs to priority list for action.”**

Project Delivery & Environment Manager has been requested to add Ainsworth Place, Fairsford Place and Stone Street EIPs to priority list for action.

(Ref 11/55/EAC Matters Arising) Councillor Owers reported that Cherry Hinton shop forecourt cycle racks were now in place.

- (vi) **11/63/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme “Action Point: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to add maintenance costs to future EIP reports.”**

Maintenance costs will be added to future Environmental Improvement Project reports.

11/69/EAC Open Forum

1. **Mr Woodburn asked several questions relating to the Police plus south and east corridor funding.**

Questions covered under items 11/70/EAC and 11/71/EAC of the agenda.

2. **Mr Woodburn raised concerns that a County Council Cabinet decision to charge for Park & Cycle and Park & Walk spaces at Park & Ride sites could lead to people parking in unregulated residential areas in order to avoid charges.**

Councillor Sadiq agreed with Mr Woodburn's sentiments, and said that he had raised these concerns at Cabinet. Councillor Sadiq hoped the expansion of Babraham Park & Ride would mitigate the situation. Councillor Sadiq encouraged stakeholders to critique the proposal during the deliberation process.

Councillor Sadiq undertook to ask County Councillor van de Ven to contact Mr Woodburn to discuss his concerns.

3. **Dr Eva raised concerns regarding parking at the northeastern end of Riverside (from Riverside Place to Stourbridge Common):**
- **In 2008 The East Area Committee agreed, in principle, to environmental improvements along the entire length of Riverside between Stourbridge and Midsummer Commons. The cost for improving Riverside between Riverside Bridge and Stourbridge Common was previously estimated at £550,000.**
 - **Dr Eva proposed a series of interim measures to improve the cityscape (streetscape).**

Councillors welcomed Dr Eva's comments and his suggestions for environmental improvement projects (EIPs). Councillors noted the suggested projects and undertook to raise these with Andrew Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager). However, a residents survey would need to be undertaken before a resident's parking scheme could be implemented.

ACTION POINT: Councillor Blencowe to respond to Dr Eva's Riverside Place concerns raised in 'open forum' section. Councillors to notify Andrew Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager) of Dr Eva's proposed environmental improvement projects in order to ascertain their feasibility.

4. **Mr Hughes and Mr Minas raised concerns about anti-social behaviour (ASB) near the Cambridge Seminar School on Newmarket Road. Specific points raised:**
- **How to prevent ASB.**
 - **How to protect a vulnerable students' environment.**
 - **Queried who could undertake enforcement action.**
 - **Concerns over Police response times, which led to school staff moving on unauthorised persons before the Police arrived.**

Councillor Smart signposted Police and Council Outreach Officers.

Councillor Wright had raised the issue of ASB affecting businesses and open spaces when she supported a Labour motion at Full Council 20 October 2011. She asked people to ring the Police to log issues in order to provide trend information for area profile monitoring.

EAC returned to this question under agenda item 11/70/EAC.

- 5. Mrs Griffiths queried why Coleridge College students were allowed to obstruct the pavement in front of the college with parked bicycles.**

ACTION POINT: Councillor Sadiq to respond to Mrs Griffiths after liaising with fellow School Governors.

- 6. Mrs Griffiths queried why a coach stop was advertised outside the Victoria Avenue toilets when coaches were not allowed to stop there any longer.**

ACTION POINT: Councillor Harrison to respond to Mrs Griffiths.

- 7. Mr Ousby asked why developers were able to pay commuted sums in lieu of open spaces on developments. He suggested open spaces would be preferable.**

Councillors agreed that open spaces were preferable to payments in lieu, but the size of the plot of land developed determined the potential open space available. Thus payments in lieu could be made when open spaces would not be viable, in preference to an unviable piece of open land that would be neglected. The (City) Head of Planning had briefed (City) Councillors on this issue, so parties were aware of resident's concerns. The review of the Local Plan was being used as a way of making a clearer apportionment of open space on developments in future. Councillors were obliged to follow Local Planning Policy, which allowed for payments in lieu, regardless of personal feelings where they may wish for more open spaces in developments.

