

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

29 November 2012

7.05 - 11.00 pm

Present

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

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

Councillors Bourke, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell left after the vote on item 12/68/EAC

Other Councillors in Attendance:

Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places: Rod Cantrill

Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services: Jean Swanson

Officers:

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Head of Community Development: Trevor Woollams

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers in Attendance:

Police Inspector: Steve Poppitt

Police Sergeant: Colin Norden

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/61/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Harison, Marchant-Daisley and Pogonowski.

12/62/EAC Declarations Of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Herbert	12/70/EAC	Personal: Lives close to both the Coleridge stops recommended for priority.
Councillor Sadiq	12/70/EAC	Personal: Lives close to proposed site for Derwent Close bus stop.
Councillor Bourke	12/71/EACd	Personal: Member of Cambridgeshire Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Saunders	12/71/EACd	Personal: Member of Cambridgeshire Cycling Campaign.

12/63/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 18 October 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

12/64/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **12/56/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillors Blencowe and Saunders to seek further information on St Martin’s Church s106 funding application to inform the November East Area Committee.”**

Project being considered at 29 November 2012 East Area Committee.

- (ii) **12/56/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Owers to liaise with Matthew Sexton and Trevor Woollams regarding alternative funding for St Martin’s Church redevelopment project.”**

Project being considered at 29 November 2012 East Area Committee.

- (iii) **12/56/EAC Open Forum “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.”**

Information regarding the process on the Community Right to Bid is available on the City Council's website:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/community-and-living/local-communities/community-right-to-bid-scheme.en>

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

The process commenced on Tuesday 16 October, so the Council can now receive nominations via forms/guidance on the Council webpages.

Patsy Dell (Head of Planning) is the lead Officer for this.

Councillor Herbert has progressed the Engineers House. Abbey resident is happy listed as a building of local interest and enjoys a level of protection.

- (iv) **12/56/EAC Open Forum “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.”**

Councillor Blencowe to raise issue at Area Chair’s Briefing in December 2012. Councilor Blencowe to ask if there is support and funding available to undertake this work.

12/65/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.

12/66/EAC Open Forum

- 1. Mr Wood raised concern regarding vehicles waiting / loading / unloading on the footway of Mill Road. He felt this impacted on safety for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.**

East Area Committee (EAC) agreed that pedestrians should have priority on the pavement. Vehicles waiting / loading / unloading on the footway did impact on safety. This was a historic issue in Mill Road, which the

Area Joint Committee was aware of; and monitored by Enforcement Officers.

Action Point: Councillor Bourke to liaise with County Council Officers regarding measures to prevent waiting / loading / unloading vehicles on the footway of Mill Road. Also the issue of drop kerbs being parked on by heavy vehicles, which leads to damage.

Action Point: Councillors Blencowe and Smart to confirm if a loading ban is in place to restrict loading times.

- 2. Dr Eva pointed out that there are currently no secure cycle stands at the River Lane Centre, pointed out how unsatisfactory this situation was given that the River Lane Centre is used as a Polling Station, and pointed out that he had raised this issue at the EAC of 25 June 2012 and had not had a satisfactory response. He then went on to say that he would like to see the EAC be ambitious in its provision of secure cycle stands.**

Councillor Johnson has liaised with City Officers regarding suitable sites for cycle parking at Council venues. If suitable places can be found, a funding bid will be made to implement parking provision.

Councillor Johnson felt that EAC could use environmental improvement project funding to implement cycle racks in its wards, but it would be impracticable for EAC to implement cycle parking provision outside these areas, as it would require a more substantial capital bid.

Councillors Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell felt cyclists were not given the same consideration as drivers in the planning process eg vehicular lanes/flow was considered before cycle lanes. Councillor Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell felt the County and City Councils could do more to give cyclists equal consideration through the Local Plan consultation process.

Councillor Sadiq said that public health would become a County Council responsibility from 2013.

Action Point: Councillor Smart to liaise with colleagues concerning the provision of cycle parking for civic buildings in future.

EAC felt the onus was on Councillors to encourage civic buildings to provide cycle parking. However they could only influence venues used, but not owned by the Council, to provide cycle parking. Councillor Johnson had been advised by Vicki Breeding (Electoral Services Manager) that polling venues identified as possible locations were not always used, therefore it was impractical to provide cycle parking for a specific venue in advance in case it was not used.

Dr Eva suggested "The East Area Committee resolves that for buildings where there exists a community or civic interest we will ensure that all such buildings are made cycle-friendly by providing an adequate provision of free and safe cycle stands by December 2013".

