

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

12 April 2012
7.00 - 11.05 pm

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

County Councillors Bourke and Sadiq

Councillors Bourke, Pogonowski and Sadiq left after the vote on item 12/20/EAC

Officers: Sarah Dyer (City Development Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Lynda Kilkelly (Safer Communities Section Manager) and Andy Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager)

Other Officers in Attendance:

Jane Darlington (Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation), Colin Norden (Police Sergeant), Steve Poppitt (Inspector), Jamie Stenton (Police Sergeant) and John Varah (Same Sky)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

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.

12/13/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Hart and Wright.

The East Area Committee (EAC) wished to pass on their thoughts to Councillor Wright to thank her for her service and pass on their best wishes for her recovery.

Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to pass on East Area Committee's thanks to Councillor Wright for her service.

12/14/EAC Declarations Of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Brown	12/17/EAC	Personal: Member of the Cleaner Cambridge Campaign.
Councillor Herbert	12/23/EACc	Personal: Friend of objector, but has not fettered discretion.
Councillor Benstead	12/23/EACc	Personal and Prejudicial: Friend of objector. Withdrew from discussion and did not vote
Councillor Owers	12/23/EACc & 12/23/EACe	Personal: General discussion of application with Objectors, but did not fetter discretion.
Councillor Saunders	12/23/EACd	Personal: Friend lives close to application in statutory consultation area, but Councillor Saunders has not fettered his discretion.

12/15/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 9 February 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

12/16/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **12/4/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: 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.”**

Committee Manger invited Dearbhla Lawson (Head of Strategic Planning) to 12 April 2012 EAC in lieu of Joseph Whelan (former Head of New Communities Service - County) changing responsibilities.

County representative to bring future reports to EAC for review of potential projects that could be supported by East and South Corridor funding.

Head of Strategic Planning has advised September 2012 would be the preferred date for the next report.

- (ii) **12/5/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to respond to Dr Eva’s Cherry Trees cycle parking query raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillor Blencowe to liaise with Building Manager concerning possibility of cycle rack provision.”**

Councillor Blencowe has discussed the provision of cycle racks with the Cherry Trees Building Manager. Councillor Blencowe was in discussions with Clare Rankin (Cycling & Walking Officer) concerning funding for the provision of cycle racks.

- (iii) **12/5/EAC Open Forum “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.”**

Action Point: Councillor Sedgwick-Jell to advise East Area Committee on progress at June meeting.

- (iv) **12/5/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Hart to respond to Mrs Peachey’s query regarding no verge parking signs in Whitehall Close raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillor Hart to liaise with Ward Councillors and officers on how to avoid council vehicles parking on verges in future.”**

Councillor Hart has taken the issue forward with City Officers, which appears to have resolved the situation.

- (v) **12/7/EAC Tree Planting on Parks and Open Space - East Area “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 Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager has attempted to contact Mr Woodburn.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager has surveyed the area and identified replacement sites.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager is happy to meet Mr Woodburn to discuss the issue.

Action Point: Councillor Blencowe to liaise with the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager plus Mr Woodburn to ensure the tree planting query has been resolved.

(vi) 12/8/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme “Action Point: Andy Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager) to report back to East Area Committee on results of bid for County Council Minor Works Fund.”

Project Delivery & Environment Manager to report back to East Area Committee post 12 April 2012 on results of bid for County Council Minor Works Fund. Project Delivery & Environment Manager to confirm a date to do this in future as the Fund is subject to the County Council process of reviewing bids.

12/17/EAC Open Forum

1. Mr Green raised a concern that people were turning their front gardens into parking lots by removing their boundary walls. This could be detrimental to the character of the Petersfield Conservation Area. Councillors were asked if planning policy could prevent this.

Councillors Smart, Blencowe and Saunders referred to the Local Plan Review. A consultation process would be undertaken Summer 2012 post publication of an issues and options paper. Residents Associations would be actively consulted for views on permitted actions in conservation areas etc as part of the review. The consultation process would enable participants to put forward their views on how to shape future planning policy.