City Labour Councillors in particular were pressing the City Council to favour open spaces over commuted sums for new developments.

11/70/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The committee received a report from the Safer Communities Section Manager, Community Engagement Officer and Constable Tregilgas regarding policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 18 August 2011. The current emerging issues/neighbourhood trends for each ward were also highlighted (see report for full details). Previous priorities and engagement activity noted in the report were misuse of public open spaces, anti-social behaviour (ASB) of moped riders in Coleridge, speeding in Mill Road, plus drug dealing and ASB affecting Norfolk Street and surrounding area.

The committee discussed the following policing issues:

- (i) Drug dealing, drug use and associated anti-social behaviour (ASB) eg dumping of needles affecting Abbey Ward.
- (ii) ASB linked to street drinking and practicability of citywide ban.
- (iii) ASB affecting open spaces in general (thematic rather than geographic focus).
- (iv) ASB, drug and alcohol use affecting Norfolk Street and surrounding area.
- (v) ASB of moped riders in Coleridge Road and possible link to other criminal activity such as drug dealing.
- (vi) Practicability of citywide enforcement of 20 mph speed limit. Alternatively, the need to join up initiatives concerning speed limit enforcement as there were multiple speed limits (20 mph and 30 mph) across the City wards.
- (vii) Speeding in Mill Road and Coleridge Road.
- (viii) Theft from shops at the Beehive Centre, and associated crime such as drug dealing.
- (ix) Police response times to non-emergency incidents.

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

- 1. Mr Woodburn queried the criteria for a speed camera van to be set up in Mill Road as he felt there was a need to take more enforcement action.**

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

The Community Engagement Officer said that the Police had three vans equipped with speed cameras. Two were targeted at sites of fatal or serious injury. The remaining speed camera van targeted community sites based on need. Mill Road was not seen as a priority in comparison with other areas.

Speeding could be addressed through education, engineering (eg putting in speed mitigation measures such as speed bumps) and enforcement. Currently, only enforcement activity occurred in Mill Road, which was undertaken by uniformed officers who achieved a short term success while present in the area.

- 2. Mr Woodburn raised concerns about levels of cycle thefts in the south and east areas. He queried if this could be an area priority following enforcement action in the north area.**

The Community Engagement Officer said that levels of theft were not seen as a priority in comparison with other areas. Theft levels were lower than the City average.

- 3. Mr Hughes and Mr Minas raised concerns about anti-social behaviour (ASB) near the Cambridge Seminar School on Newmarket Road.**

The Safer Communities Section Manager said an action plan was in place to address street life issues around the City. The Police and Council Outreach Team Officers would undertake joint action. Residents were asked to ring the Police to log issues in order to provide trend information for area profile monitoring, plus an evidence base for remedial action such as section 30 enforcement. As an alternative to the main Police Switchboard number, the public could ring/email PCSOs direct using contact details on e-cops if an immediate response was not required. However, if a crime was in progress, 999 or the main Police Switchboard number were more appropriate numbers.

4. Mr Lucas-Smith asked if a specific campaign would be undertaken to target cyclists without lights.

The Community Engagement Officer said on-going monitoring would occur as part of routine police patrols, a specific campaign was not imminent.

5. Mr Taylor asked if Police Community Support Officers undertook undercover/covert work.

Constable Tregilgas said that Police Community Support Officers did not undertake covert work.

Councillor Owers requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Owers formally proposed to add the following priority:

- Traffic regulation and enforcement of 20 mph speed limit in Coleridge Road

The priority was **agreed (by 6 votes to 0)**.

