

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

18 October 2012

7.00 - 9.35 pm

**Present**

**Area Committee Members:** Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Owers (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Brown, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, Marchant-Daisley, Moghadas, Saunders and Smart

**Area Committee Members:** County Councillors Bourke, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell

Councillors Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell left after the vote on item 12/57/EAC

Councillor Bourke left after the vote on item 12/59/EACa

**Officers:**

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation: Jane Darlington

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****12/52/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Pogonowski.

**12/53/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Saunders	12/57/EAC	Personal and Prejudicial: Member of Friends of Mill Road Cemetery.  Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote

**12/54/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 6 September 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

**12/55/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

- (i) **12/48/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councilor Herbert to advise Officers of Budleigh Close residents’ concerns that shrubbery is subject to anti-social behaviour due to lack of maintenance.”**

Councilor Herbert met on site with Paul Jones and Georgie Deards. Mr Jones agreed follow up work which will lead to wider garden maintenance work on the Tiverton Estate.

- (ii) **12/49/EAC East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans “Action Point: Councilor Bourke to circulate feasibility study information regarding Chisholm Trail for bicycles.”**

The information was circulated 17 October 2012.

- (iii) **12/49/EAC East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans “Action Point: Head of Transport and Infrastructure (County) to advise Councillor Owers if his proposed Transport Corridor Area Transport Plan project for speed warning lights in Coleridge Road is eligible for s106 funding.”**

Councillor Owers to follow up this issue.

- (iv) **12/49/EAC East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans “Action Point: Head of Transport and Infrastructure (County) to bring back a report to East Area Committee (EAC) regarding East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans**

A report will be brought back to 25 April 2013 EAC.

**12/56/EAC Open Forum**

- 1. Mr Sexton thanked EAC for its support of the St Martin's Church project. He requested details about the EAC s106 Workshop 20 September 2012.**

Councillors understood that the St Martin's Church project was under time pressure as it was ready to be implemented, and time sensitive, but awaiting funding. The purpose of the 20 September meeting was for members of the public to identify potential projects to be prioritised for s106 funding. EAC would make a decision on which projects would receive funding at its 29 November 2012 meeting.

**Action Point: Councilors Blencowe and Saunders to seek further information on St Martin's Church s106 funding application to inform the November East Area Committee.**

**Action Point: Councillor Owers to liaise with Matthew Sexton and Head of Community Development regarding alternative funding for St Martin's Church redevelopment project.**

- 2. Dr Eva referred to the Community Right to Bid scheme. He sought clarification concerning the process and asked if the Engineer's House in Riverside could be registered as a building / community asset of interest.**

Councillors said Information regarding the process on the Community Right to Bid was available on the City Council's website.

Community groups can put forward sites to go on the list.

**Action Point: Councilor Herbert or Committee Manager to enquire status of Engineer's House in Riverside ie if it was listed/protected as a community asset under the Community Right to Bid scheme.**

- 3. Dr Eva said that climate change was an important issue and asked how the City could take more action to mitigate issues. Dr Eva asked for climate change to be added as a regular item to EAC agendas.**

Councillor Smart said that the City Council required support from the County Council to achieve its climate change targets. Work had been undertaken to reduce the carbon footprint of Council housing stock by

making it more energy efficient. Also, as part of their accreditation scheme, landlords received grants to insulate their properties. The Council hoped to support householders taking up the 'green deal' in future.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley said the Council was aware that it was not meeting its current Climate Change Strategy targets. These would be revised in 2014 – 2015 when more reliable data was available to set more specific, measurable and achievable targets.

EAC felt citywide action, rather than EAC specific initiatives, were required to address climate change in future.

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell suggested that it was up to politicians to raise the profile of climate change, even if it were an unpopular subject on occasion. He felt that a combination of top-down and bottom-up initiatives were required, otherwise local initiatives would be canceled out by Central Government policies.

**Action Point: Councilor Blencowe to raise issue at Area Chair's Briefing of adding climate change initiatives as a regular item on committee agendas in future. Councilor Blencowe to ask if there is support and funding available to undertake this work.**

Dr Eva suggested that EAC's support of the proposed Chisholm Trail was an example of how it could support the climate change agenda.

Councillor Saunders suggested that the growth of the City affected climate change, therefore EAC had an indirect impact on climate change policy.

### **12/57/EAC Community Development and Leisure Grants**

Councillor Saunders withdrew from the meeting for the discussion concerning Mill Road Cemetery and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

The Committee received a report from the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (CCF) regarding Community Development and Leisure Grants.

