

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**26 March 2013  
7.00 - 10.55 pm**Present**

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

**Area Committee Members:** County Councillors Bourke and Sadiq

Councillors Bourke and Sadiq left after the vote on item 13/25/EAC

**Officers:**

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Operations and Resources Manager: Jackie Hanson

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Police and Crime Commissioner: Sir Graham Bright

Police Sergeant: Colin Norden

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****13/18/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Hart, Herbert and Sedgwick-Jell.

**13/19/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Bourke	13/22/EAC	Personal: Member of Cambridgeshire Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Saunders	13/22/EAC	Personal: Member of Cambridgeshire Cycling Campaign.

**13/20/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 14 February 2013 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

### **13/21/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

- (i) **13/15/EAC Open Forum “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.**

**Councillor Herbert undertook to pass Dr Eva’s concern onto Abbey Ward Councillors and ask them to contact Dr Eva about his concerns.”**

Councillor Blencowe passed on Dr Eva’s comments to Alistair Wilson (Asset Manager (S&OS)). The Asset Manager apologised to Dr Eva for the lack of contact information and took on board his comments for future consultation exercises.

Councillor Herbert passed on Dr Eva’s concerns to Councillor Johnson who has responded.

### **13/22/EAC Open Forum**

1. **Mr Taylor queried the impact on cycle parking provision at the Railway Station from 6 March 2013 Planning Committee’s decision to refuse planning permission for demolition of Wilton Terrace as part of application 12/1556/FUL 32-38 Station Road.**

Councillor Blencowe said that planning permission had been refused for the previous iteration of 12/1556/FUL as part of the CB1 development. The Council was waiting to see if the Applicant would appeal against the decision to refuse planning permission for 12/1556/FUL. If this occurred, both appeals maybe dovetailed together. An appeal would lead to delays in s106 payments coming forward, which would impact on infrastructure.

2. **Mr Gawthrop asked for East Area Committee’s (EAC) comment on station cycle parking provision being dependent on the demolition of Wilton Terrace. Mr Gawthrop raised the following points:**
- **Brookgate had already received public funding to provide cycle parking.**

- **The provision of parking should not be dependent on the demolition of Wilton Terrace.**

Councillor Brown said that the demolition of Wilton Terrace had been given outline planning permission, but was subject to Conservation Area Consent permission. This was an on-going issue.

Councilor Blencowe said cycle parking was linked to the demolition of Wilton Terrace through the s106 infrastructure package. He added that EAC could not comment in detail until the Applicant had decided how to proceed with 12/1556/FUL.

**3. Mr Green raised the following points:**

- **Three committees had rejected applications related to 12/1556/FUL due to car parking provision issues.**
- **Referred to 2006 Local Plan car parking standards.**
- **Expressed concern regarding the 2013 Local Plan consultation process, specifically details relating to car parking provision standards. Mr Green did not feel he had received satisfactory responses to his representations to Officers and the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places.**

Councilor Blencowe said the 2006 Local Plan set maximum, not minimum parking standards. Any representations made by Mr Green would be discussed by the Local Plan Steering Group amongst other issues as part of the car parking review.

**Action Point: Councilor Blencowe to clarify details with Mr Green regarding 6 March 2013 Planning Committee's decision to refuse planning permission for applications 12/1556/FUL and 12/1553/CAC 32-38 Station Road.**

**4. Mr Wood raised the following points:**

- **Asked if EAC would commit to giving consideration to which stretches of roads and streets should be considered for a ban on footway and verge parking.**
- **Queried if a ban should apply along the section of Mill Road within Petersfield Ward.**
- **Suggested a ban on footway and verge parking would benefit cyclists and pedestrians without a negative impact on traffic flow or deliveries.**

- **Queried if Members were aware that English Traffic Authorities with civil parking enforcement powers (eg County Council) could prohibit parking on footways and verges where considered necessary.**
- **Referred to Secretary of State Norman Baker's correspondence to Council Leaders 21 February 2011 setting out details on how local pavement parking bans could be introduced through traffic regulation orders.**