Councillor Sadiq requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Sadiq formally proposed to retain the following priority:

- ASB of moped riders in Coleridge Road

The priority was **agreed (by 6 votes to 2)**.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

- (i) ASB, drug and alcohol use affecting Norfolk Street and surrounding area (eg Newmarket Road).
- (ii) Traffic regulation and enforcement of 20 mph speed limit in Coleridge Road, specifically ASB of moped riders.
- (iii) Traffic regulation and enforcement of 20 mph speed limit in Mill Road.

11/71/EAC East and South Corridor Funding

The committee received a report from the County Council 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, had drawn up four development-

related transport plans. They covered the whole of the Cambridge City area, and some of the necklace of villages surrounding the city that lie in South Cambridgeshire.

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

£4m had been allocated to SACTP and £400k to EACTP. East Area Committee were invited to suggest potential projects. These could be discussed with County Officers to being worked up into viable projects. Head of New Communities Service would bring the projects back to a future East Area Committee for prioritization, prior to agreement by Portfolio Holders from the participating Councils.

ACTION POINT: Head of New Communities Service to bring future reports to EAC for review of potential projects that could be supported by East and South Corridor funding.

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

- 1. Mr Woodburn asked if Tins Phase 2 could be made an EACTP priority.**

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

- 2. Mr Woodburn asked if Hills Road Bridge Steps could be made an EACTP priority. Mr Woodburn offered to give Councillors a site tour of the bridge to demonstrate why he felt the project was required.**

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

- 3. Mr Gawthrop suggested providing an access link from the CB1 development to the Leisure Park, so that both sites could access the Leisure Park multi storey car park, as the CB1 development would no longer include one.**

Councillor Herbert suggested this might be a more viable option for off peak, rather than peak traffic.

Members considered schemes for funding as set out in the Officer's report. The Head of New Communities Service responded to member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

Resolved (11 votes to 0) to endorse the officer recommendation to approve the grant allocations as listed below:

ECATP

- (i) Newmarket Road Bus Priority – Part 1: £100,000.
- (ii) Crossing Provision, Ditton Lane / Newmarket Road: £60,000.
- (iii) The Tins Phase 2: £275,000.

SCATP

- (iv) Hills Road Bridge Steps: Cost subject to cost appraisal.

Resolved (by 11 votes to 0) not to endorse the officer recommendation to approve the grant allocations as listed below:

ECATP

- (v) Radial Route Signing: £50,000.

SCATP

Radial Route Signing: £50,000.

11/72/EAC Approach From Sainsburys for the City Council to Dedicate Land at 103 Mill Road for use as a Loading Bay

The committee received a report from the Chief Property Surveyor regarding the dedication of land at 103 Mill Road for use as a Loading Bay.

The Chief Property Surveyor said in response to questions from members of the public:

- (i) The Cambridgeshire Cycle Campaign would be included in the consultation.
- (ii) The term “amenity value” would be clarified in the consultation material.

Councillor Smart requested an amendment to the list of consultees set out in paragraph 2.1 of the Officer’s report. Text to be amended as set out below:

“Nearby residents and businesses would be consulted using a short questionnaire seeking views on the impact of the proposal on the amenity value of the open space. This would be available on the Council’s website and posted to nearby addresses using the same database when publicising the

planning application. This will comprise written consultation with 485 neighbouring addresses, incorporating both residential and business addresses. In addition, residents associations, the Mill Road Society and other interested parties will be consulted in the area ~~including respondents to the original planning application~~. However, the consultation would not duplicate the planning consultation because this proposed consultation is in relation to the impact on the amenity value of the Council's public open space."

The committee approved this amendment by 5 votes to 4.

The committee resolved unanimously to adopt the recommendation that members of the East Area Committee considered the contents of the Officer's report and confirmed that they supported this proposed process for local consultation in order to inform any decision by the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Spaces on whether to consider dedicating the land for a loading bay or not, subject to agreement of terms.

11/73/EAC Alternative Future Arrangements for EAC Meetings

The committee agreed to defer this item to 9 February 2012. Councillors would discuss options in a Chair's briefing pre-meeting, prior to further discussion and consideration at the next committee.

