

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

9 February 2012

7.30 - 10.50 pm

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

County Councillors: Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

Councillors Pogonowski, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell left after the vote on item 12/10/EAC

**Officers:** Tony Collins (Principal Planning Officer), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Deborah Jeakins (Planning Enforcement Officer), Andy Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager), Trevor Woollams (Head of Community Development) and Alistair Wilson (Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager)

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Andrew Limb, Head of Corporate Strategy

Mr Clark (St. Philips Church), Vickie Crompton (Cambridgeshire DAAT Co-ordinator) and Mr Merryl (INCLUSION)

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

**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 would follow the order of the agenda.

**12/1/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Councillors Bourke, Harrison and Wright

**12/2/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
------	------	----------

Councillor Saunders	12/12/EACa	Personal: General discussion of application with Objectors, but did not fetter discretion.
---------------------	------------	--

### **12/3/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 15 December 2011 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

11/69/EAC Open Forum question 6: Mrs Griffiths queried why a coach stop was advertised outside the Victoria Avenue toilets when coaches did not in fact were not allowed to stop there any longer.

### **12/4/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

- (i) **11/69/EAC Open Forum “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.”**

Councillor Blencowe has raised this issue with Andrew Preston.

- (ii) **11/69/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Sadiq to respond to Mrs Griffiths’s Coleridge College cycle parking concern raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillor Sadiq to liaise with fellow School Govenors.”**

Councillor Sadiq has raised this issue with fellow School Govenors. Greater provision of cycle racks has been suggested.

- (iii) **11/69/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Harrison to respond to Mrs Griffiths’s concern raised in ‘open forum’ section regarding why a coach stop was advertised outside the Victoria Avenue toilets when coaches were not allowed to stop there any longer. Councillor Harrison to liaise with County Officers.”**

Councillor Harrison has liaised with Paul Nelson (County Council Public Transport Manager).

Other than the X5 service, the Public Transport Manager was not aware of any coaches that should be stopping near the Victoria Avenue toilets.

The X5, service was a limited stop local bus service, and often viewed by people as being a "coach service".

The Public Transport Manager asked that if the situation persisted, further information could be passed to him, so that he could ensure that misinformation was not provided in future.

- (iv) 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."**

Councillors requested an update report for 12 April 2012 East Area Committee (EAC).

**Action Point: Committee Manger to invite Joseph Whelan (Head of New Communities Service - County) to 12 April 2012 EAC.**

### **12/5/EAC Open Forum**

- 1. Mr Woodburn advised EAC on behalf of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign that initial results were positive for the additional provision for cycle traffic on Hills Road bridge. Overall safety for cycle and vehicular traffic appeared to have increased.**
- 2. Mr Woodburn queried if public consultation would be undertaken on the use of commuted s106 funds for Coleridge Recreation Ground.**

Councillor Owers said that Coleridge Ward Councillors would meet Phil Back week beginning 13 February 2012. Mr Back would then begin wider consultation with the public concerning options on how to use the funding.

Councillor Owers has passed on representations he has received to date to Mr Back.

3. **Dr Eva queried if cycle parking could be provided outside of the EAC Cherry Trees Day Centre venue.**

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Blencowe to respond to Dr Eva's Cherry Trees cycle parking query. Councillor Blencowe to liaise with Building Manager concerning possibility of cycle rack provision.**

4. **Dr Eva raised queried when gritting would occur in Riverside Place.**

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Sedgwick-Jell to respond to Dr Eva's Riverside Place gritting concerns. Councillor Sedgwick-Jell to clarify position with Graham Hughes (Service Director, Growth & Infrastructure – County) to ascertain gritting schedule.**

5. **Mrs Owles said that Petersfield was short of community open space. Specific points raised:**
- **Took issue with land 'handed' to CityLife.**
  - **Queried if proceeds from St Matthew's School land disposal could be used to provide community open space through the City Council purchasing the east strip of land next to the Howard Mallett Centre.**
  - **Felt there was a history of s106 money raised in Petersfield being allocated to a central pot.**

EAC Councillors empathised there was a lack of open space in Petersfield Ward. The Head of Legal Services had confirmed that if Wards wished to access s106 funding, they would have to bid for it from the central pot. EAC Councillors would champion greater open space provision in future developments.