Members considered applications for grants as set out in the Officer's report, and amended below. The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation responded to Member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

<b>Current Applications. Available: £16,048</b>				
<b>CCF ref</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Requested</b>	<b>CCC Grants Manager Recommendations</b>
WEB 54153	Friends of Mill Road Cemetery	For running costs, hall hire, insurance, publicity.	£400	£400
WEB 54188	Mill Road Winter Fair	To provide better signage and information boards for the Mill Road Winter Fair.	£900	£900
WEB 54804	Cambridge Art Salon	First 'Romsey Art Festival' in Summer 2013.	£900	£900
WEB 55333	Mill Road Bridges	To print and distribute newsletters.	£3,280	£1,640
<b>Total</b>			<b>£5,480</b>	<b>£3,840</b>
<b>Budget available</b>				<b>£16,048</b>
<b>Budget remaining after recommendations</b>				<b>£12,208</b>

Ms Wright spoke in favour of funding for Friends of Mill Road Cemetery. This would contribute towards running costs when the organisation had received less funding than expected after the Officer's report had been written.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Marchant-Daisley formally proposed to amend the recommended Friends of Mill Road Cemetery (ref WEB 54153) funding as follows:

(i) ~~£300 for running costs, hall hire, insurance, publicity.)~~

(i) £400 for running costs, hall hire, insurance, publicity.

The amendments were **agreed (unanimously - by 10 votes to 0)**.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

(i) **Resolved (unanimously - by 10 votes to 0)** to approve the grant allocation as amended for £400 to Friends of Mill Road Cemetery.

Councillor Saunders rejoined EAC for the discussion regarding remaining projects.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

(ii) **Resolved (unanimously - by 11 votes to 0)** to approve the grant allocation as listed for £900 for Mill Road Winter Fair.

(iii) **Resolved (unanimously - by 11 votes to 0)** to approve the grant allocation as listed for £900 for Cambridge Art Salon.

(iv) **Resolved (by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** to approve the grant allocation as listed for £1,640 for Mill Road Bridges.

## **12/58/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.

## **12/59/EAC Planning Applications**

### **12/59/EACa 12/0480/FUL: 8 Montreal Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of four dwellings following demolition of 8 Montreal Road.

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

- Mr Williams
- Dr Simpson

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Took issue with the Officer's recommendation for approval. Resident's felt the development was inappropriate and had petitioned against it as it raised the following concerns:
  - The application could have a negative impact on the character of the area.
  - Traffic safety, flow and parking issues. Particularly as the application proposed that residents would share a long driveway. Mill Road is a busy traffic route already.
  - Overlooking / overshadowing.
  - The same concerns from previous applications had not been addressed.
- (ii) The design looked adequate, but not inspiring.
- (iii) Houses in Mill Road experienced a lot of noise at the front (the area is affected by anti-social behaviour), but enjoyed quiet at the back. This made the back area an important amenity.
- (iv) The proposed development would cause more traffic and general noise (during and after construction), which would impact on existing resident's quiet space eg causing noise and light pollution.
- (v) Romsey needed housing, but the application would develop an important local open space. The National Planning Policy Framework does not support garden developments, which the application was seeking to do.

Ms Richards (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Killian Bourke (Romsey Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Local residents had reservations regarding the application. They were particularly concerned it would impact on their amenities.

- (ii) The site access road only just met Highways Authority standards, and could lead to traffic flow and safety issues.
- (iii) The application was sited close to a Conservation Area.
- (iv) Requested the application be turned down.

### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 2)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

### Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6, ENV7.

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 4/11, 4/13, 5/1, 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](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 1 December 2012, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, 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, community development facilities, waste storage,

waste management facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 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 RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD 2012, and the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

### **12/59/EACb 12/0935/FUL: 7 Kerridge Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a new house to be built on foundations of existing house extension.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Mr Mitton was speaking on behalf of various residents.
- (ii) Requested that if the development went ahead, materials used should match existing properties.
- (iii) Observed that existing properties had maintenance requirements and constraints in their deeds.
- (iv) Concern over lack of parking provision.
- (v) The application would increase the number of bins to be collected in the area, which may lead to access issues between Ainsworth Street and Kerridge Close.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a considerate construction condition should be included.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, with the addition of conditions to limit both construction hours and construction deliveries to 8am-7pm Mon Fri, 8am-1pm Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

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 ENV6 ENV7  
  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8  
  
Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1 3/4 3/7 3/8 3/10 3/12 4/4, 4/11 5/1 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.

**INFORMATIVE:** The occupiers of the new house hereby approved planning permission should be made aware that they are not entitled to use parking spaces allocated to other residents of Kerridge Close and are not entitled to residents parking permits.

## **12/60/EAC General Items**

### **12/60/EACa Enforcement Report - 32 Romsey Road**

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

The application sought authority to close the Enforcement Investigation on the grounds that it is not expedient to pursue the breach of planning control further.

Site: 32 Romsey Road, Cambridge.

Breach: Unauthorised Development - alteration to the roof of an existing rear extension that exceeds permitted development limitations.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation that the Head of Planning Services be authorised to close the Enforcement Investigation on the grounds that it is not expedient to pursue the breach of planning control further.

The meeting ended at 9.35 pm

**CHAIR**