11/74/EAC Meeting Dates 2012/13

Meeting dates for 2012/13 were agreed as follows:

14 June 2012, 16 August 2012, 18 October 2012, 13 December 2012, 7 February 2013, 11 April 2013.

(Subject to amendment as part of the discussion concerning alternative future arrangements for EAC Meetings on 9 February 2012).

Indicative 2013/2014 dates for information:

13 June 2013, 15 August 2013, 17 October 2013, 12 December 2013, 6 February 2014 and 3 April 2014.

11/75/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.

11/76/EAC Planning Applications

11/76/EACa 11/0664/EXP: 187 Cherry Hinton Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of 187 Cherry Hinton Road and the erection of a three storey block of flats in its place, together with the erection of 4 semi-detached houses at the northern end of the site in place of the garages.

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

- Mr Wigglesworth

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Expressed concerns about procedural issues regarding the application.
- (ii) Expressed concerns about the application and over development of the site (north side).
- (iii) Lack of gardens at properties.
- (iv) Expressed concerns about refuse arrangements and storage areas.

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

Lewis Herbert (Ward Councillor for Coleridge) addressed the committee about the application.

- (i) Referenced concerns raised in the 2008 iteration of the application regarding amenity space, and suggested these had not been met.
- (ii) Suggested the application did not meet Policy 3/7 due to a lack of amenity space.
- (iii) Suggested there was a lack of accessible secure cycle storage.

- (iv) Raised no objection to the site being developed in principle, but suggested the current application was not appropriate.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Councillor Herbert spoke as a Ward Councillor and did not participate in the decision making for this item.

Reasons for Approval

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

East of England plan 2008: SS1, T2, T3, T9, T13, T14, ENV7, WM6

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8, P9/9

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4, 4/13, 4/15, 5/1, 5/12, 8/1, 8/2, 8/6, 8/10, 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.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, and the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the

Obligation has not been completed by 31 December 2011 it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development did not make appropriate provision for open space, community facilities, education and Area Transport Contributions, in accordance with the following policies, standards and proposals: policies 3/8, 8/3 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; policies P6/1, P8/3, P9/8 and P9/9 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004, Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002 and Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation of Open Space Standards 2006.

11/76/EACb 11/0535/FUL: 14 Emery Street

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey side extension, dormer to loft and dormer to side (following demolition of existing single storey perspex lean-to).

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed rear box dormer window, by reason of its size, scale, and third storey rear projection beyond the roof plane, would result in a disproportionate roof extension in relation to the terraced property, detracting from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider Conservation Area. As such, the development has not used the key characteristics of the locality to inform its design and is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11.

11/76/EACc 11/1097/EXP: 71-73 New Street

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extension of time for the implementation of planning permission reference 09/0063/FUL for change of use of existing vehicle workshop and storage site to residential to create six flats with five car parking spaces, refuse and cycle storage.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) 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 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: policies ENV7 and WM6

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 5/1 and 7/3

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.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, and the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the

Obligation has not been completed by 15th March 2012 it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason.

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space/sports facilities, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

11/76/EACd 11/0872/FUL: 292 Mill Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 5 houses and conversion/extension to provide student accommodation (16 units).

The committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Mr Bell
- Mr Ainsworth
- Ms Walker
- Ms Jeffery

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Cambridge Past, Present & Future (CPPF) strongly objected to the change of use from a Public House/Restaurant to flats.
- (ii) Referred to Policy 5/11 of the Local Plan and NPPF Paragraph 126, suggesting they were relevant because objectors believe that Public Houses were Community Assets.
- (iii) CPPF objects to the loss of a commercial premises along the popular Mill Road.
- (iv) Suggested that although it hasn't operated as a pub for a few years, the Royal Standard could be converted back into a pub.
- (v) CPPF and Campaign For Real Ale were confident that in the right hands, the Royal Standard would be a thriving business and a real asset to the community.
- (vi) Concerns about the impact of the proposals on highways and parking.

