

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

15 April 2010
7.00 - 10.25 pm

Present: City Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Benstead, Ellis-Miller, Herbert, Howell, Shah, Smart, Walker and Wright
County Councillors: Bourke and Sadiq

Officers Present: Peter Carter – Principal Development Control Manager,
Wendy Lansdown – Neighbourhood Panel Liaison Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council,
Andrew Preston - Environmental Projects Manager
Alastair Roberts – Safer Communities Manager
Toni Birkin – Committee Manager

10/11EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from City Councillors Hart and Lynn and from County Councillors Harrison and Sedgwick-Jell.

10/12EAC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 18th February were agreed and signed as a correct record.

10/13EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

10/3, 09/72 Speedwatch volunteers.

City Cllr Howell and Blencowe and County Cllr Harrison will undertake this initially. It will be reviewed post election.

10/5 Youth Summit

Members had been updated on Easter Holiday events but were unhappy at the limited number in the East Area and the poor publicity. It was not felt to be good value for money. A further update on the four issues resolved at the last meeting was requested. Cllr Walker will look into this.

Action: Cllr Walker

The West Central and South Area Committees have recently agreed to fund a pilot youth leisure card project for young people in years 7 and 8. East Area will consider this later when a formal request is made.

10/06 Q6 Play Equipment Petersfield Area

The swing set was removed recently as it is deemed non-maintainable due to age and condition. The same is true for the remaining timber structure which is also to be taken out next week.

S106 funds are being made available for a redevelopment of the play area at a future date. However, in the mean time a temporary solution of a multi-play modular unit is going to be installed after delivery in early May. Typically, there is a large lead time for any ordering of play equipment.

The situation in Flower Street is still under discussion. However, it is unlikely that this will be a play area in future. Alternative provision will be available in the near future.

10/14EAC Declarations Of Interest

10/15EAC Open Forum

Q1 Mr Green

The City Council's response to letters and complaints is unacceptable. Mr Green would like an undertaking from this committee that all complaints will receive a response. Officers have failed to respond to questions about replacement or upgrades to play equipment in the Petersfield area. The play equipment has been out of order for some months and telling small children that improved equipment will be supplied in the future does not meet their current needs. Interim provision should have been made. It is inequitable to spend £3,000 on older children and nothing on under fives.

A. The Chair will look into this matter and will find out why Mr Green did not get a response.

Action: Cllr Blencowe

10/16EAC Safer Neighbourhoods

The Safer Communities Manager introduced the item and the Police officer gave her presentation outlining the current position across the four wards.

A recent Community Action Safety Day was very successful. This will now be evaluated and may be repeated in other areas. Action has been taken to reduce youth related crime in the vicinity of McDonalds on Newmarket Road and a multi agency approach has been taken.

Bus related crime has been reduced following the introduction of CCTV on the buses.

The officer made the following recommendations:

1. Continuation of work to tackle anti-social behaviour in North Barnwell
2. Vehicle-related crime and anti-social behaviour incorporating speeding

Q1 Mr Taylor

Has the loss of the S30 been reflected in the statistics and has the promise of a continuance of a pro-active approach to recording all incidents been met?

A. Data gathering has not changed and is available. Community consultation has improved. Street life incidents in the East Area have gone down while they appear to be on the increase in the West Central Area. The quality of the data has not decreased and previous hot spots continue to be monitored. The summer months may have an impact on the incident numbers and these will be addressed as and when they arise.

Q2 Mr Taylor

The West Central committee have been informed of a rapid implementation protocol for S30. Why is the approach across the City contradictory?

A. All councillors will be receiving a briefing on the protocol and full details will be available on the web. The current Police position is that all citizens have the right to enjoy open spaces lawfully and peacefully. S30 orders do not resolve all problems and a range of proportional options are available when problems occur. Members of the public can pass on their views on this matter via members.

The Safer Communities Manager stated that the final decision on this would go to the Strategy and Resources Committee. Members of the East Area Committee would like to see the final report.

Action: Alastair Roberts

Mr Green

Why are ward comparisons no longer part of the Safer Neighbourhood Report? Who decided what is a proportional response when problems occur? Why is the protocol not the subject of public consultation? If problems are now being moved on to other parts of the City, why is there no City-wide approach?