Councilor Blencowe said that Ward Councilors had asked the Council to purchase the land CityLife was situated on at Full Council several years ago; this had not been supported. It would require a major sum of money being offered to CityLife in order to incentivise them to relocate; the funds from the sale of St Matthew's School land would be insufficient in their own right. There was no desire for the Council to purchase this land at present.

6. **Mr Johnson asked about proposed new council dwellings in Abbey Ward. He referred to Latimer Close in Abbey, where Mr Johnson understood the Council's new build programme proposed to build 12 new units. However there were**

currently 16 council flats on that site. Mr Johnson suggested that after the development there would be a net loss of 4 council dwellings in Latimer Close.

Mr Johnson believed there was also a proposed development of 51-73 Barnwell Road and plans to reduce the number of council flats from 22 to just 10. Mr Johnson raised the following specific questions:

i) Could Councillor Smart justify to residents and tenants why the council's new build programme would actually result in, for some cases, less council dwellings available in parts of Abbey than currently?

ii) Could Councillor Smart confirm that the overall gain of new, affordable housing in Abbey after the city council's three-year programme was not as significant as has been publicised?

iii) Does Councillor Smart agree that for the interests of residents and tenants the city council openly publish information on all their plans as part of their affordable housing programme?

iv) To that end, why hasn't the city council arranged effective consultation with all potentially affected?

v) If following consultations, current tenants vote against the plans, which would mean they had to leave their homes, does this suggest the council would be unable to proceed in line with their wishes?

Councillor Smart responded as follows:

- A 3 Year Affordable Housing Programme report was published post June/July Community Services Scrutiny Committee in each year regarding proposed sites the Council has identified for housing. In addition, progress details were published regarding sites identified in the previous year ie if they were in use or not.
- Latimer Close existing scheme: 20 dwellings (16 Council properties and 4 leaseholders). Therefore 16 Council bed spaces provided.

New scheme: 12 Affordable Housing dwellings, approximately 53 bed spaces. This was an increase of 37 bed spaces.

- Barnwell Road existing scheme: 24 dwellings (23 Council properties and 1 leaseholder). Therefore 23 Council bed spaces provided. New scheme: 10 Affordable Housing dwellings, approximately 43 bed spaces. This was an increase of 20 bed spaces.
- Wadloes Road existing scheme: 0 dwellings, therefore 0 Council bed spaces. New scheme: 7 Affordable Housing dwellings, approximately 29 bed spaces. This was an increase of 29 bed spaces.
- Bed spaces in the 3 sites would increase from 39 Council bed spaces to 125 Council bed spaces. The total increase in bed spaces for all three schemes was 86 bed spaces.
- Accommodation provision could be measured through a number of ways including bed space and room number. The Council wished to provide a quality service. Experience from another scheme where the Council helped sheltered housing tenants move from; and return to, homes on a redeveloped site should be transferable to Abbey Ward developments.
- All three sites will provide a range of dwelling sizes from one bed flats to 4 bed houses, whereas currently Latimer Close and Barnwell Road are solely one bed flats. The new schemes reflect the need in Cambridge and will provide a more sustainable mix of dwellings, which will hopefully enable growing households to move onto different accommodation in the local area.

**7. Mrs Deards expressed concern at the increase in Council rent.**

Councillors empathised that the increase was not desirable. However it had occurred as a result of inflation. The Council had protested to Central Government through a submission. Pensions and housing benefits should also increase with inflation.

Councillor Herbert hoped the Council could identify a way to smooth out the rent increases so costs did not increase sharply all at once.

**8. Mrs Peachey (Chair of Whitehill Close Neighbourhood Watch) raised concerns about vehicles parking on grass verges; specifically council vehicles rather than residents.**

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Hart to respond to Mrs Peachey's no verge parking signs query. Councillor Hart to liaise with Ward**

**Councillors and officers on how to avoid council vehicles parking on verges in future.**

Public questions also covered under items 12/6/EAC, 12/7/EAC, and 12/8/EAC of the agenda.

**12/6/EAC Cambridgeshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team - New Drug Treatment Service Provider**

The committee received a report from the Cambridgeshire DAAT Co-ordinator regarding the Cambridgeshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team - New Drug Treatment Service Provider.

The report outlined that the Cambridgeshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) undertook a tendering exercise In 2011/12 for the 'Provision of Adult Drug Treatment Services in Cambridgeshire'. This was a legal requirement, as the existing contract would expire on The 1st April 2012.

