

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE**

25 April 2013  
7.00 - 9.40 pm

**Present**

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

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

Councillors Bourke left after the vote on item 13/34/EAC

Councillors Sadiq left after the vote on item 13/36/EACa

**Officers:**

Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers in Attendance:**

Head of Transport & Infrastructure & Policy & Funding – County: Dearbhla Lawson

Capital & Funding Manger – County: Daniel Clarke

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**13/29/EAC Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Hart.

**13/30/EAC Declarations Of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**13/31/EAC Minutes**

The minutes of the 26 March 2013 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

### **13/32/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes**

- (i) **13/22/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councilor Blencowe to clarify details 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.”**

Councillor Blencowe has contacted Mr Green.

### **13/33/EAC Open Forum**

1. **Mr Kavanagh queried why Councillor Bourke circulated a document in Romsey Ward alleging Labour Councillors opposed investment to the Chisholm Trail.**

Councillor Bourke said the document referred to County, rather than City Councillor intentions. He referred to comments made by Councillor Sales (County Council Labour Group Leader) made in a BBC interview; saying these showed Labour were opposed to the £8m investment required for the Chisholm Trail.

Councillor Bourke said that East Area Committee (EAC) had supported a feasibility study into the Chisholm Trail, but three had been undertaken already, so another would not make the Chisholm Trail a reality.

City Labour Councillors and Mr Kavanagh took issue with Councillor Bourke’s interpretation of Councillor Sales’s comments regarding Chisholm Trail funding.

2. **Dr Eva made the following points:**
- **Councillors’ response time to constituents was perceived as slow.**
  - **Expressed concern at speed of enacting change once a decision was taken.**
  - **Queried how constituents could be kept up to date with progress of agreed projects.**

- **Suggested newly elected councillors undertook management training.**

Councillor Johnson gave an update on Riverside project progress:

- (i) Riverside mooring consultation would close in approximately six months (circa November 2013), riverside railings would be painted after this.
- (ii) Funding was in place for the Tesco path; action would be taken when the consultation process finished in the near future.
- (iii) Councillor Johnson was working with Officers regarding yellow lines to stop unregulated parking. A resident's parking scheme was also proposed.

Councillor Owers said that Councillors had a training champion and budget. He queried how the public would respond to an increase to the training budget, which would be required to facilitate Dr Eva's management course suggestion for councillors.

EAC agreed with Dr Eva's point that councillors should respond to residents in a timely fashion and update them on project progress. Councillors were sometimes frustrated at the slow progress of project implementation once a decision had been made. EAC felt that communication between them and County Officers could also be improved. Councillor Bourke said that the County Council had been restructured and that Officers were focussing on urgent work due to high workloads. This was why some Riverside projects had not yet been implemented.

3. **Mrs Deards referred to the 'Romsey Beach' article in the 15 April 2013 Cambridge News and queried what the development proposed.**

Councillor Bourke said there was a proposal to open up the area behind Spinney School. He had sent a letter to Romsey Ward residents suggesting the chalk pit lakes be opened up for recreation access, and received a positive response to the idea of beach/water sport facilities. It was also an opportunity to redevelop a dangerous site that was already used for recreation purposes, albeit without permission. Councillor Bourke then shared the results of his survey with the Cambridge News. The proposal was still in the consultation stage.

Councillor Bourke acknowledged the facility would affect/interest residents and councillors outside of Romsey Ward. He agreed with EAC that a larger public meeting would be beneficial.

**Action Point: Councillor Bourke to clarify details regarding the suitability of Tins pathway ie could it be used for access by wheelchairs, prams, bikes, walkers etc.**

Councillor Bourke said he had asked the Cambridge News not to style the 'beach' article as a holiday advert due to current safety concerns regarding the area, but his request had been disregarded.

### **13/34/EAC South & East Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans**

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

The Officer brought the report up to date by stating the County Council Cabinet was prioritising and implementing transport schemes. A programme would go to Cabinet in future. A methodology had now been agreed to assess any schemes proposed by EAC.

The Head of Transport & Infrastructure & Policy & Funding referred to progress on approved schemes as set out in her report.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- (i) Welcomed details on how projects were progressing.
- (ii) Expressed concern regarding the slow speed of project delivery.
- (iii) Referred to resident's comments and said that County Officers needed better communication with residents on priorities.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Transport & Infrastructure & Policy & Funding said the following:

- (i) £1.72 m funding has been awarded as part of the Better Bus Area Funds towards enhancing accessibility for buses on key corridors, an element of this is considering better enforcement of infringements in bus lanes with partners.