2. Mr Dixon spoke as Chair of Petersfield Mansion Resident’s Association to express concern regarding the width of the Palmer’s Walk path. Specific points raised:

- **The path was busy and well used.**
- **The path was too narrow to enable a contraflow of cyclists and pedestrians.**

- **Damage was caused to flowerbeds and grass land when pedestrians/cyclists stepped off the path.**
- **EAC were asked to support an assessment of the path with a view to its widening.**

EAC supported the path assessment and suggested this could be achieved through an environmental improvement project.

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.

3. **Mrs Peachey (Whitehall Neighbourhood Watch) queried future actions regarding flowerbeds in Whitehall Close now the project had been added to the list of possible environmental improvement projects.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager would report back to East Area Committee in future on the results of a bid for County Council Minor Works Fund to undertake environmental improvement work. The report would include a feasibility study of the Whitehall Close flowerbed project.

4. **Mr Johnson raised concerns regarding dog fouling in Abbey ward. Specific points raised:**
 - **It was his opinion, and many residents agreed, that the Abbey area needed to be cleansed on a far more regular basis. Specifically alleyways, play areas and public spaces.**
 - **City Ranger had been called on multiple occasions to clear up fly-tipped litter or to cleanse a particular area.**
 - **It was discovered through a Freedom of Information request to the City Council that the Council has not issued any fixed penalty notice to a dog owner suspected of letting their dog foul in public spaces for the last five years.**
 - **Councillors were asked to consider the view that there needed to be a re-evaluation of the current street cleaning and dog enforcement services provided by the City Council. Dog fouling was a serious issue that affected open spaces.**
 - **Queried if the £30,000 spent on a pilot scheme of 'Street Champions' by the City Council was the most effective usage of money.**

EAC and members of the public felt that dog fouling was a continuing citywide issue

Councillor Pogonowski said that he had been unsuccessful in 2011 when seeking agreement from the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services to increase the frequency of enforcement patrols to prevent dog fouling. He invited members of the public to lobby the City Council directly or through him to amend the budget in order to increase enforcement patrols.

Councillor Smart said the aim of the Street Champions scheme was to address issues through preventative action ie the focus was on prevention rather than cure.

5. **Mr Johnson raised concerns regarding the impact of high travel costs on visitors to Addenbrooke's Hospital. Specific points raised:**
- **Abbey residents, patients and key NHS workers faced many difficulties in reaching Addenbrooke's hospital. Going from Barnwell Road to the hospital by public transport currently involved two bus rides, into, and then out of the city centre. The journey commonly takes at least 50 minutes.**
 - **Alternative transport to Addenbrooke's via taxi is prohibitively expensive for many people.**
 - **Motorists to Addenbrooke's faced limited and expensive parking facilities.**
 - **Due to the above issues, residents in Abbey had organised a campaign and petition to prove to Stagecoach, and other bus operators, the need for a direct bus service from Abbey Ward to Addenbrooke's.**
 - **The Petition was presented to the last full meeting of the County Council and would seek, in due course, the support of the City Council.**
 - **East Area Committee were asked for their informal support for the campaign.**

EAC Councillors were happy to support the direct bus service from Abbey Ward to Addenbrooke's.

Councillors Sadiq and Bourke observed that the 114 service was due to be reviewed in 2013. It was hoped that discussions between councillors and officers would lead to a continuation of service. It would be a

valuable addition to the service if the 114 could cover the current route and Mr Johnson's proposal.

6. **Mrs Owles said that Petersfield was short of community open space. Specific points raised:**
- **Referred to comments made at 9 February 2012 EAC.**
 - **Felt there was a history of s106 money raised in Petersfield being allocated to a central pot**
 - **Queried if the City Council had reconsidered its decision not to purchase the east strip of land next to the Howard Mallett Centre.**

EAC Councillors acknowledged there was a lack of open space in Petersfield Ward. It was not possible to address this retrospectively, so EAC Councillors would champion greater open space provision in future developments. Planning Officers would be encouraged to more rigorously enforce Local Planning Policy 3/8 in future to require greater open space provision.