- (vii) Objectors queried if the application met Policies 3.10 and 4/11.
- (viii) Referred to Design & Conservation Panel comments on the application.
- (ix) Suggested the application to be an overdevelopment of the site that failed to respect the setting and character of the Conservation Area. The proposal would not enhance the character and appearance of the area. It would replace a prominent local landmark.
- (x) Concerns regarding overshadowing.

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

The committee unanimously agreed to rule out CPPF's late submission as it was received post deadline.

Kilian Bourke (Romsey Ward County Councillor) addressed the committee about the application. He reiterated resident's concerns relating to development in a Conservation Area, appearance of the design, parking, over development of site plus loss of a local landmark.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment that s106 negotiations should be delegated to officers.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, because of the loss of the space on the street corner, and the impact of the proposed extensions on the existing Building of Local Interest, would have a harmful effect on the building, the street scene, and the character of the conservation area, contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), policies 3/10, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to government advice in PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' (2010).
2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for

open space/sports facilities, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, waste facilities, restriction of occupation of the student units to those studying at Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge or monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, 7/10, 8/3 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, and the Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002

DELEGATED AUTHORITY was granted to officers to negotiate a Section 106 agreement in the event of an appeal.

11/76/EACe 11/0288/FUL: 15 Swann's Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use to car hire business and erection of associated office and wash down canopy on land off Swann's Road.

The City Development Manager explained that this application was being brought back to Committee because in the interval between resolution to accept the officer recommendation to approve the application in August 2011, and issuing the decision notice, a letter was received from solicitors acting for an objector which threatened judicial review.

In summary the letter argued that the Council had failed to:

- (i) Carry out a comprehensive screening assessment.
- (ii) Publish the screening questionnaire, which it had carried out.
- (iii) Consider the project cumulatively with other operations on the rest of the area.

Officers did not, and do not think, it necessary to carry out a comprehensive screening exercise as the preliminary exercise (the screening questionnaire) led to the conclusion that the application project did not fall within the relevant statutory criteria which would trigger a screening. At their last meeting the Committee did not address the other operations (ie the scrap metal storage

and sorting) on the rest of the area (“the Area”) because it was not thought to be material.

However in the light of this letter and further information supplied since 18th August, the Committee was taking the opportunity to consider the proposed development in conjunction with the other activities on the rest of the area (ie the cumulative impact) and if necessary review their earlier resolution. Officers have also looked at this additional aspect but remain of the opinion that this application does not present the risk of any significant environmental impact either alone or in conjunction with the current lawful activities on the remainder of the site.

The City Development Manager also referred to the Amendment Sheet to which was attached a letter from the objector’s representative to the National Planning Casework Unit which is part of the Department of Communities and Local Government. This letter related to an application that is under consideration by the County Council but had been copied to the City Council. This letter effectively challenged the decision of the Secretary of State that is referred at the end of paragraph 0.8 of the report. It is put before the Committee so that they are aware of the full facts and in the opinion of officers its contents do not affect the officer recommendation.

Officers remain of the view that the application should be supported for the reasons set out in this report. The contents of the report and the recommendation set out a paragraph 10 remain unchanged.

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

- Dr Stookes

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) The Council has been provided with noise assessment reports relating to the site.
- (ii) Suggested the Council has not been provided with evidence to dispute the noise assessments.
- (iii) Suggested the Council was unable to rely on the fact that activities occurring around the site contribute to the overall level of noise, and so make noise from the application site acceptable in comparison.
- (iv) Suggested the Council is obliged to remedy any breach of failure to comply with the EIA Directive 85/337/EEC.

- (v) Invited Councillors to defer the application and require the Applicant to submit an environmental statement in support of the proposal.

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

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) 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: Policies SS1, T1, T9, T14, ENV7 and WM6

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): Policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/13, 4/15, 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 11.44 pm

CHAIR