

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

21 June 2012  
7.00 - 10.50 pm

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

County Councillors Bourke, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

Councillors Bourke and Sedgwick-Jell left after item 12/30/EAC

Councillor Sadiq left after the vote on item 12/31/EACb

**Officers:** Tony Collins (Principal Planning Officer) and James Goddard (Committee Manager)

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

**12/24/EAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Councillor Owers proposed, and Councillor Marchant-Daisley seconded, the nomination of Councillor Blencowe as Chair.

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)** that Councillor Blencowe be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Blencowe assumed the Chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

Councillor Benstead proposed, and Councillor Pogonowski seconded, the nomination of Councillor Owers as Vice Chair.

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)** that Councillor Owers be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

**12/25/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart.

**12/26/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

NAME	ITEM	INTEREST
Councillor Brown	12/31/EACa & 12/31/EACc	Personal: Member of Campaign for Real Ale
Councillor Saunders	12/31/EACa & 12/31/EACc	Personal: Knows one of the Objectors, but did not fetter discretion
Councillor Saunders	12/31/EACa & 12/31/EACc	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Marchant-Daisley	12/31/EACb & 12/31/EACi	Personal: Application near to place of work
Councillor Blencowe	12/31/EAC h	Personal and Prejudicial: Lives in Ferndale Rise  Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote

**12/27/EAC Appointment to Outside Bodies**

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

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)** that Councillor Hart be the representative for Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee for the ensuing year.

Councillor Herbert proposed the nomination of Councillor Johnson as the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre.

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)** that Councillor Johnson be the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre for the ensuing year.

**12/28/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 12 April 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

**12/29/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

- (i) **12/13/EAC Apologies For Absence “Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to pass on East Area Committee’s thanks to Councillor Wright for her service.”**

Councillor Blencowe has passed on East Area Committee’s thanks and best wishes to Councillor Wright.

- (ii) **12/16/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes “Action Point: Councillor Sedgwick-Jell to respond to Dr Eva’s Riverside Place gritting concerns raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillor Sedgwick-Jell to clarify position with Graham Hughes (Service Director, Growth & Infrastructure – County) to ascertain gritting schedule.”**

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell continues to follow up the gritting issue with County Officers, and has asked them to make the Riverside Place cycle lane and road a priority.

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell hoped to bring back a further report to the next East Area Committee (EAC) 2 August 2012.

- (iii) **12/16/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes “Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to liaise with the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager plus Mr Woodburn to ensure the Clifton Road tree planting query has been resolved.”**

The Open Spaces Asset Manager is following up this issue.

- (iv) **12/17/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to liaise with Andy Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager) regarding adding the assessment of the Palmer’s Walk path to the environmental improvement projects scheme.”**

Councillor Blencowe said the Palmer’s Walk path proposal would be considered for inclusion in the next round of environmental improvement projects.

- (v) **12/17/EAC Open Forum matter arising: Addenbrooke’s bus service concern**

Councillor Johnson said that he and Councillor Sadiq met with Councillor Ward to discuss this issue.

- (v) **12/20/EAC Community Olympics Art Project “Action Point: Committee Manager to publish Same Sky artist contact details so Cambridge residents can volunteer to participate in the Community Olympics Public Art Project.”**

Details published through minutes on 12/04/12 EAC webpage.

### **12/30/EAC Open Forum**

1. **Mr Stamp raised concerns about street life anti-social behaviour (ASB) in Mill Road and the surrounding area. Mr Stamp was also concerned by slow Police response times to calls logged via the #101 number**

Councillor Bourke said that drug and alcohol related street life ASB in the East of the city was a Police priority set by EAC at the 12 April meeting. Councillor Bourke had spoken to PCSOs and local officers, who said they were monitoring reported issues.

Councillor Owers felt there had been improvements just after the Police priority was set, but issues had noticeably arisen again recently.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley said she was aware of specific ASB issues in Norfolk Street.

EAC Members encouraged members of the public to log ASB incidents via the #101 number so the Police could gather trend information. EAC noted members of the public dissatisfaction with call response times.

**ACTION POINT: Councillors Bourke and Marchant-Daisley to meet with ward residents and shopkeepers to discuss drug and alcohol related street life ASB in the area around Mill Road and Norfolk Street. Issues to be reported back to 2 August 2012 EAC.**

2. **Mr Rogers raised concerns that PCSOs did not challenge street life ASB.**

Councillor Blencowe said that drinking in the street was not an offence, whereas ASB was. PCSOs faced a dilemma on when to take action so charges could realistically be brought against suspects.