Following discussion the following resolution was adopted instead:

The East Area Committee resolves that for buildings where there exists a community or civic interest we would strive to ensure that all such buildings are made cycle-friendly by providing an adequate provision of free and safe cycle stands by December 2013.

3. Mr Goode asked if cycle parking could be provided at Cherry Trees Day Centre.

Councillor Blencowe said that he had raised the issue with Cherry Trees Trustees.

Mr Bond, speaking as a Cherry Trees Trustee, said that a number of proposals were coming forward in future. Land ownership issues restricted potential sites for cycle racks.

4. Mr Taylor asked if EAC had any contact from the new Police & Crime Commissioner. Also if EAC were aware of the Commissioner's view of EAC setting East Area policing priorities. Mr Taylor asked if the Commissioner would be invited to future EAC meetings.

Councillor Johnson said he had not received a response to his invitation for the Police & Crime Commissioner to attend an EAC meeting.

Councillor Herbert suggested that EAC Councillors could meet the Police & Crime Commissioner to identify policing priorities.

Action Point: Councilor Blencowe to ask City Council Chief Executive to invite Police and Crime Commissioner to meet Councillors and members of the public to discuss police priorities. Councillor Bick to be asked to follow up the issue through Scrutiny Committee if an open forum is not possible.

5. Mrs Peachey asked for an update on the flowerbed environmental improvement project in Whitehill Close.

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager is liaising with Housing Officers regarding revenue funding available to implement the project. The aim is for planting to take place in Spring 2013. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager will liaise with Mrs Peachey as funding available will impact on options for what can be planted.

6. Mr Walsh raised concern regarding the cleaning of the public toilets in Mill Road in general; and in particular just before the Winter Fair.

Councillor Swanson made the following points:

- (i) Monday to Friday the first clean is at 6.00 am. The toilets are then left to automatically open at 8.00 am. The second clean is undertaken at 1.30 pm leaving a final clean and close at 8.00 pm.

Supervisors carry out the cleaning at the weekend. However due to their start time the first clean does not commence until 9.30 am.

If a complaint is received between cleaning sessions then somebody would be dispatched to clean immediately.

The toilets are cleaned regularly, but can be soiled almost immediately afterwards by users.

- (ii) A deep clean has been carried out and Officers are supervising the situation closely.
- (iii) Cubicles are not abused equally. The disabled toilet is abused more due to its size. Rough sleepers will often try and sleep through the night in this cubicle. Police are contacted if they refuse to leave. Other cubicles are also abused.

- (iv) A visible sign on the outside of the toilets lists opening times and a contact number (Customer Service Centre) to report problems. An out of hour emergency number is inside each cubicle.
- (v) Mill Road toilets will be fully attended from 8.00 am to 4.00 pm along with a final clean at 8.00 pm to support the Winter Fair. The same service was provided last year.
- (vi) A fourth inspection per day may not address soiling issues. Part of the difficulty Officers face is not about the number of cleans; but addressing the abuse which could occur directly after a clean, and still be unpleasant for the next visitor. Officers had recognised that they wanted to address this issue. Part of the Building Cleaning improvements had already planned a different way of working. The implementation of the improved service should take place in the New Year. In the meantime supervisors have been instructed to give an additional check and clean at 10.00 am Monday to Friday.
- (vii) Ultraviolet light in the toilets is designed to make it harder for people to inject drugs as they would find it difficult to find their veins. However, people continue to inject regardless of the low light, hence the continuing bloodstains in the toilets.
- (viii) Sharps drop off points are provided, but not always used.
- (ix) A mystery shopper visit to the toilets proved satisfactory.

12/67/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The Committee received a report from Sergeant Norden regarding the policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 2 August 2012. 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:

- (i) Alcohol and drug-related street anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the East, targeting known hot spots (including Mill Road, Mill Road Cemetery and Norfolk Street, plus drug dealing in the Riverside Area) and focusing on education and enforcement to address licensed premises selling alcohol to the intoxicated.
- (ii) Anti-social use of mopeds in Riverside, Coleridge and Abbey areas.
- (iii) Vehicle crime, such as theft and vandalism, in East of City.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- (i) Drug users and drug dealing in the Riverside and Stourbridge Common area.
- (ii) The possibility of targeting class A drug dealers as a higher priority than class b drug dealers as a topic for discussion with the Police & Crime Commissioner.
- (iii) Theft of cycles in the East area (organised and opportunistic).
- (iv) Enforcement action against cyclists not wearing lights.
- (v) Vehicle crime, such as theft and vandalism, in East of City
- (vi) Alcohol related ASB in the Petersfield area.

