

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

6 June 2013
7.00 - 10.20 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Owers (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Brown, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, Moghadas, Roberts, Saunders, Smart, Kavanagh, Walsh and Whitehead

Area Committee Members: County Councillors Kavanagh, Walsh and Whitehead

Councillors Brown and Benstead left after the vote on item 13/44/EAC

Councillor Whitehead left after the vote on item 13/45/EAC

Officers:

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces): Alistair Wilson

Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers in Attendance:

Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Technical Officer: Declan O'Halloran

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/37/EAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The Committee Manager took the Chair whilst the East Area Committee elected a Chair.

Councillor Johnson proposed, and Councillor Moghadas seconded, the nomination of Councillor Blencowe as Chair.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0) that Councillor Blencowe be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Blencowe assumed the Chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

Councillor Herbert proposed, and Councillor Roberts seconded, the nomination of Councillor Owers as Vice Chair.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0) that Councillor Owers be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

13/38/EAC Apologies For Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Bourke and Marchant-Daisley.

The Chair welcomed new Councillors to the Committee.

13/39/EAC Declarations Of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

13/40/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 25 April 2013 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments shown in bold:

- (i) 13/33/EAC (agenda P9) regarding Councillor Johnson's update on Riverside project progress. Delete (ii) and (iii) then replace with: **"Funding was in place for double yellow lines by Tesco to avoid car/cyclist conflict."**
- (ii) 13/34/EAC (bottom P11) (iii) "Removal of **redundant** street signs...".
- (iii) 13/34/EAC (P12) insert the following as (viii) **"A safer crossing between Newmarket Road and Meadowlands"**.

13/41/EAC Appointment to Outside Bodies

The following nominations for the representative for Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee were received:

- (i) Councillor Smart proposed by Councillor Brown
- (ii) Councillor Hart proposed by Councillor Roberts

On a show of hands, Councillor Hart was elected by 7 votes to 3 votes.

Councillor Hart proposed the nomination of Councillor Johnson as the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0) that Councillor Johnson be the representative for East Barnwell Community Centre for the ensuing year.

13/42/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **13/33/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Bourke to clarify details regarding suitability of Tins pathway ie could it be used by wheelchairs, prams, bikes, walkers etc.”**

East Area Committee (EAC) assumed Councillor Bourke had actioned this; or Mrs Deards would follow it up.

13/43/EAC Open Forum

- 1. Ms Howard-Smith queried what progress, if any, City and County Councillors had made on resolving the on-going issue of parking in Silverwood Close. Residents understood discussions were on-going regarding S106 money from the Travelodge, but they had not been updated for some time. Double yellow lines were requested in front of the green to prevent illegal parking.**

Councillor Johnson said this was an on-going issue. Part of the main project proposal was to improve access to the green and put double yellow lines around it. A separate proposal had been put forward to improve council and emergency vehicle access to Queen’s Circle.

Councillor Whitehead had recently met County Officers who were looking at the project currently.

Councillors Blencowe, Johnson and Whitehead suggested a resident’s parking scheme could be brought forward in the area depending on the results of a local consultation. A Premier Inn development was occurring near to Silverwood Close. The contractors may be part of the considerate contractor scheme, but would be reminded of the requirement not to park in the residential area. This should avoid residents being disturbed as per the Travelodge development.

- 2. Dr Grout asked what is the future for Cambridge United. IE where would it be located in future.**

EAC felt the City Council had a duty to assist Cambridge City and Cambridge United Football Clubs relocate to venues where they could provide more community facilities (as was their wish). Various sites had been considered as part of the 2013 Local Plan process and were set out in the document. The 2006 and 2013 Local Plans set out uses that football club sites could be put to. There was a change in policy between 2006 and 2013 Local Plans. The Draft 2013 Local Plan would be considered at Environment Scrutiny Committee 11 June 2013. Residents were invited to respond to the Local Plan consultation process.

3. Mr Roman spoke on behalf of Abbey Ward Residents' Neighbourhood Watch to raise concerns regarding driver and pedestrian anti-social behaviour (ASB) issues; relating to speeding, parking and access to Abbey Meadows School and the slip road from Barnwell Road to Raison Way.

Councillor Smart acknowledged the ASB issues and said they occurred all around the city. The Abbey Meadows School Head Teacher had been asked to raise the issue of dangerous driving and parking with parents. Mr Roman said the Head Teacher had done so, but would appreciate greater support from EAC Councillors.

Councillor Johnson suggested work to mitigate issues could be undertaken as an environmental improvement project post consultation with residents.

For example, speed bumps.