Councillor Bourke said he had been in contact with others concerning the footway and verge parking ban issue, including Secretary of State Norman Baker. County Officers would present a capital program to the Cabinet in April 2013 that included funding to repair pavements damaged by parking. A significant sum was expected to be allocated to the Mill Road area. Councillor Bourke acknowledged verge and pavement parking were important issues for residents, and thanked Mr Wood for his evidence which had been used to justify funding. Councillor Bourke said the root causes for pavement and verge parking needed to be reviewed as part of the Transport Plan, as would the impact on traffic flow if vehicles parked in the road instead eg to make deliveries.

- 5. Mr Lucas-Smith asked if EAC would support residents' calls to replace car parking spaces outside their properties with cycle parking spaces.**

Councillors said they would support individuals making requests to replace car parking spaces outside their properties with cycle parking spaces. However, they did not think it appropriate to support unilateral car parking space removal. Residents may wish to apply for environmental improvement project funding through the City Council website to replace car parking spaces with cycle ones. EAC suggested it may be advisable to trial the parking space conversion in one area to review its impact. Residents may consider joining a car club as another way to free up parking spaces. Acknowledged that cycle racks were not always secure, that secure cycle parking was required for people's homes; and ideally in front of public access buildings such as pubs.

### **13/23/EAC Police and Crime Commissioner**

The Committee received a verbal presentation from Sir Graham Bright, Police and Crime Commissioner. He made the following points:

- (i) Different issues were being reviewed, such as anti-social behaviour.
- (ii) Burglary was a priority issue to address.
- (iii) Historically it had been difficult to encourage members of the public to report concerns on the 101 number due to the long response time. A response could now be expected within approximately 30 seconds.
- (iv) The Police would aim to be able to respond to a call anywhere in the county within minutes of a call.
- (v) Referred to the work of Neighbourhood Watches.
- (vi) Members of the public could access Home Office software listing neighbourhood profile information, such as emerging issues and crime levels.
- (vii) Sir Graham had the following priorities:
  - He wanted to speed up the response time by support services to victims of crime. Sir Graham was concerned that victims were traumatised after attacks and may not know how or where to seek help.
  - Focussing on crime prevention.
  - Proactive youth crime prevention through early intervention (through joining up actions with other services) to help young people avoid getting into trouble as this could stigmatise them. For example, providing activities. Sir Graham was seeking sponsorship from businesses to assist with this.
  - Raising the profile of and recruiting more Special Constables, plus giving them specific roles to perform alongside Police Officers.
- (viii) Sir Graham felt the old Police Authority Plan worked well, so he used this as a basis for his own Police and Crime Plan for consistency.
- (ix) Sir Graham needed appropriate funding for his Police and Crime Plan. He was liaising with surrounding counties to look at different ways to work jointly, reduce costs and share resources.
- (x) Crime rates were falling in the county and Sir Graham hoped to continue this trend. Cambridgeshire was one of the safest areas in the country.

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

**1. Mr Taylor asked for clarification on some points made in Sir Graham's presentation.**

Sir Graham responded:

- (i) 94% of calls to the 101 number were answered within 30 seconds, 100% within 35 seconds. The Call Centre had a monitoring system to record calls missed and the reason why. Sir Graham had expressed his thanks to Call Centre staff for improving call response times.
- (ii) The Draft Police and Crime Plan was available on the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire website. People were asked to comment on it. The Plan could be amended in future and was not set in stone. Consultation comments would be taken on board.
- (iii) Appropriate staff were required to generate and test ideas for the Police and Crime Plan. Sir Graham was recruiting support staff as people undertaking the jobs to date had other roles to perform as well.
- (iv) Sir Graham would set high level Police and Crime Plan priorities after listening to local priorities suggested by others such as the East Area Committee. Input from East Area Committee etc was welcome.