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

- (i) Councillor Hart said the number of discarded needles found in Abbey Ward increased sharply due to Street Scene Officers actively monitoring the area around Ditton Fields and Stourbridge Common for a set period, which affected the statistics in the Officers report. Active on-going monitoring by PCSOs has discouraged further needle dropping.
- (ii) Councillor Blencowe met with Inspector Poppitt post 18 November 2012 EAC regarding street life ASB issues. Further information is expected in future.

The Safer Communities Section Manager referred to the 'Review of Street-Based Anti-Social Behaviour' presented to 15 October 2012 Strategy & Resources Committee.

Action Point: Lynda Kilkelly (Safer Communities Section Manager) to write a press release to raise public awareness of 'Review of Street Based Anti-Social Behaviour' report; and meeting between Safer Communities Officers, Councillors and stakeholders in January 2013.

In response to Members' questions the Safer Communities Section Manager confirmed the following:

- (i) Three thousand discarded needles were found in one location in Coleridge ward. This void property was a centre for ASB, crime and prostitution. The building had been closed and cleaned up, so was no longer a danger to the public.
- (ii) The provisions of sharps drop off points and a campaign regarding clean up of needles had led to more responsible disposal by users

and an overall decline in the number of discarded needles in public spaces.

- (iii) A priority regarding alcohol related ASB in the Petersfield area would cover the wider area around Petersfield by implication as Officers would follow issues if they moved.

Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to ask City Council Street Scene Officers to clarify needle drop figures in 29 November 2012 Officer report.

The following priorities were **unanimously agreed**:

- (i) Theft of cycles in the East area.
- (ii) Alcohol related ASB in the Petersfield area.
- (iii) Drug dealing in the Riverside & Stourbridge Common area.

12/68/EAC Devolved Decision-Making and Developer Contributions: Update Following East Area Workshop

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager regarding devolved decision-making and developer contributions. The report provided a summary of the project ideas for new or improved local facilities suggested at the East Area workshop on 20 September 2012. The ideas were assessed in terms of their eligibility for developer contributions funding and their deliverability in the short-term (by the end of March 2014).

A list of three project proposals was identified as being eligible for the funding and deliverable in the short-term. The East Area Committee was asked to prioritise one, two or all three of these project ideas, within the developer contributions funding totaling £450,000 currently available to the East Area. Detailed project appraisals would be developed for priority projects.

The report contrasted existing / unallocated developer contributions in the East Area to the city's three other Areas, with specific reference to limited play provision funding. It also highlighted project ideas raised at the East Area workshop which could also benefit other Areas, and projects on the 'on hold' list of the City Council's Capital Plan: these will be reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in January 2013 for the Executive Councillors to consider their priorities for city-wide funding.

The Committee received public comments.

- (i) **Mr Goode expressed concern that short term projects may be prioritized over longer term ones (ie ones that take time coming forward), even though longer term ones may bring equal benefits.**

Councillor Blencowe referenced funding available for projects (listed in Appendix B, P14, of the Officer's report), which would limit projects that could be funded.

- (ii) **Mrs Tait and Mr Bond spoke in favour of Cherry Trees Day Centres' funding bid. This was for a well used community building that required urgent refurbishment and improvement.**

The Urban Growth Project Manager said the 20 September workshop had identified a number of projects that attendees would like to see funded. Further information was required regarding project aims, contacts and timetables before they could be taken forward. Projects could then be assessed against eligibility criteria and directed towards appropriate funding streams (which may not be s106).

Councillor Blencowe said that he was liaising with Mrs Tait regarding the Cherry Trees application.

Action Point: Head of Community Development to undertake an assessment of Cherry Trees Day Centre funding bid and bring it to 10 January 2013 EAC.

The Area Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- (i) The list of projects identified in Appendix D of the Officer's report would be considered a working document from which projects could be considered and prioritised.
- (ii) Councillor Bourke proposed that EAC ask the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places to give funding from city-wide developer contributions to East Area children and family projects to take these forward as the East Area could not progress these projects with its own limited budget. Councillor Bourke suggested discounting children's projects from EAC s106 projects and seeking city-wide funding for them instead.

The Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places gave an overview of s106 process aims and undertook to consider any requests from EAC for city-wide funding.

In response to Members' questions the Urban Growth Project Manager confirmed the following:

- (i) There were strict criteria governing the use of funding streams.
- (ii) Each city area had proposed a number of projects seeking s106 funding, these needed to be treated consistently.
- (iii) A report will be brought to 26 March 2013 EAC meeting, by which time it may have become clearer whether there is any further developer contributions funding available.

Following discussion, the East Area Committee **resolved:**

- (i) To note the summary of all consultation feedback arising from the East Area workshop and related emails.
- (ii) Identified the following projects as priorities for delivery, subject to project appraisals and the identification of appropriate funding to meet any related revenue and maintenance costs:
 - Increase biodiversity at Stourbridge Common [A09]
 - Improve access to Abbey paddling pools from Coldham's Common [A11b].
 - Install adult gym equipment next to Ditton Fields play area [A12b].
- (iii) To urge the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places (via the Community Services Scrutiny report in January) to make funding available from the city-wide fund for children and young peoples' projects.

Action Point: East Area Committee to ask the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places to supplement the East Area's devolved funding for play provision with some city-wide funding in the event that the updated financial analysis in January 2013 does not identify an increase in funding available to the Area for this contribution type.

Action Point: Urban Growth Project Manager to liaise post meeting with Councillor Blencowe regarding initial assessment of feasibility of projects identified as eligible for s106 funding in Appendix D of Officer's report. Initial assessment on the feasibility of the identified S106 projects to be brought to March EAC meeting.

12/69/EAC East Area Capital Grants Programme Update St Martin's Church Centre - Phase 2

The Committee received a report from the Head of Community Development regarding the East Area Capital Grants Programme Update with regards to St Martin's Church Centre Phase 2.

The report outlined an update of the East Area Capital Grants Programme and brings forward a request for further capital funding by St Martin's Church Centre in Suez Road for consideration by the East Area Committee.

An update on the East Area Committee's Capital Grants Programme was shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

St Martins Church Centre was awarded £120,000 by East Area Committee in April 2011 for their Phase 1 works to improve the main community hall. At this time, the report also set out plans for a second Phase to provide meeting rooms and storage space on a new first floor together with additional improvements to the ground floor.

The Phase 1 works commenced on site on 1 October 2012 and is due for completion before Christmas. The Phase 1 works are self contained and will significantly improve the community provision at the centre.

Representatives from St Martin's Church Centre had requested a further capital grant so that they can proceed with some of the Phase 2 works whilst their contractor is on site. East Area Members were asked to consider whether they wish to award a further capital grant to St Martin's Church Centre as a contribution to Phase 2 of their improvement works.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Community Development said St Martins Church Centre undertook work with vulnerable groups and offered facilities at a rate comparable to City Council venues.

The Committee **resolved unanimously**:

- (i) To award a further capital grant to St Martin's Church Centre towards Phase 2 of their improvement works.
- (ii) Agreed an additional capital grant of £115,000 to cover all the items in Table 1 (Officer's report Appendix A) and a contribution towards the items in Table 2 (Officer's report Appendix B). Also to recommend to the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health that the grant is approved.

- (iii) To note that £100,000 has been provisionally set aside as a contribution towards a proposed new community facility off of Stainesfield Road in Abbey ward, which will be managed by the 29th Cambridge Scouts Group who will use it as their base and hire it out to community groups.

12/70/EAC New and Replacement Bus Shelter Programme

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Bus Shelter Programme. He advised that the report contained typographical errors on P39 of the agenda referring to “East Area” as “North Area”.

The report outlined that the City Council had approved expenditure of £267,000 on the provision of 12 new shelters and the replacement of approximately 60% of the 62 existing City Council owned shelters across the city. The report requested that East Area Committee approved the proposed allocation of 3 new shelters at existing bus stops in the East Area of the city.

In response to the report, Members suggested the following locations for bus shelters:

- (i) Cherry Hinton Road (opposite Derwent Close).
- (ii) Hills Road (Cambridge Leisure).

In response to Members’ questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager said the following:

- (i) Deliverability was a factor for consideration as part of the prioritisation process. If EAC did not wish to approve the three bus shelter locations in the Officer recommendations, Appendix A of the Officer’s report set out a list of further options in priority order for implementation (ie those at the top should be considered first).
- (ii) Two sites had been proposed in Cherry Hinton Road due to the high level of current and expected future usage.
- (iii) The design would provide basic shelter facilities (a wall, roof and seat) where people could wait for a bus. The shelters should not cause safety issues as they would not intrude upon the highway.

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

To approve the proposed allocation of 3 new shelters at:

- (i) Cherry Hinton Road (opposite Clifton Road).
- (ii) Cherry Hinton Road (near Rock Road).
- (iii) Fison Road (lay-by stop).

12/71/EAC Planning Applications

12/71/EACa 12/0967/CAC - 191 Mill Road

The Committee received an application for Conservation Area Consent.

The application sought approval for Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the existing building (193B Mill Road).

Councillor Herbert proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that an additional condition be required regarding demolition consent being subject to contract.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda with the addition of the following extra condition:

3. No demolition shall take place until a contract for the development of the site in accordance with the application 12/0906/FUL, or another proposal approved by the Council, has been let.

Reason: To ensure that the character of the conservation area is not harmed by the lengthy persistence of a vacant site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/11)

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): 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 or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

12/71/EACb 12/0966/FUL - 191 Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 6 studio units; and a retail unit (Class A1) to the rear of 191 Mill Road, and internal alterations at first floor level to convert a single one bed residential unit into 2 studio units (following demolition of existing rear outbuilding), together with associated infrastructure. Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the existing building (193B Mill Road).

Councillor Moghadas proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that condition 2 should require precise details of the Juliet balcony design.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda with the addition of the following amendment to Condition 2:

After the words 'hereby permitted' add 'and precise details of the proposed balcony railings'.

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): 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/13, 8/2, 8/6

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

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

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 February 2013, 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, life-long learning facilities, waste storage, waste management facilities and 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.

12/71/EACc 12/1132/FUL - CB1 32 Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the retention of the existing CB1 Internet Cafe and the provision of 9 new Studio Flats, by conversion and new build.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) 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: SS1, H1, T2, T9, T14, ENV6, ENV7, WM6

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/14, 4/11, 4/12, 4/13, 5/1, 5/2, 8/2, 8/6

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

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, 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 March 2013IN it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s).

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space/sports facilities, community development facilities, life-long learning facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 5/5, 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.

12/71/EACd 12/1071/FUL - Mickey Flynn's Pool and Snooker Club 103 Mill Road

The Committee received an application for change of use.

The application sought approval for change of use from Pool and Snooker Club to A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Restaurant and Cafes), and A4 (Drinking Establishments) in the alternative.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to a planning consultation response from the (County) Lead Highway Development Control Engineer tabled at committee. EAC agreed to accept this late submission.

Mr MacNamara (Dawecroft Ltd, the Applicants) addressed the Committee in support of the application. Mr MacNamara referred to an article from the 'accountancy-live' website tabled at committee. EAC agreed to accept this late submission.

Mr Brown (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- Mr Lucas-Smith
- Mr Wood
- Ms Brightman
- Mr Arain

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Supported Mickey Flynn's as a business, but expressed concern that resulting deliveries and vehicular/pedestrian traffic would have a negative impact
- (ii) Concern that application would lead to traffic flow and parking issues. Particular concern that the anticipated number of deliveries would exacerbate existing and future issues.

- (iii) Felt the application would also exacerbate existing noise and nuisance issues in the area.
- (iv) Took issue with Applicant's November letter regarding the expected number of deliveries and their impact on traffic flow.
- (v) Referred to Planning Inspector comments set out in the Officer's report.
- (vi) Suggested that there had been no attempt to find another applicant to provide leisure facilities on-site.
- (vii) Hoped the Local Plan consultation would protect the diversity of shops in Mill Road, particularly A1 and A2 usage.
- (viii) Suggested reasons for refusal in the last application had not been addressed.
- (ix) Suggested the application should be rejected on the grounds of Planning Policies 6/1, 8/2, 8/4, 8/7 and 8/9.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

The Chair decided that the reasons for refusal in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

Reasons for Refusal

Resolved (by 5 votes to 4) to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

1. The proposal would lead to the loss of a leisure facility. The facility would not be replaced, and the application fails to demonstrate that WT's snooker club on East Road would constitute another appropriate premises of similar or improved accessibility. The application does not demonstrate that there is no longer any need for the facility, and is consequently in conflict with policy 6/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government advice in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

2. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the servicing and delivery activities associated with all the proposed uses

could be accommodated without a threat to highway safety, contrary to policies 8/2 and 8/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2012.

3. Insufficient information is submitted to demonstrate that Class A3 or A4 uses could operate on the site without the individual and cumulative impact of the uses and the environmental problems and nuisance associated with them being unacceptable, in conflict with policy 6/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan.
4. The grant of permission for Class A1 use and other Class A uses in the alternative would subvert the local planning authority's ability to protect the proportion of A1 uses in the district centre enshrined in policy 6/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, because it could facilitate the loss of A1 use on other sites without guaranteeing continuing A1 use on the application site.

The meeting ended at 11.00 pm

CHAIR