There was no inclination for the Council to purchase the strip of land near the Howard Mallett Centre at present due to the anticipated cost.

7. **Mr Gawthrop suggested that EAC should bid to use some of the expected circa £1m section 106 developer contribution from the CB1 development for open space provision.**

12/18/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The committee received a report from Sergeant Stenton regarding the policing and safer neighbourhoods trends.

The report outlined actions taken since the Committee on 15 December 2011. 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 alcohol-related anti-social behaviour (ASB) in Norfolk Street, East Road and Newmarket Road, anti-social use of mopeds, plus excess speed in Mill Road and Coleridge Road.

The committee discussed the following policing issues:

- (i) Anti-social behaviour (ASB) linked to street drinking.
- (ii) ASB affecting open spaces in general.

- (iii) ASB affecting Norfolk Street area when music events were held at the Man on the Moon pub.

Sergeant Stenton undertook to liaise with Councillor Brown regarding the policing of Norfolk Street area when music events are held at the Man on the Moon pub.

- (iv) Street life ASB in east of city. Specifically relating to alcohol, drugs and threatening behaviour. Areas of particular concern were identified as Mill Road, Mill Road Cemetary, Broadway, Norfolk Street and Newmarket Road.
- (v) Greater emphasis on licensing agreement terms to prevent the sale of alcohol to people who were already intoxicated. Licence holders should feel supported that they can refuse to sell alcohol when it would be inappropriate to do so, and that they have a responsibility not to do so under licensing law eg when someone is intoxicated.
- (vi) Rising levels of ASB in Petersfield and Romsey.
- (vii) The need to address ASB through joined up multi-agency action. For example, provision of support and facilities for the street life community, as well as the option for Police and Licensing Officers to take enforcement action. Greater focus on education, encouragement and support.
- (viii) Speeding in Mill Road and Coleridge Road. Also the need to tackle this through long term measures rather than just periodic police enforcement action.

Sergeant Stenton undertook to liaise with Councillor Owers regarding the policing of Mill Road to reduce speeding.

- (ix) ASB relating to the riding of mopeds in Birdwood Road area.
- (x) Vehicle crime such as theft and vandalism in the Rustat Road area.
- (xi) People should report crimes in order to help the Police collect evidence and trend information.

Members of the public raised a number of points, as set out below.

1. **Mrs Deards raised concern about drug dealing and ASB of moped riders in Budleigh Close and Burnside.**

Sergeant Stenton noted these concerns.

2. **Unannounced fire service premises inspections had led to joined up multi-agency action to tackle ASB and arson incidents.**

EAC and the Police representatives welcomed this information. Sergeant Stenton added that street life ASB and drinking required a multi-agency response to avoid displacing problems from one area to another. This was why an East Area wide alcohol and drug related priority had been suggested.

Councillor Owers requested changes to the recommendations. Councillor Owers formally proposed to amend the recommended priorities as follows:

- ~~(i) Class A drug dealing and street life ASB in East of city.~~
- ~~(ii) ASB mopeds in Coleridge.~~
- ~~(iii) Abbey/East sector damage to motor vehicles.~~

- (i) Alcohol and drug related street anti-social behaviour in the east, targeting known hotspots and focussing on education and enforcement to address licensed premises selling alcohol to the intoxicated.
- (ii) ASB mopeds in Coleridge.
- (iii) Vehicle crime such as theft and vandalism in east of City.

The amendments were **unanimously agreed**.

The following priorities were **agreed unanimously**:

- (i) Alcohol and drug related street anti-social behaviour in the east, targeting known hotspots and focussing on education and enforcement to address licensed premises selling alcohol to the intoxicated.
- (ii) ASB mopeds in Coleridge.
- (iii) Vehicle crime such as theft and vandalism in east of City.

12/19/EAC Community Development and Leisure Grants

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.