In response to EAC Members' questions Sir Graham said the following:

- (i) Reported levels of hate crime had increased, possibly due to greater awareness rather than a higher number of incidents. People did not want to talk about hate crime, but they should be encouraged to report it.
- (ii) Greater agency join up was desirable in future to address hate crime issues and give victims appropriate support from specially trained staff.
- (iii) Sir Graham wanted the NHS to be more involved in the community eg to support people with mental health issues, as arresting them could be detrimental to their condition, so preventative action was desirable to avoid this. The Police, Fire and Ambulance Service could not support people on their own; NHS support was required too for specialist roles such as mental health. Join up may have to be tackled at national level.
- (iv) The Safer Peterborough Partnership was signposted as an example of good practice where agencies had joined up services based on experience from Glasgow. Glasgow staff were expected to visit in May 2013. E-CINS software was used by different agencies to monitor families with issues.

- (v) Sir Graham wanted to work with community and voluntary organisations to make use of their equipment and services to gather evidence of crimes (including raising awareness of and reporting them) and supporting victims. Sir Graham reiterated the need to encourage people to report issues to be followed up by the Police and specialist support agencies.
- (vi) One of Sir Graham's priorities was crime prevention. He was seeking sponsorship from businesses to support voluntary and community organisation work in this area. For example early intervention could help prevent youth crime by providing activities to prevent mischief such as vandalism. The Police could only respond to crimes, whereas join up with other agencies could lead to the identification and offer of support/intervention to youths and their families to prevent crime.
- (vii) Currently there was no formal partnership to share equipment and services with neighbouring counties. Sir Graham was considering if it would be viable to, with whom and how. The intention was to free up police officers from administration tasks so they could spend more time on the beat.
- (viii) The culture within the Police was changing. Specialist officers were aware of the seriousness of domestic violence, other officers were prompted to recognise when a situation had arisen and call in specialists. The Chief Constable was keen to tackle domestic violence.

The Committee asked Sir Graham to come back in future when he felt it appropriate.

### **13/24/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 29 November 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 theft of cycles in the East area, alcohol-related anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the Petersfield area, plus drug dealing in the Riverside and Stourbridge Common area.

The Committee discussed the following policing issues:

- (i) Rough sleepers in Mill Road Cemetery.
- (ii) Drug dealing, drug use and associated ASB affecting Norfolk Street and the surrounding area.
- (iii) ASB affecting open spaces in general (thematic rather than geographic focus).
- (iv) ASB linked to street drinking in Mill Road.
- (v) Number of burglaries in Abbey Ward.
- (vi) Speeding in Coldham's Lane.

In response to EAC Members' questions Sergeant Norden and the Safer Communities Section Manager said the following:

- (i) Police officers would arrest people in possession of Class A and B drugs, particularly dealers. If residents could signpost areas to target, the police would do so.
- (ii) In February 2013 the Safer Communities Section organised a street surgery in Ditton Fields, following some complaints about disruptive behaviour in the area. Surgeries had also been organised by PCSOs. All issues raised to date had been addressed to Sergeant Norden's knowledge, but he undertook to liaise with Councillor Johnson if not.
- (iii) The Police had only undertaken one licence review to date in the City, others may be considered in future as the case was successful in changing licencees' behaviour. Plain clothes officers were monitoring alcohol sales in the Mill Road area.
- (iv) The "bin the pin" campaign by council officers to drug users had reduced the number of discarded needles in public areas, as had the increased frequency of bin emptying. Any discarded needles should be picked up within 2 hours of identification.
- (v) The Mill Road area was patrolled daily, sometimes more than once. Any offences such as ASB around the Co-op should be reported to the police.
- (vi) The Police could undertake ad hoc speeding checks in Coldham's Lane without making it a police priority.

In response to members of the public concern regarding rough sleepers in Mill Road Cemetery, Councillor Blencowe said this issue would be addressed through the proposed 'Alcohol-related ASB in the Petersfield and Mill Road area' priority.

