

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

6 September 2012

7.00 - 10.10 pm

Present

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

Area Committee Members: County Councillor Bourke

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Benstead

Officers:

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers in Attendance:

Head of Transport and Infrastructure (Policy and Funding) – (County): Dearbhla Lawson

Senior Programme Manager – (County): John Clough

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/44/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Harrison, Hart, Marchant-Daisley, Moghadas, Pogonowski, Sadiq and Sedgwick-Jell.

12/45/EAC Declarations Of Interest

NAME	ITEM	INTEREST
Councillor Bourke	12/49/EAC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Saunders	12/49/EAC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Benstead	12/50/EACd	Personal: Discussed application with Applicant

12/46/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 2 August 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to Councillors Brown, Hart and Herbert being removed from the attendee list as they had sent apologies.

12/47/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **12/42/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods “Action Point: Sarah Steggles (Senior Anti-Social Behaviour Officer) to send East Area Committee (EAC) Members a list of contact numbers for reporting different types of anti-social behaviour. These in turn can be passed to residents.”**

The list of contact numbers has been circulated to EAC Members.

- (ii) **12/42/EAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods “Action Point: East Area Committee Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes to meet Inspector Poppitt to discuss implementing a street drinking order on a specific zonal basis.”**

A meeting between East Area Committee Chair, Vice Chair, Spokes and Inspector Poppitt is anticipated prior to the next EAC meeting 18 October 2012.

- (iii) **12/43/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme “Action Point: Andrew Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager) to amend Whitehill Close Planting environmental improvement project and return it to East Area Committee for consideration post discussions with residents.”**

Councillors anticipated the Project Delivery & Environment Manager would follow up this issue on his return from holiday.

- (iv) **Dates of future meetings.**

There are a number of dates in 2013 when East Area Committee meetings clash with other Area Committees. These are Thursday 10 January 2013 and 21 March 2013.

EAC unanimously voted to retain the Thursday 10 January 2013 meeting date due to a lack of alternatives, but to meet on Tuesday 26 March 2013 instead of Thursday 21 March 2013.

12/48/EAC Open Forum

- 1. Mrs Deards raised concerns regarding suspicious activity of people parking in the Budleigh Close and Burnside area to drop off packages. The concerns/incidents have been reported to Police Community Support Officers.**

Councillor Blencowe responded:

- The concerns/incidents could be raised at the next Neighbourhood Panel meeting.
- Suggested re-contacting the Police Community Support Officers whom the incidents were reported to, and informing them further information could be provided upon request.

- 2. Mrs Deards raised concerns that Budleigh Close shrubbery was subject to anti-social behaviour due to lack of maintenance.**

Councillors said that Andrew Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager) would be asked to ensure maintenance work is undertaken.

Action Point: Councilor Herbert to advise Officers of Budleigh Close residents' concerns that shrubbery was subject to anti-social behaviour due to lack of maintenance.

12/49/EAC East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans

The Committee received a report from the Head of Transport and Infrastructure (Policy and Funding) (County) regarding the East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans.

The report outlined S106 contributions for transport received from developers in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, are largely collected through the Corridor Area Transport Plan (CATP) process.

The Officer's report outlined progress of existing schemes presented at the December 2011 Committee meeting. The report also included an assessment of new suggested schemes for 2012 that had the potential to be supported by Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan (ECATP) funding, as well as SCATP funding where the committee area extended into the Southern Corridor. The principal factor being that schemes proposed fit with the CATP, relate to development and the need to mitigate the effect of additional transport related movements from new development.

The views expressed by East Area Committee Members on projects to take forward would be included as key input into the decision by County Council Cabinet when asked to approve the recommendations in a report expected in November 2012.

Existing Schemes: Progress

The Head of Transport and Infrastructure referred to progress on approved schemes as set out in the Officer's report.