- 3. Mr Rogers raised concerns that Stagecoach had changed the #3 bus route and that alternative services were unsatisfactory as they covered different routes and caused longer waiting times.**

Councillor Sadiq was unhappy that bus companies could change routes without consultation, this meant that some areas lost services. Councillor Sadiq signposted the County Council Transport Strategy available on its website. He encouraged members of public to respond to the consultation.

Councillor Johnson felt that the #3 bus route had been changed without sufficient warning from Stagecoach.

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Johnson to raise EAC bus service concerns, specifically changes to the #3 bus route, with Andy Campbell (Stagecoach).**

- 4. Mrs Deards queried progress on Budleigh Close/Tiverton Way double yellow line joint minor works scheme with the County Council.**

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Herbert to respond to Mrs Deards after liaising with Andy Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager).**

- 5. Dr Eva queried why cycle racks were not available outside community centers owned by the City Council, or ones used by them as voting stations.**

Councillors welcomed Dr Eva's comments and his suggestions to provide cycle racks. Councillors Blencowe and Hart said that some of the premises the Council uses were owned by other organisations, thus it was difficult to impose a requirement for cycle racks on these organisations.

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell suggested that cycle racks were generally added to properties as a retrospective feature. He felt the planning

process should require cycle parking to be put in early in the design process.

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Hart to liaise with Clare Rankin (Cycling & Walking Officer) and respond to Dr Eva to clarify if the River Lane Community Centre has cycle racks or alternatives.**

6. Dr Eva raised the following issues on behalf of Mr Catto:
- Littering around Tesco in Cheddars Lane.
  - Drug users and drug dealing in the Riverside area.
  - A request for double yellow lines along Riverside.
  - Residents were unhappy with the choice of colour for Riverside railings selected by the Project Delivery & Environment Manager.

Councillor Johnson said that Tesco and the City Council had drawn up a voluntary code through a Memorandum of Understanding to address the littering issue. If Tesco did not meet cleansing standards, it may face enforcement action.

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Johnson to raise drug users and drug dealing in the Riverside area as a Police priority at 2 August 2012 EAC.**

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Johnson to raise request for double yellow lines along Riverside with Brian Stinton (Area Manager - County).**

**ACTION POINT: Councillor Blencowe to raise resident's concerns with the choice of colour for Riverside railings with the Project Delivery & Environment Manager.**

## **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.

## **12/31/EAC Planning Applications**

**12/31/EACa 12/0248/FUL: The Royal Standard, 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 (13 units).

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following local residents:

- Ms Jeffery
- Ms Walker

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Referred to a petition by 350 people supporting the retention of the Royal Standard. Residents took issue with the proposed change of use from a pub into housing as this would lead to the loss of a valued local amenity.
- (ii) The area had lost many pubs in recent years.
- (iii) The Royal Standard has a garden that is a valued open space amenity in the area.
- (iv) An s106 payment in lieu of open space provision in the application was unacceptable due to the lack of open space in the local area.
- (v) The Royal Standard was a building of historic interest in a Conservation Area.
- (vi) The building was an item of visual interest that contrasted with surrounding terrace houses.
- (vii) Concerns about overlooking and overshadowing from the application. It would also exacerbate local parking issues.
- (viii) Suggested the application should be turned down due to policies in the Open Space Strategy, Local Plan, National Planning Policy Framework and Parking Strategy.

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

Councillor Bourke (Romsey Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application through a statement read by the Committee Manager. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Several professional bodies had expressed concerns on the level of technical detail in the application.
- (ii) The application would lead to an overdevelopment of the site.

- (iii) Suggested the diminution of the site's garden contradicts the City Council's Open Space Strategy.
- (iv) A potential community asset could be lost by converting the site of a former public amenity into flats.
- (v) The Royal Standard is a "Building of Local Interest", its loss would have a detrimental effect on the site as a whole.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 10 votes to 1)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reason:

The proposal involves the permanent loss of a former public house, whose value to the local community is evidenced by the responses to the application. No adequate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the building could not be returned to viable use as a public house, and as such form a valued community facility. The proposal is consequently contrary to government guidance on promoting healthy communities in section 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**12/31/EACb 12/0490/FUL: 25 Cambridge Place**

The Committee received an application for change of use.