The following priorities were unanimously **agreed**:

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

### **13/25/EAC Community Development and Leisure Grants**

The Committee received a report from the Operations and Resources Manager regarding Community Development and Leisure Grants.

Members considered applications for grants as set out in the Officer's report, and table below. The Operations and Resources Manager responded to Member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Award</b>
<b>E1</b>	Cherry Trees Over 50's	Summer outing	<b>500</b>
<b>E2</b>	Christ the Redeemer Church	Family Summer Holiday Club	<b>950</b>
<b>E3</b>	Friends of Mill Road Cemetery	Victorian Day	<b>314</b>
<b>E4</b>	Hemingford Road Street Party Committee	Street Party	<b>1,500</b>
<b>E5</b>	Mill Road Winter Fair	Workshops/materials for Carnival Parade	<b>5,000</b>
<b>E6</b>	Mill Road Winter Fair	New design of brochure for 2013 Fair	<b>1,850</b>
<b>E7</b>	Pakistan Cultural Association	Meetings	<b>100</b>
<b>E8</b>	Pakistan Cultural Association	Exercise sessions	<b>300</b>
<b>E9</b>	Pakistan Cultural Association	Swimming sessions	<b>1,400</b>
<b>E10</b>	Petersfield Area Community Trust	Summer event	<b>4,178</b>
<b>E11</b>	Rawlyn Court Residents Association	Entertainment evening	<b>335</b>
<b>E12</b>	Romsey Mill	Positive activities for young people - weekly sports and arts sessions and youth club	<b>4,000</b>
<b>E13</b>	The MAP Project	Community Arts Project	<b>4,000</b>

<b>Budget available</b>	<b>£27,048</b>
<b>Total awards</b>	<b>£24,427</b>
<b>Budget remaining</b>	<b>£2,621</b>

Following discussion, Members **resolved (unanimously)** to approve projects as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report (and summarised above).

### **13/26/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.

### **13/27/EAC Planning Applications**

#### **13/27/EACa 12/1573/FUL - 10 Coldhams Grove**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for part-first-floor and part single-storey extension to the side and single-storey extension to the rear and change of use from single dwelling house to an eight-bedroom house in multiple occupation (sui generis).

The Principal Planning Officer referred to a typographical error listing '19 Alpha Grove' instead of '10 Coldham's Grove' in Condition 7 of the Officer's report.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, with the amendment of the bracket in Condition 7 to read '10 Coldham's Grove' instead of '19 Alpha Grove'.

#### 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): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/14, 5/1, 5/2, 5/7, 8/1, 8/2, 8/4, 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.

### **13/27/EACb 13/0115/FUL - 5 Montreal Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of single dwelling house (1 bedroom).

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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:

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

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/10, 3/12, 5/1, 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.

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.

### **13/27/EACc 12/1139/FUL - 2 Tenison Road**

The Committee received an application for retrospective permission for continued use for Friday prayers every week, and daily during Ramadan.

The application sought approval for a retrospective application for temporary continuation of use for additional assembly area for worship on Fridays (12.30pm to 2.30pm) and during Ramadan (midday to 2pm and 5pm to sunset).

The Principal Planning Officer referred to amendment sheets setting out revisions to conditions 5 and 6; plus minutes of the 16 January 2013 Development Control Forum regarding this application.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) The application was a major shift in scale of Mosque facilities.
- (ii) Five hundred people were gathering in the space for two Victorian houses up to five times a day. This occurred 04:30 to post sunset. Residents felt this was a health and safety issue.
- (iii) The Mosque impacted on resident's amenities, which conditions failed to control.
- (iv) Residents were told that the Mosque would have to break planning conditions to operate. There was an established precedent of the Mosque Management Committee agreeing to conditions to get retrospective permission then breaking them.
- (v) Residents had specific concerns regarding:
  - Noise from Mosque public address system.
  - General noise from traffic.
  - Parking issues.
  - Threatening behaviour by Mosque visitors towards residents.
  - Lack of City Council enforcement of planning conditions.
- (vi) Residents queried if planning permission could be withdrawn if conditions were not met. Also if the planning permission could be granted for shorter periods in future (if appropriate).
- (vii) Residents welcomed having a Mosque in the area, but it needed to be a better neighbour, and find an alternative site as it had out grown its current location.