New Schemes That Require Decisions

Members considered a number of 2012 schemes put forward for approval.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Transport and Infrastructure and Senior Programme Manager (County) answered:

- (i) Approximately £600,000 of funding was currently available to spend in the east area.
- (ii) S106 funding could not be used to undertake maintenance work, but some projects included some improvement work to aid accessibility that s106 funding could be used for.
- (iii) (2.2) Access link from the CB1 development to the Leisure Park, so that both sites could access the Leisure Park multi storey car park could be undertaken as a joint project with the South Area Committee. The Leisure Park bridge had been proposed as a previous project, but did not go ahead for various reasons given at the time. The project still had merit, so a feasibility study could be undertaken to try and address feasibility of delivery concerns.
- (iv) (2.6) Tenison Road traffic calming scheme required £500,000 to deliver the scheme, but would also receive an additional £250,000 from a separate funding scheme if the project was approved. Therefore £250,000 was required from EAC to support delivery of the scheme.

- (v) The County Council would model pinch points on the infrastructure network in future to assess growth needs as part of the Long Term Transport Strategy work underway.
- (vi) Members were invited to propose suggestions for future projects to be funded.

Councillor Bourke requested the Chisholm Trail be added to the list set out in section 2 of the Officer's report.

EAC supported the principle of undertaking joined up infrastructure projects with other Area Committees as strategic projects would benefit the whole of Cambridge. EAC would allocate s106 funding from their budget for joint projects on the understanding that other Area Committees would do the same.

Action Point: Councilor Bourke to circulate feasibility study information regarding Chisholm Trail for bicycles.

Councillor Owers requested speed warning lights in Coleridge Road be added to the list of future projects seeking s106 funding.

Action Point: Head of Transport and Infrastructure 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 requested merging the following projects and removing maintenance actions that were not covered by s106 criteria:

- (2.1) Refreshing all cycle path and cycle lane markings, especially around the Perne Road/Cherry Hinton Road roundabout.
- (2.3) Perne Road/Cherry Hinton Road roundabout improvements to address traffic flow and safety issues.

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

- (i) To recommend projects set out below for approval by County Council Cabinet:
 - A joint project combining (2.1) Refreshing all cycle path and cycle lane markings, especially around the Perne Road/Cherry Hinton Road roundabout with (2.3) Perne Road/ Cherry Hinton Road roundabout improvements to address traffic flow and safety issues.
 - (2.5) Contraflow Cycling Signage following audit to identify need
 - (2.6) Tenison Road traffic calming scheme

- (ii) To recommend the Chisholm Trail joint infrastructure project proposed by Councillor Bourke for further investigation into its feasibility and estimated cost to be shared with other Area Committees.
- (iii) To approve retaining the following projects as low priorities to be funded if any budget remained after funding higher priority projects:
 - (2.7) Removal of unnecessary street signage.
 - (2.10) Citywide 20 mph/coherent speed limit (this could be explored as part of wider strategy work).
- (iv) To approve undertaking a joint feasibility study with South Area Committee for (2.2) Access link from the CB1 development to the Leisure Park, so that both sites could access the Leisure Park multi storey car park.
- (v) To defer consideration of s106 fund allocation for (2.9) Improve safety at Stanley Road junction with Newmarket Road until environmental improvement work and road marking changes had been implemented. This would enable Officers to ascertain if s106 funding was still required, or if issues had been addressed.
- (vi) To discount projects set out below:
 - (2.4) Madingley Road Cycleway Phase 2 as this should be referred to the West Area Committee for approval, although a member of public raised it at East Area Committee.
 - (2.8) Park and ride facility for Cherry Hinton as feasibility and need would need to be considered as part of the long-term County Transport Strategy.

EAC asked for a Transport Corridor Area Transport Plan report six months from 6 September 2012 meeting.

Action Point: Head of Transport and Infrastructure to bring back a report to East Area Committee regarding East and South Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans in March/April 2013.

12/50/EAC Planning Applications

12/50/EACa 12/0260/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 4 no1bedroom flats, along with cycle and refuse store, first floor dormer side extension and part demolition of rear.