- (ii) The Eastern Gate SPD was a City Council document. The County Council were developing a Transport Strategy with the City and South Cambridgeshire Councils, which may pick up key Eastern Gate SPD projects if they were not eligible for corridor funding. A consultation exercise on the Transport Strategy would be undertaken during Summer 2013.
- (iii) The City Council could spend Community Infrastructure Levy funding anywhere within its boundaries. S106 funding would be restricted to site specific use in future. The Transport Strategy could work alongside the new Local Plan as a mechanism to overcome this.
- (iv) Risk assessments were undertaken for all projects to ensure they could spend funding allocated.
- (v) Suggestions for projects could be sent to Daniel Clarke (Capital & Funding Manger – County), Dearbhla Lawson (Head of Transport & Infrastructure & Policy & Funding).

The Head of Transport & Infrastructure & Policy & Funding undertook to provide EAC with further information regarding:

- (i) Details regarding the Tenison Road traffic calming scheme, including funding available.
- (ii) The possibility of installing temporary lights in Coleridge Road for traffic management and speed monitoring purposes. Also to clarify which organisation would have to pay the cost for these.
- (iii) If key projects in the Eastern Gate SPD were eligible for corridor funding.

The Committee noted the programme for progressing schemes in the area (set out in the officer's report); and proposed schemes for consideration and assessment of fit with Area Corridor funding as follows:

- (i) Installing temporary lights in Coleridge Road for traffic management and speed monitoring purposes.
- (ii) Key projects in the Eastern Gate SPD.
- (iii) Removal of street signs in the Romsey Conservation Area.
- (iv) Perne Road/Radegund Road roundabout.
- (v) Completing work on the Cherry Hinton cycle path (left unfinished by

another project).

- (vi) Removal of superfluous metal lumps/posts in pavements.
- (vii) Implementing a standard requirement for county council contractors to remove street clutter upon completion of work.

Councillor Blencowe said South Area Committee were funding a feasibility study regarding a pedestrian/cycle link bridge to the Cambridge Leisure Park.

The Committee invited the Head of Transport & Infrastructure & Policy & Funding to return at an appropriate point in future to report back on South & East Transport Corridor Area Transport Plans.

### **13/35/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.

### **13/36/EAC Planning Applications**

#### **13/36/EACa 12/1613/FUL - Land r/o 289-293 Cherry Hinton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of two semi-detached houses, car parking and associated landscaping on land to the rear of numbers 289-293 Cherry Hinton Road.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet which set out representations and the Planning Officer's response.

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

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda.

## Reasons for Refusal

1. Because of their scale, mass, and position on the site, the proposed semi-detached houses would appear bulky and cramped, protruding into the street scene in an unacceptably dominant manner, eroding openness and detracting from the character of the area. The proposal would respond poorly to the context, and be poorly integrated with the locality, contrary to policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/14 and 10/1 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

### **13/36/EACb 13/0102/FUL - Garages r/o 76 Abbey Road and 12 Riverside**

Officers; with the Applicant's support, ask EAC to defer considering this application to the next EAC meeting. Comments were received from the Environment Agency late in the process.

The Environment Agency did not support the application due to the Health and Safety of future occupiers in the event of flooding, as this could hamper ingress/egress of people and an adequate finish floor level in the event of flooding.

The Applicant and the Environment Agency were in process of resolving the concerns, but were not able to produce the required information in time for consideration at this committee.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** not to consider this application at the meeting.

**13/36/EACc 12/1621/FUL - 117 Vinery Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing house and side extension, and erection of 6 new apartments.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet which set out representations and the Planning Officer's response. Three further responses had been received from 113 Vinery Road, 172 Vinery Road and 36 Vinery Park; these were not included on the amendment sheet, but their issues had already been raised in other representations.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to the amendment sheet and said that the parking survey had not been assessed by the Planning Officer or played a part in his recommendation to EAC.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Referred to the parking survey on the amendment sheet and said this had not been submitted in time to be considered.
- (ii) Suggested the application should be refused under Local Plan Policy 5/2 (parking). The application would exacerbate existing parking issues in the area.
- (iii) Raised the following specific concerns:
  - a. Bike and refuse access.
  - b. Over development of site.
  - c. Impact on resident's amenities.
- (iv) Referred to the Design & Access Statement; took issue with proposed site usage by students/professional as there was no evidence to support this.

Mr and Mrs Patel (Applicants) addressed the Committee in support of the application.



Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a car club informative should be included.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 2)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda with the addition of an informative as follows:

The applicant is urged to consider providing a period of Car Club membership for the initial occupiers of the units hereby approved in order to reduce the demand for on-street car parking.

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: SS1 and ENV7.

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

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm

**CHAIR**