The application sought approval for change of use from offices (Class use B1) to form 3 No. studios and 2No. 1Bed. flats with associated access arrangements and external alterations.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ms Josselyn.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Concern over lack of parking facilities for visitors and service personnel (eg cleaners).
- (ii) Suggested the development was only suitable for able bodied, young, single, childless people. Thus it did not meet the needs of



Cambridge's diverse population in general (eg the elderly), just the needs of some.

- (iii) There was no provision for an accessible lift or disabled parking.

Mr McEwan (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

1. The proposal provides no car parking space for visitors, contrary to policy 8/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
2. Cycle parking and waste storage are not successfully integrated into the design. This is likely to lead to waste bins and cycles being left outside the building, detracting from the street scene and causing inconvenience to future residents of the development and nearby occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and to government guidance on good design in section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, life-long learning facilities, waste storage, waste management facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/8, 3/12 5/14 and 10/1, and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD 2012 and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

**12/31/EACc 12/0255/FUL: Former Greyhound Public House, 93 Coldhams Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing buildings and erection of premises for B1/B2/B8 use including trade counters with associated access, parking and landscaping

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions)** 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:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/1, 4/3, 4/6, 4/13, 7/1, 7/2, 8/2, 8/6, 8/9, 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](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.

**12/31/EACd 12/0398/FUL: 50 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for change of use.

The application sought approval for use of existing structure for use as a "shisha" pipe smoking shelter.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Gawthrop.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Residents mourned the loss of a general shop that has become a pipe shop and internet cafe.
- (ii) Residents were concerned that retrospective changes of use had led to inappropriate premises usage. Retrospective permission was sought after complaints by residents.
- (iii) The shop was used as a smoking area for the café, but technically met planning policy through sui generis use.
- (iv) The proposed application was not the same as one given previous permission, as this was not implemented.

Mr McEwan (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 10 votes to 1)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

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, 4/11, 4/13, 4/15, 6/7 and 6/10

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

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](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.

**12/31/EACe 12/0377/FUL: 23 Hooper Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for rear extension at ground and first floor levels.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Beauregard.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Concern regarding impact of application on neighbours due to its size and potential overshadowing effect.
- (ii) Took issue with paragraph 8.2 of the Officer's report concerning similarity of application to extensions at 106 and 108 Ainsworth Street.
- (iii) Felt the application was inappropriate in size for the Conservation Area.

Dr Kantaris (Owner) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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, 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, 3/14 and 4/11

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

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](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.

**12/31/EACf 12/0342/FUL: 34 Clifton Road**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the Applicant who had withdrawn the planning application.

**12/31/EACg 12/0169/FUL: Site Adjacent 19 Sleaford Street**

The Committee queried if a decision on this application could be taken through Officer delegated powers, and if so, would this delay proceedings.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the decision on this application could be taken through Officer delegated powers, and it would not delay proceedings.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to delegate this application to Officers as no objections had been received from members of the public and it had not been called in for scrutiny by Councillors.

**12/31/EAC h 12/0028/FUL: 1 Ferndale Rise**

Councillor Blencowe withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

Councillor Owers took the role of Chair.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

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

Mr Joy (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 10 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda and pre-Committee amendments to recommendation as set out on the amendment sheet:

1. APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 31st August 2012 and subject to the following conditions:

(Conditions as per officer report)

2. 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 31st August 2012, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/8 and 3/12, 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.

#### 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 SS1, 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, 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](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.

**12/31/EACi 12/0260/FUL: Ryedale House, 40 Cambridge Place**

This item was deferred to Monday 25 June 2012.

**12/31/EACj 12/0058/FUL: Coleridge Community College, Radegund Road**

This item was deferred to Monday 25 June 2012.

**12/32/EAC General Items**

**12/32/EACa 102 Mill Road**

This item was deferred to Monday 25 June 2012.

**12/32/EACb 36a Mill Road**

This item was deferred to Monday 25 June 2012.

**Meeting Adjourned**

The Committee resolved by 10 votes to 0 to adjourn and reconvene on Monday 25 June 2012 to consider items 8i – 9b on the agenda.

The meeting ended at 10.50 pm

**CHAIR**