A. Members of the public are welcome to comment on proposals and the protocol is open to the public. S30 is a decision of the Leader of the Council in consultation with the Police. Current statistics suggest do not make a case for an S30 in the East Area at present.

The Head of Homicide, George Barr, gave an update on the Fanshawe Road incident. A person has been charged and there was no risk to the wider community.

Cllr Howell highlighted a discrepancy between the statistical evidence that speeding is not a major problem and the perception of residents. He suggested that this could be the result of the PCSO's presence lowering speeds and skewing the statistics. Members confirmed that they continue to get complaints about rat running in narrow residential roads.

Members discussed the suggested priorities. It was agreed that the existing priorities were producing results and should remain in place. The speeding priority has not been completed and the Police will take this forward in the post election period.

The following recommendations were agreed:

1. Continuation of work to tackle anti-social behaviour in North Barnwell
2. Promotion of community cohesion in Tiverton Way in response to complaints of localised anti-social behaviour, focused around the Forum
3. Vehicle-related crime and anti-social behaviour incorporating speeding

10/17EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The Environmental Projects Manager introduced the report and gave an update on current projects.

Members were pleased to see progress on the Cherry Hinton Road shop forecourts project that had taken a long time to implement. However, shopkeepers in the area are not enthusiastic. Further safety improvements were discussed but agreed to be impossible due to ownership issues and the number of dropped kerbs in the area.

National Express had been approach for match funding for the planter scheme in Devonshire Road. More details on this will follow at a later date.

Fairsford Road was discussed and members agreed that an imperfect planning system had caused problems. The Chair expressed the opinion that the original planning decision, which was later overturned, had been correct. This issue will be revisited when the issue of parking restrictions has been resolved. It was further agreed that consultation on the Stone Street, Ainsworth Street and Fairsford Road should take place post election.

A toad crossing on Burnside had been added to the EIP.

This was Cllr Ellis-Miller's last area committee meeting and the Chair thanked her for her past service. Cllr Smart will take over her role as the promoter of planting in the Romsey Area.

Q. Mrs Deards

Early last year an overgrown area of Budleigh Close and Burnside Gardnes was cleared and planted. However, maintenance of the area has been very poor. This is a waste of money.

A. Streetscene will be asked to carry out maintenance work.

Action: Streetscene

The recommendations were amended and agreed.

Resolved:

- **Cherry Hinton Road Shop Forecourts**

To implementation subject to public consultation at a cost of £70,000 as per decision in the report.

- **Fairsford Place Cycle Parking**

To put Fairsford Place cycle parking on hold whilst the 'no waiting' restrictions scheme in this year's programme is investigated.

10/18EAC Future Meeting Dates

The following dates were agreed for future meetings:

17th June 2010, 19th August 2010, 14th October 2010, 16th December 2010, 10th February 2011 and 14th April 2011.

All meetings will be held at the Cherry Trees Day Centre.

10/19EAC Planning Applications

The Councillors present for the consideration of planning applications were Cllrs Blencowe, Benstead, Ellis-Miller, Herbert, Shah, Smart, Walker and Wright.

These minutes and the appendix should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown.

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those that the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up.

9a 09/0869/FUL - 35, Belgrave Road

Site Address: Rear of 35 Belgrave Road
Application Number: 09/0869/FUL
Proposal: Erection of single storey house to the rear of 35 Belgrave Road
Applicant: Mr Andy Carolan, 60 Hemingford Road, Cambridge CB1 3BZ
Case Officer: Amy Lack
Officer Recommendation: REFUSE
Public Speaker: Agent of the applicant, George Davison
Decision: APPROVED (overturning the recommendation of officers – 5-4 on the Chairman’s casting vote)
Reasons for approval: Having heard a petition on behalf of the applicant by the architect, questioned the planning officer and then discussed the proposal and its

implications for the area and for the neighbours (including specifically those at 76 and 78 St Philip's Road who had not responded), Committee resolved to approve the application. It did so because it did not think the scheme would erode the openness or residential grain characteristic of the area; would not, because of the design and lowering of the building into the site create an intrusive form, harmful to the local townscape or to the amenity of the neighbours to the north at 76 and 78 St Philip's Road; and would not afford a level of amenity for the prospective occupiers so poor as to justify refusal of the application. For these reasons the proposal was not considered to be in conflict with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008) or policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

This development has therefore been approved, conditionally (with the section 106 unilateral already completed), because subject to those requirements the proposal is considered to generally conform to the Development Plan, particularly the following policies:

East of England Plan 2008 - ENV7 Quality in the Built Environment.

Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12

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.

Conditions were delegated to officers following discussion about what those conditions would be: they will address commencement; materials; a requirement that the car parking spaces for the existing flats are to standard (a minimum 2.4m x 4.8m per space); control of construction hours; control of contractors operations; control of hours of collections from and deliveries of materials to the site; provision of adequate waste storage and cycle parking accommodation; restriction of the height of the proposed building; retention of a car parking space for the dwelling; and informatives suggested by the highway authority.

Site Address: 8 Montreal Road, Cambridge CB1 3NP
Application Number: 10/0028/FUL
Proposal: Erection of chalet bungalow to rear of 8 Montreal Road and demolition of outbuildings to side of 8 Montreal Road
Applicant: Mr Collacott
Case Officer: John Evans
Officer Recommendation: APPROVE
Public Speaker: Objector Mr Charbel Mattar
Decision: REFUSED (by 7 votes to 1) (contrary to the officer recommendation) for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The introduction of the proposed chalet bungalow into this backland site is unacceptable, because instead of proposing a form that will have a positive impact, it introduces an alien built form, entirely out of keeping with the housing to the west in Mill Road and the housing of Montreal Road, which will detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The proposal has not therefore demonstrated that it has responded to its context or drawn upon key characteristics of the surroundings. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design in conflict with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in Planning Policy Statement 1(2005)2. The proposal has not demonstrated that it has adopted a comprehensive design approach to achieve good interrelations between buildings, routes and space, but instead prejudices the comprehensive development of the wider area of which the site forms a part. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policies 3/7 and 3/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)3. The proposal, because of its height and position, would be overbearing in its relationship with neighbouring property to the north, causing occupiers to feel unduly dominated and unreasonably enclosed by the new building, with a consequent adverse impact on their amenity, particularly on the gardens, which occupiers should expect to enjoy. For these reasons the proposal is in conflict with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), policies 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice in Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005)

9c 10/0068/FUL - 65 Norfolk Street

Site Address: Upper Cuts, 65 Norfolk Street, Cambridge, CB1 2LD
Application Number: 10/0068/FUL
Proposal: Conversion of hairdressing salon and redundant basement to 1-bed studio flat with basement kitchen and external works.
Applicant: Mrs Louise Boughey, 63 Norfolk Street, Cambridge, CB1 2LD
Case Officer: Catherine Linford
Officer Recommendation: REFUSE
Public Speakers: The applicant did not wish to speak but circulated a letter supporting his application to all members.
Decision: Approved (by 5 votes to 2) against officer recommendations for the following reasons: Having questioned the planning officer about the planning application, discussed the relationship of this building in the context of the whole local centre and the core parade of shops and heard the justification in the Local Plan (para 6.24) for policy 6/7 supporting the retention of retail units in local centres, Committee resolved to approve the application. It did so because: it did not consider the premises to be well related to the core of the local centre, but to be peripheral to it; because the building was to be of too limited a size for a viable Class A1 (Shops) retail use; because the moving of the Class A1 activity previously undertaken in this unit to another, vacant, unit within the same Local Centre would mean that there was no diminution of the range of provision in this centre; and because these matters meant the loss of this unit was not seen as being harmful to the central ambition of the policy or to the particular Local Centre in this particular case. For these reasons the proposal was not considered to be in conflict with policy 6/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) This development has therefore been approved, conditionally, subject to the completion of the unilateral undertaking. 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.

Conditions were delegated to officers. They will address; commencement; detail of how the existing corner door will be blocked up; conditions to meet environmental health requirements regarding waste storage, construction hours, windows and the use of the basement; and advice that neither existing nor proposed occupiers will qualify for parking permits (other than visitor permits) in the Residents' Parking Schemes operating in surrounding streets.

The meeting ended at 10.25 pm

CHAIR