Current Applications. Available: £27,048				
CCF ref	Group		Offer (Officer Report)	Offer (EAC Amended)
WEB9405	Petersfield Community (PACT)	Area Trust	Max of £3,858 (minus £858 if not required for the road closure)	Max of £5,000 (minus £374 if not required for the road closure)
3408	East Barnwell Friendship Club		£300	£300
3416	Priory Townswomens Guild		£250	£250
WEB45548	28th Cambridge Scout Group		£500	£500
WEB45670	SIN Cru		£1,000	£2,000
3430	Cambridge Music Festival		£2,000	£2,000
Total			£7,908	£10,050
Remaining			£19,140	£16,998

The Chief Executive of CCF advised EAC that subsequent to publishing of the Officer's report, it was now recommended to allocate £2,000 to SIN Cru.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Marchant-Daisley formally proposed to amend the recommended PACT (ref WEB9405) funding as follows:

- (i) ~~Max of £3,858 (minus £858 if not required for the road closure)~~
- (i) Max of £5,000 (£4,626 plus a maximum of £374 if required for the road closure).
- (ii) Max of £4,626 (if the road closure was not required).

The amendments were **agreed (by 6 votes to 3)**.

Councillor Pogonowski requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Pogonowski formally proposed to amend the recommended SIN Cru (ref WEB45670) funding as follows:

- (i) ~~£2,000~~

- (i) £5,000

The amendment was **lost (6 votes to 5 – with Chair’s casting vote)**.

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

- (i) **Resolved (by 6 votes to 3)** to approve the grant allocation as amended for £4,626 up to a maximum of £5,000 for PACT.
- (ii) **Resolved (unanimously)** to approve the grant allocation as listed above for £300 for East Barnwell Friendship Club.
- (iii) **Resolved (unanimously)** to approve the grant allocation as listed above for £250 for Priory Townswomens Guild.
- (iv) **Resolved (by 9 votes to 1)** to approve the grant allocation as listed above for £500 for Queen's Jubilee Street Party.
- (v) **Resolved (unanimously)** to approve the grant allocation as listed above for £2,000 for SIN Cru.
- (vi) **Resolved (unanimously)** to approve the grant allocation as listed above for £2,000 for Cambridge Music Festival, dependent on 2 schools being identified in the East Area.

The Chief Executive of CCF undertook to provide Councillor Blencowe with further information regarding the two east area primary schools (when identified) that would participate in the Cambridge Music Festival (ref 3430).

12/20/EAC Community Olympics Public Art Project

The committee received a presentation from the Director of Same Sky (project artist company) and (City) Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Community Olympics Public Art Project.

The presentation outlined:

- (i) Same Sky wished to work with local artists, schools and community groups as part of the event.
- (ii) Same Sky proposed to undertake public art and carnival projects to promote community cohesion.
- (iii) Same Sky wished to showcase the event through a free show (serving as a rehearsal for the Olympics event) at an earlier local event. Nominations for such an event were requested.

Volunteers, suggestions for events that Same Sky can engage with, comments or queries should be addressed to:

Dan Lake
Project & Production Manager
Same Sky
www.samesky.co.uk

12/21/EAC Meeting Dates 2012/13

Meeting dates for 2012/13 were agreed as follows:

~~14 June 2012~~, 21 June 2012, 2 August 2012, 6 September 2012, 18 October 2012, 29 November 2012, 10 January 2013, 14 February 2013, 21 March 2013 and 25 April 2013.

12/22/EAC National Planning Policy Framework

The committee received an oral report from the City Development Manager regarding the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The City Development Manager advised:

- (i) The NPPF was published 27 March 2012.
- (ii) Members were provided with a note from the City Council Policy Team entitled Key Headlines from the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (iii) The Committee needed to be aware of the NPPF and take the guidance that it provides into account.
- (iv) The effect of the NPPF is to replace existing government guidance in the form of the Planning Policy Guidance, Planning Policy Statements, Circular 05/2005, which relates to Planning Obligations and other government guidance documents. This guidance is replaced by the NPPF, which sets out the Governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
- (v) The NPPF does not replace the Development Plan which comprises the Cambridge Local Plan, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan and the East of England Plan.
- (vi) At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means approving

development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

- (vii) Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF or where specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.
- (viii) It is the opinion of officers that the development plan is neither absent nor silent in relation to the policies against which the applications on this Agenda need to be assessed. The development plan is also not out-of-date in this regard. For this reason officers are confident that the development plan can be relied on for decision making purposes and it is not necessary to rely on the NPPF alone.
- (ix) Officers have reviewed their recommendations in the light of the guidance provided by the NPPF. In each case a table was produced on the Amendment Sheet that demonstrates the relationship between previous government guidance and the NPPF guidance.

12/23/EAC Planning Applications

12/23/EACa 12/0164/DEMDT: 14 Mercers Row

The committee received an application for prior approval to demolition.

The application sought approval for demolition of single storey industrial buildings (2no) of brick construction under felt flat roof with fibre cement pitched roofs.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0 - unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to grant prior approval as per the agenda.

Reason prior approval granted:

1. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

12/23/EACb 12/0020/FUL - 19A Lyndewode Road

The committee received an application to widen the existing vehicular access.

The application sought approval to widen vehicular access onto applicant's property and for enclosure of the area in front of the garage to prevent the accumulation of litter from passers-by.

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

- Mr Gawthrop
- Mr Turner

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Concern that the proposed work would damage tree roots on-site, specifically the walnut tree's.
- (ii) Suggested the root assessment report requested by the Arboriculture Officer was missing from the Planning Officer's report.
- (iii) Concern over Planning Department procedures notifying residents of the application.
- (iv) Concern over loss of a Victorian wall due to the insertion of a gate. This would affect the streetscape and character of the area.
- (v) Concern over pedestrian and vehicular safety as a result of the proposed new access. This would exacerbate current issues.
- (vi) Suggested the application would exacerbate current parking issues. There was currently restricted turning space in the street.

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

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 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: SS1, ENV6 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 4/3, 4/4, 4/11 and 8/2

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.

12/23/EACc 12/0018/FUL: 109 Burnside

Councillor Benstead withdrew from the meeting 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 a single storey rear extension.

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

- Mrs Deards

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Concerns over size of extension and its proximity to the boundary fence.
- (ii) Concerns regarding overlooking, overshadowing and the effect of a taller neighbouring building on skyline views.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) 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 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 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 or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

Continuation of Business

The Committee **resolved (by 4 votes to 0)** to extend the committee post 10:30 pm to conclude its business.

12/23/EACd 12/0269/FUL: 17 Ainsworth St

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a loft conversion and rear roof extension.

Mr Hunter (Applicant) addressed the committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0 - unanimously) to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0 - unanimously) to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendations subject to the following conditions and reasons for approval:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. 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 (East of England policies ENV6 and ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/14 and 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:

East of England Plan policies ENV 6 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4, 3/14 and 4/11

2. The decision has been made having 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 their decision the East Area Committee were of the view that the revisions that had been made to the plans in response to the refusal of planning permission for an earlier application were sufficient to overcome their concerns about that earlier scheme. The Committee took account of the site context, the degree to which the development would be visible in the streetscene and the changes that had been made to the proposal in comparison with the earlier scheme. The Committee were of

the view that the development would not harm the amenity of the Conservation Area of which the site forms part.

12/23/EACe 12/0058/FUL - Coleridge Community College, Radegund Road

The committee received an application for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought retrospective approval for replacement of floodlights around the multi-use games area.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 4) to defer the application to the next meeting of the East Area Committee to allow confirmation of the following to be brought forward:

1. The hours of operation of the floodlights that the applicant wished to be available to them.
2. Clarification of the timing of the visit by the Environmental Health officer to the site and a definitive view of whether or not the operation of the lights would be likely to have an adverse effect on amenity. Clarification was also sought regarding the reference to a statutory light nuisance.

The meeting ended at 11.05 pm

CHAIR