Councillor Blencowe read a statement on behalf of Mr Mukhtar (local resident) in support of the application.

Councillor Meftah (Ward Councillor for Trumpington) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Councillor Meftah had been involved with the Mosque Management Committee since November 2012. It was their responsibility to ensure the Mosque was a good neighbour.
- (ii) Most Mosque visitors arrived on foot.
- (iii) Cyclists and drivers were encouraged to park responsibly.
- (iv) Residents had not approached Councillor Meftah to report concerns regarding the Mosque. He acknowledged the public address system in the Mosque was loud, but so was the public address system in surrounding buildings such as the Salvation Army. They all had the same issues eg parking.
- (v) Friday prayers and Ramadan were important for Muslims.

- (vi) Space was required to educate people. The Mosque provided this to help community cohesion.
- (vii) The Mosque hoped to move to a bigger alternative site in future.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requiring a management travel and liaison plan be submitted to the City Council for approval.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation for condition 1. The length of permission was reduced to 2015.

This amendment was **carried 4 votes to 1**.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation for condition 3. Alternative wording was proposed: Delete 'In the event that'; insert 'Before any'.

This amendment was **carried 6 votes to 0**.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 2)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, subject to the following amendments to conditions. (Reasons for conditions to remain as published in all cases.)

Within three months of this decision, a management, travel and community liaison plan for the use of the application premises shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

Activities within 2 Tenison Road shall take place thereafter only in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that the use hereby permitted does not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbours or on the highway network. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 8/2).

Condition 1: Delete '01 January 2017'; insert '01 January 2015'.

Condition 3: Delete 'In the event that'; insert 'Before any'.

Condition 5: Delete all and replace with this text.

The use of the ground floor of this site as an assembly area for prayers hereby permitted shall take place only on Fridays between 1200 and 1500, except during Ramadan, when the use is permitted on any day between 1130 and 1430 and between 1630 and half an hour after sunset.

The precise dates for the period of Ramadan shall be submitted to the local planning authority at least one calendar month before Ramadan begins in each year.

Condition 6: Delete all and replace with this text.

Within three months of this decision, a framework document explaining the educational activities to be undertaken on the ground floor of the application site, which includes details of the activities, the number of people taking part, and the times involved shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

Educational activities during the times for prayer hereby permitted shall take place only in accordance with the approved framework document. Educational activities shall not take place on the application site outside the times for prayer hereby permitted.

Add new Condition 7:

Within three months of this decision, a management, travel and community liaison plan for the use of the application premises shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

Activities within 2 Tenison Road shall take place thereafter only in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that the use hereby permitted does not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbours or on the highway network. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 8/2)

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): policies 3/4, 3/7, 4/13, 5/12, 8/2, 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.

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.

### **13/28/EAC General Items**

#### **13/28/EACa 12/1132/FUL: CB1, 32 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application an amendment to the original officer recommendation for conversion of 32 Mill Road to provide 9 self-contained studios and the retention of the CB1 Internet Café.

The application sought approval to amend the contributions required for the s106 agreement so that it contains the financial contributions detailed in paragraph 3.2 of the Officer's report. These are considered to be the correct financial obligations and those which meet the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which place a statutory requirement on the Local Planning Authority to ensure that where planning permission is dependent upon a planning obligation under s106 being completed, the obligations sought pass the following tests:

- (i) They are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- (ii) They are directly related to the development.
- (iii) They are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The second recommendation was that the Committee allowed an extension of time for completion of the s106 agreement until 30 April 2013 to allow sufficient to draft the s106 agreement.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that completion of the s106 agreement be amended to 30 June 2013.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendations as amended to approve amending the contributions required for the s106 agreement and extend the time for completion.

The meeting ended at 10.55 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank