

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

14 February 2013

7.00 - 8.25 pm

**Present**

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

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

Councillors Bourke and Sedgwick-Jell left after the vote on item 13/15/EAC

**Officers:**

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****13/11/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Hart, Johnson, Pogonowski and Sadiq.

**13/12/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Sedgwick-Jell	13/15/EAC	Personal: Boat owner.
Councillor Benstead	13/16/EACa	Personal: Has connections with both Applicant and Objector.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote on this decision.
Councillor Owers	13/16/EACa	Personal: Discussed application with both Applicant and Objector. General discussion as a Ward Councillor, so did not fetter discretion.

## **13/13/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 10 January 2013 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

## **13/14/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

- (i) **13/5/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Moghadas to enquire status of Coldham’s Common Management Plan (ie if one exists) and if a new one is required to be produced.**

**Councillor Moghadas to advise stakeholders of Management Plan status.”**

Councillor Moghadas has been in contact with stakeholders.

Councillor Smart said a petition regarding Coldham’s Common was handed into the Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 17 January 2013. The Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places proposed that a Coldham’s Common Management Plan be included in the portfolio plan for the period April 2013 to March 2014, and committed to working with all stakeholders to resolve the issues in a way that is acceptable to all parties.

- (ii) **13/6/EAC East Area Capital Grants Programme “Action Point: Head of Community Development to ask Planning/Housing Officer to advise Councillor Sadiq of planning application details regarding housing scheme on the land off Stanesfield Road.”**

Gary Norman (Development Officer) has contacted Councillor Sadiq.

## **13/15/EAC Open Forum**

1. **Dr Eva raised the following points:**
  - **The Riverside Area had issues relating to maintenance, drugs and anti-social behaviour.**
  - **Houseboats moored in the area between Commons was an important issue to Riverside.**

- Dr Eva had received a Moorings Consultation document in January. He expressed concern regarding the document, covering letter and consultation process in general.
- Queried which councillors and officers were responsible for Moorings Consultation covering letter. Dr Eva felt it was unsatisfactory and asked who had signed it off.
- Referred to comments from Joye Rosenstiel in the Moorings Consultation document and asked if these showed that policy had been set before the consultation closed.
- Expressed concerns regarding East Area (Committee) Abbey Councillors:
  1. City Councillors were not present.
  2. The County Councillor was unable to input into the County consultation process due to a prejudicial interest.

Councillor Sedgwick-Jell said that responsibility for moorings had passed from the County to City Council, so his interest as a boat owner would not preclude him from having an input into the process in future.

Councilor Blencowe said the Moorings Consultation was not within East Area Committee's remit, so they could not halt the process as Dr Eva requested. However, the Committee could pass on Dr Eva's concerns.

**Action Point: Councilor Blencowe to raise Dr Eva's concerns regarding Riverside Consultation process and consultation document covering letter with relevant Officers and Members prior to close of consultation process 15 March.**

**Action Point: Councillor Herbert undertook to pass Dr Eva's concern onto Abbey Ward Councillors and ask them to contact Dr Eva about his concerns.**

## **13/16/EAC Planning Applications**

### **13/16/EACa 12/1565/FUL- 1 Brothers Place**

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

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a new two bedroom terraced dwelling house.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Existing neighbours' amenities would be affected through overlooking if the application was approved.
- (ii) This was the third planning application for the site. Mr Davies felt that planning conditions regarding contaminated land and considerate construction were being ignored. He asked who enforced planning conditions.
- (iii) Referred to objections in the Officer's report and amendment sheet.
- (iv) Suggested there was an issue relating to right of way ie the Applicant was trying to illegally use a private road to access the site.
- (v) Expressed concern regarding the amount of time residents were given to respond to the planning application notification letter during the December 2012 – January 2013 period.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, with the addition of the Considerate Contractors informative.

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:

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 3/14, 4/13, 5/1, 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.

3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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.

### **13/16/EACb 12/1558/FUL - Ryedale House, 40 Cambridge Place**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for conversion of existing buildings to form four one-bedroom flats, along with cycle and refuse store, first floor dormer side extension and part demolition of rear.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mrs Bell.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Referred to Objector's comments made on previous application for this site 12/0260/FUL made at 6 September 2012 East Area Committee.
- (ii) Expressed concerns regarding:
  - Some changes to the application have not been included in the Officer's report.
  - The application would overlook existing neighbouring properties leading to a loss of privacy.
  - The application would extend existing upper storeys put in without planning permission.
  - It was suggested the design of proposed accommodation was poor quality and would encourage dormitory / commuter residents.

- Siting the dance studio so near to residential properties meant they were obliged not to open windows, leading to a lack of light and air.

Mr Drake (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda.

Reasons for Approval

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

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: policies 6/1 and 9/8;

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): Policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 5/1, 5/2, 7/3, 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.
3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 14th March 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 facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14 and 10/1, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

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.

### **13/16/EACc 12/1476/FUL - 30 Derwent Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to create a separate 2 bedroom dwelling to the side of No.30 after demolishing the existing garage.

Councillor Herbert proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that materials be submitted to Planning Officers for approval.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, subject to the materials condition (2) being replaced with the condition below:

No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14).

### 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:

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 5/1, 8/1, 8/2, 8/6, 8/10 and 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.
3. In reaching this decision the local planning authority has acted on guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraphs 186 and 187. The local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to bring forward a high quality development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

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 28th 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, waste facilities, waste management 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 Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010.

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.

### **13/16/EACd 12/1621/FUL - 117 Vinery Road**

The Principal Planning Officer recommended that Committee defer the application until the following meeting 26 March 2013.

Some information was incorrect when the application was submitted. The Applicant submitted revised information, but this was not made available on the City Council planning public access portal during the consultation period. Thus Objectors may feel they had not had the opportunity to comment.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to defer the application until the following East Area Committee meeting 26 March 2013.

### **13/17/EAC 12/0490/FUL - 25 Cambridge Place**

The Committee received a report concerning 12/0490/FUL 25 Cambridge Place for planning permission refused at East Area Committee on 21 June 2012. An appeal was lodged. The Inspector's decision on the appeal has now been issued and officers advised EAC of the Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal, and for allowing a claim for costs against the Council.

#### The Committee:

Noted the Planning Inspector's two decisions on this appeal, and particularly her reasons for allowing the appeal and for allowing a claim for costs.

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm

**CHAIR**