The tender was concluded in December 2011 and the Contract awarded to INCLUSION Drug Services, part of South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust. The new contract would commence on Monday 2nd April 2012.

Over the next two months the DAAT would be working alongside INCLUSION to implement and embed the new service.

In response to Member's questions the DAAT Co-ordinator and Mr Merryl (INCLUSION representative) confirmed the following:

- (i) Mill House would continue to be used as a meeting place for people accessing the DAAT service.
- (ii) INCLUSION aimed to learn from the experiences of the previous provider [Adaction] and retain their good practices. INCLUSION's focus would be on education, employment, a structured approach to treatment; and a move away from medication based treatments towards others such as counseling.
- (iii) Staff from Adaction would be TUPE'd across to INCLUSION, to aid continuity of service and retention of experience for service recipients.
- (iv) INCLUSION would be contracted as a service provider for a minimum of 3 years, extendable to up to 7; depending on quality of service delivered as monitored by DAAT on a quarterly basis.

- (v) The contract included a partnership working requirement for INCLUSION to undertake joint action with pharmacies, Drug Service, Neighbourhood Wardens, Police etc to address cross-cutting issues such as reducing needle deposits in public areas.
- (vi) Figures were not available to quantify the impact of education and employment as part of drug treatment. INCLUSION's aim was to get people off drugs in conjunction with other organisations.

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

**1. Mr Gawthrop queried details about the Bridge Project and raised concern about needle depositing in the area.**

The DAAT Co-ordinator said the Cambridge & Peterborough Trust oversaw the Bridge Project. Few clients were seen on site. Staff generally liaised with them off site, and most cases concerned soft drug usage.

A needle exchange scheme was in place to reduce needle depositing in public areas.

**12/7/EAC Tree Planting on Parks and Open Space - East Area**

The committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager regarding the Tree Planting on Parks and Open Space - East Area.

The report outlined that the City Council was one of the largest single owners of trees in Cambridge.

The Council identified the need to increase the investment in tree planting as detailed in the Budget Setting Report for 2011/12, in which the Council approved a four-year planting programme totaling £200,000.

The tree planting project would increase opportunities for communities to be involved with tree planting, create opportunities for local people to make decisions relating to tree planting proposals and to provide a focus for community based volunteering.

In response to Member's questions the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager confirmed the following:



- (i) Projects identified in the Officer's report would receive funding from the current budget. This assumed that projects were on City Council owned land. The Council would have to pay maintenance costs if its trees were planted on other organisation's properties, which would over stretch the current budget.
- (ii) If any further projects came forward in future from the public or Ward Councillors, the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager would look to identify funding from other sources.
- (iii) The tree planting budget was for trees on City Council owned land. Other funding streams such as environmental improvement projects could be used for trees on land owned by others.
- (iv) The budget available did not necessarily restrict the number of trees that could be planted. For example, 2 small trees could be bought for less than 1 mature tree. Due to the high density of building in the east area, creative solutions maybe required to implement tree planting projects, such as the use of smaller trees.
- (v) Officers were reviewing tree canopy cover in city wards.
- (vi) The tree mortality rate was 25%. This was mainly due to vandalism; but accidents, disease and pests were also contributing factors. The tree planting budget included provision for replacing trees, generally in the year after planting.
- (vii) The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager was in discussion with the Tree Council to establish a tree warden scheme. Resident association volunteers welcomed to join the scheme to receive mentoring/training before they undertook work.
- (viii) The intention was to avoid monocultures in future in order to get a mix of trees that would mature at different rates.
- (ix) The Tree Strategy would aid Tree Team and Planning Department join up, plus contribute to tree longevity by seeking to avoid cutting down or replacing trees too soon.
- (x) Conditions in planning applications given approval would monitor and protect trees on new developments. Current cover was in place for 5 years.

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

1. **Mr Woodburn noted that poplar trees near the Cambridge Leisure Park area had been removed. He asked if the trees could be replaced as they provided a habitat for a distinctive set of caterpillars.**

**ACTION POINT: Alistair Wilson (Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager) to respond to Mr Woodburn's tree planting query raised in 'Tree Planting on Parks and Open Space - East Area' section. Alistair Wilson to liaise with Matthew Magrath (Arboricultural Officer) and Ward Councillors concerning practicability of replacing poplar trees in Clifton Road.**

The committee **unanimously approved:**

- (i) The provisional four-year planting schedule set out in paragraphs 4.5 to 4.8 of the Officer's report.
- (ii) The proposal to consider, adapt and approve the list of proposed sites on an annual basis.

## **12/8/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme**

The committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP). The report outlined progress of existing schemes and new suggested schemes for 2012/13.

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager advised the Committee that the report contained a typographical error. Projects #3 – 7 in section 5 were situated in Petersfield Ward, not Romsey.

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager undertook to bring a report to the next EAC and Area Joint Committee on traffic regulation orders.

**ACTION POINT: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to report back to East Area Committee 12 April 2012 on results of bid for County Council Minor Works Fund**

### New Schemes That Require Decisions

Members considered a number of 2012/13 schemes put forward for approval.

In response to Member's questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager answered:

- (i) Projects approved in the current financial year would carry over funding into the next. Therefore funding would not be lost from the budget in the next financial year.

- (ii) EAC were invited to submit further EIPs for consideration. They would be included subject to a feasibility review.

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

**1. Mr Woodburn expressed concern over delays affecting EIPs requiring County Council funding.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager answered that the current financial year deadline had passed for highway orientated projects. A bid would have to be made for funding from the next financial year.

Councillor Pogonowski requested [on behalf of Councillor Wright] to add 4 projects to the list set out in section 5 of the Officer's report. The projects were:

- (i) Information board beside the Cellarer's Chequer on Beche Rd - (Councillor Wright).
- (ii) Signage indicating route to Leper Chapel from Riverside - (Councillor Wright).
- (iii) Bollards (of some sort) to protect central grassed area of Rayson Way - (Councillor Wright)
- (iv) Verge parking prohibition signs and enforcement in Peverel Road – (Councillor Pogonowski).

Councillor Sedgewick-Jell requested [on behalf of himself and Councillor Wright] to add 1 project to the list set out in section 5 of the Officer's report. The project was:

- (i) Upgrade/improvement to the cycle/pedestrian route down the side of the car park of Christ the Redeemer from Newmarket Road through to Peverel Rd - (Cllrs Wright & Sedgewick-Jell).

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously):**

- (i) To approve projects as set out in section 5 of the Officer's report for further investigation into their feasibility and estimated cost.
- (ii) To approve projects proposed by Councillor Pogonowski and Councillor Sedgewick-Jell for further investigation into their feasibility and estimated cost.

## **12/9/EAC Information Report - Results of Consultation for Proposed Loading Bay at 103 Mill Road**

The committee received a report from the Chief Estates Surveyor regarding the results of consultation for proposed loading bay at 103 Mill Road.

The Committee noted the report.

## **12/10/EAC Alternative Future Arrangements for EAC Meetings**

The committee discussed the following alternative future arrangements:

- (i) Moving from an (approximate) 8 week meeting cycle to a 6 week one.
- (ii) Retaining Policing and Safer Neighbourhood items on a quarterly basis so that other notable items of public interest could be scheduled at other meetings. Therefore more 'big' items could be accommodated in the meeting schedule.
- (iii) Moving from an area committee structure to ward based parish councils.
- (iv) Keeping community items at area committees, but considering planning applications in a different way; such as at the main Planning Committee.
- (v) The merits of alternating community and planning orientated meetings in the schedule, instead of having a single meeting split into two separate halves.
- (vi) Moving planning items to the start of the meeting.
- (vii) Undertaking more proactive agenda management to ensure meetings could operate within a guide time of 7:00 pm – 10:30 pm, with a guillotine time of 11:00 pm.
- (viii) The merits of changing or maintaining the current start time.

The following arrangement was agreed by 11 votes to 0:

- (i) Moving from an (approximate) 8 week meeting cycle to a 6 week one; for a trial period of 12 months from the start of the next municipal year.

The following arrangement was agreed by 10 votes to 0:

- (ii) Undertaking more proactive agenda management to ensure meetings could operate within a guide time of 7:00 pm – 10:30 pm, with the opportunity to extend the meeting until 11pm to conclude business if agreed by a majority of the committee members present.

Arrangements were subject to a trial period of 12 months from the start of the next municipal year.

The Chair to manage future agendas to ensure meetings could operate within the guide time.

### **12/11/EAC East Area Capital Grants Programme - Application and Project Appraisal for St. Philips Church, Mill Road**

The committee received a report from the Head of Community Development regarding the East Area Capital Grants Programme - Application and Project Appraisal for St. Philips Church, Mill Road

The report outlined an update on the East Area Capital Grants Programme and an application by St.Philips Church in Mill Road for consideration by the East Area Committee

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

- (i) Welcomed the scheme and the facilities it offered.

In response to Member's questions the Head of Community Development and Mr Clark (St. Philips Church) confirmed the following:

- (i) Grant recipients were required to adhere to a grant agreement that stipulated the wider community would be granted access to facilities. The City Council undertook on-going monitoring to review this.
- (ii) The café project proposed to target a different client base to cafés already existing in Mill Road, therefore it should not directly compete with them. Prices would be comparable to avoid undercutting. The café should open in May 2012.

The committee **unanimously approved** to recommend to the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health that a capital grant of £78,000 be awarded to St.Philips Church as a contribution towards the cost of providing new community rooms and a community cafe, subject to compliance with the Council's legal agreement.

### **12/12/EAC Planning Applications**

**12/12/EACa 11/1321/FUL: 129 - 131 Vinery Road, Cambridge**

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a terrace of 3no three bedroom dwellings and 2no semi-detached four bedroom dwellings, following the demolition of the existing bungalows at 129 and 131 Vinery Road, Cambridge.

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

- Mr Walton
- Mr Eden-Green

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Took issue with Officer's report concerning road safety and the application being in accordance with policy 5/1 and part c of policy 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
- (ii) Vinery Park resident's objected to the development in its current form.
- (iii) Requested the following conditions if the application were approved:
  - Noise mitigation.
  - An independent day light study to ensure the development conforms to BRA guidelines.
  - Mitigation of the impact of the bay window in plot 4 on existing neighbouring properties.

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

Councillor Saunders proposed amendments that:

- (i) A considerate contractor informative should be included in the conditions.
- (ii) Imposing a condition that the application's appearance should be in the style of existing neighbours.

These amendments were carried unanimously.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 10 votes to 0 - unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda with the addition of the following condition and informative:

No development shall take place until details of sills, lintels, and other architectural features of the front elevation of units 1, 2 and 3 have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Development shall take place only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development responds appropriately to the context. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/12)

**INFORMATIVE:** New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

#### 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 was considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: SS1, ENV6, ENV7

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, 8/3, 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](http://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 Planning, in consultation with 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 09 May 2012, or if Committee determine that the application be refused, it was recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

- (i) The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, and life-long learning facilities, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, 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, and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

### **12/12/EACb 11/1432/FUL: 13-14 Mercers Row**

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for replacement of buildings with new buildings for taxi firms offices, call centre, workshop and carwash, and restroom, snack bar and smoking area.

Ms Page (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

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

- Mr Masters

The representation covered the following issues:



- (i) Gave background information regarding SCA (neighbouring company).
- (ii) Expressed concern about:
  - Impact of development on SCA.
  - Lack of information regarding impact of development on neighbours.
  - Suggested the application conflicted with Local Plan Policy 7/3 concerning the need to protect employment classes.

### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 4)** to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

### Reasons for Refusal

1. The loss of floorspace within uses B1(c), B2 and B8 on a site designated in the Local Plan as a Protected Industrial Site would reduce the diversity of employment opportunities in the city. The application provides no evidence that the proposal meets any of the criteria, which might render such loss acceptable, and was therefore contrary to policy 7/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and government guidance in Planning Policy Statement 4 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth' (2009).

### **12/12/EACc Land formerly known as the rear of 7 – 9 Mill Road, Cambridge, now 1a Willis Road, Cambridge**

The committee received an application for planning enforcement action to be taken.

The application sought authority to serve an Enforcement Notice to address a breach of planning control through failure to comply with the requirements of a planning condition.

Site: 1a Willis Road, Cambridge.

Breach: Failure to comply with Condition 11 of 09/0487/FUL.

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

- Mr Whitfield

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Mr Whitfield put a drawing from the original planning application before Members that he considered represented the boundary treatment.
- (ii) Referred to plan circulated by Mr Whitfield at EAC. Built boundary fence in line with planning specifications.
- (iii) Made wooden fence a folding feature for ease of access for property maintenance. This was approximately in the style of neighbouring properties; there were a mixture of styles in the road.
- (iv) Queried if boundary treatment conditions could be set aside.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to issue enforcement notices under the provisions of S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), for Failure to comply with a condition.

The meeting ended at 10.50 pm

**CHAIR**