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

- Mrs Bell
- Mrs Josselyn

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) The Bodyworks Dance Studio holds classes for adults and children; these were loud and intrusive to neighbours.
- (ii) Took issue with Environmental Health Officer comments that previous noise concerns had been addressed. Noise restriction measures implemented in the past were not effective.
- (iii) Raised concern regarding lack of information about the application available on-line.
- (iv) The proposed extension would impose on the skyline and overshadow neighbours. It was suggested the design was poor quality because it overdeveloped the site, overshadowed neighbours, was airless and noisy.
- (v) Concern regarding lack of parking for the application, although some provision as part of the development was welcomed to mitigate overspill into neighbouring residential areas.
- (vi) Objectors suggested the area needed more accommodation (housing) rather than a larger dance studio.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

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

Reasons for Refusal

- 1 In the absence of a noise report to demonstrate the impact of the noise generated by the adjacent use, Bodyworks Dance Studio, on the living conditions of future occupants and mitigation measures to ensure that

the internal and external noise environment for future residents will be acceptable in terms of residential amenity, the development is contrary to policies 4/13 and 5/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2008.

- 2 The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, affordable housing, public realm improvements, public art, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is granted to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development.

12/50/EACb 12/0837/FUL - 25 Cambridge Place

The Committee received an application for change of use.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Welcomed the inclusion of parking facilities in the application.
- (ii) Suggested the application did not meet National Planning Policy Framework or City Council sustainable development requirements.
- (iii) Units were too small and not serviced by a lift. It was suggested this made them suitable only for able bodied students and temporary occupants, when homes were required for all members of society. It was suggested that Cambridge Place was being swamped by small developments that broke up diversity.
- (iv) A house or two maisonettes were suggested as more appropriate developments for the site.

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

The City Development Manager proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the application would only be brought back to Committee if new issues were raised in correspondence.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, amended to confirm that the application would only be brought back to Committee if new issues were raised in correspondence.

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: ENV6, ENV7

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 4/11, 4/13, 5/1, 5/2, 8/2, 8/6, 8/10, 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 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 06 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, life-long learning facilities, waste storage, waste management facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 5/14, 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.

12/50/EACc 12/0883/FUL - 47 Priory Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear extension

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

- Mr Holden
- Ms Elwood

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Took issue with the Officer's recommendation to approve the application.
- (ii) Concerns regarding lack of light and overshadowing from the development. This would exacerbate current low light levels in neighbour's gardens.
- (iii) The rising ground level would make the building more visible to neighbours.

Ms Adams (Applicant's Architect) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 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): 3/1, 3/4, 3/14, 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.

12/50/EACd 12/0742/FUL - 233 Lichfield Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a new first floor extension over existing garage to provide study/bedroom.

Mr Douglas (Applicant's Architect) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Benstead (Ward Councillor for Coleridge) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Supported the application and took issue with the reasons for refusal.
- (ii) The building lines of existing terrace houses varied, so the application would not fit into these.
- (iii) The application would not look out of character in the area.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Resolved (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. 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)

3. The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the extension is in keeping with the existing building. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

Reasons for Approval

Having heard comments from the applicant's agent, and comments from a Member representing the ward, East Area Committee questioned the City Development Manager and then discussed the proposals and its implications for the area (particularly the visual impact of the extension and the impact on

the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers). East Area Committee resolved to approve the application because the Committee did not think that the visual impact of the development would have a detrimental effect on the streetscene. The site is well screened by trees and the extension does not project forward of the building line established by the adjacent block of flats. Taking into account the relationship between the front garden and windows in 235 Lichfield Road and the side elevation of the extension and the lack of objection from the occupiers of that property, the Committee considered that the extension would not be harmful to the residential amenities of the occupiers of 235 Lichfield Road.

This development has therefore 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, ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/14

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.

12/51/EAC General Items

12/51/EACa Enforcement Report - 86 Brooks Road, Cambridge

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

The application sought authority to authorize the Head of Legal Services to commence enforcement proceedings under the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), for unauthorised operational development.

Site: 86 Brooks Road, Cambridge.

Breach: Unauthorised Development: erection of an extension without planning permission.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to commence enforcement proceedings under the provisions of Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), for unauthorised operational development.

The meeting ended at 10.10 pm

CHAIR