Councillor Whitehead had discussed remedial work with Ian Lock. Residents would be consulted to clarify if they would prefer double yellow lines or a residents parking scheme.

4. Mr Dixon spoke to re-iterated Mrs Howard-Smith's points regarding parking issues in Silverwood Close.

Councillor Johnson suggested a meeting could be held between city councillors, county councillors, the Highways Authority and local residents to identify solutions to resident's concerns. He understood that work to resolve verge parking issues had been delayed due to the re-organisation of the County Council.

Further public questions covered under item 13/43/EAC of the agenda.

13/44/EAC Devolved Decision-Making and Developer Contributions: Taking Forward East Area Priority Projects

The Committee received a report from Tim Wetherfield (Urban Growth Project Manager) which provided an update on progress in taking forward the East Area Committee's first three priority projects from the first round of devolved decision-making over the use of developer contributions.

The report also invited the Area Committee to set a fourth 1st round priority from options for a local play area improvement, now that further funding had been made available for this purpose. Reference was also made to a further report to the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 11 June 2013 on the proposed process for the second priority-setting round.

Alistair Wilson (Assets Manager) tabled further briefing papers, including photographs of each of the current play areas under consideration for improvement and the latest demographic data from the 2011 Census on number of children and young people by age group in each ward.

Councillor Blencowe summarised the background to the process. Three first round priority projects had been identified by the East Area Committee, now another was being selected from a shortlist.

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

- (i) Sought clarification regarding the budget available for play area improvement. Councillor Owers asked if the total figure of £67,500 on page 20 of the agenda papers was correct.

Action Point: Urban Growth Project Manager to clarify the budget available for play area improvement to Councillor Owers.

- (ii) Asked for future reports to provide further information and needs analysis to help councillors identify gaps in facility provision and prioritise options for new projects.

The Urban Growth Project Manager replied that officers would explore ways of doing this for future reports.

- (iii) Queried whether it would be possible for more than one play area improvement project to be prioritised (including mini improvements

across a number of play areas) in the East Area at this stage, if resources were available.

The Urban Growth Project Manager explained that this would not be possible at this stage, given the need to make sure that a fair and consistent approach was taken to all Area Committees. There would be a further opportunities for play area improvements to be identified in the next priority-setting round this autumn. The Environment Scrutiny Committee report on the proposed process for the second priority setting round also raised the possibility of similar or related project ideas being consolidated into larger project proposals.

A member of the public raised the following issues.

1. Ms Roberts expressed concern that:

- **Decisions would be made regarding the next priority for section 106 monies for new play equipment without any reference to a needs or gap analysis.**
- **The Officer's report did not provide an understanding of what is currently available. It implied that a play area would be provided for under sevens whilst making no note of whether play areas are needed for over sevens.**
- **The consultation process was not joined up or feedback to residents.**

The Asset Manager said that local play areas in need of improvement, which were identified in the East Area workshop last September, had been looked at by officers to map facilities provision for different age groups. He referred to the play value scores for each play area included in the report: lower ratings on the A-E scale denoted lower amounts and lower levels of sophistication of the current play equipment.

The Urban Growth Project Manager clarified that the play area improvements would not be limited to those for children under seven. The example given in the reported was aimed simply at illustrating one option of the sort of equipment that could be provided. The fund would include developer contributions from the 'provision for children and teenagers' category. As part of the next steps of project scoping and appraisal, there would be further opportunities for local residents and community groups to be consulted on the specific type of equipment to be provided at the play area prioritised for improvement.

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

- (i) To note the steps being taken to deliver the East Area Committee's current first round priority projects (to be funded by devolved developer contributions) and the progress of other on-going projects.

Members resolved (by 9 votes to 0 votes):

- (ii) To identify St Thomas' Square play area improvement project in Coleridge ward as the East Area Committee's fourth priority project from the first round of developer contributions devolved decision-making.

13/45/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP). The report outlined progress of existing schemes and new suggested schemes for 2012/13.

Existing Schemes: Progress

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager referred to progress on approved schemes as set out in tables 1.0 and 2.0 of his report.

New Schemes That Require Decisions

Members considered a number of 2012/13 schemes put forward for approval.

In response to Members' questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager answered:

- (i) Double yellow lines had been painted on the corner of Stone Street/Ainsworth Street to improve access for larger vehicles. Officers had reported to the Project Delivery & Environment Manager that refuse vehicles no longer had an issue accessing the area. In response to Councillor Brown's query if further work was required, the Project Delivery & Environment Manager undertook to liaise with Waste Services to clarify if issues had been resolved; or if further work was required as part of a reserve list project.

ACTION POINT: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to report back to East Area Committee after to liaising with Waste Services to clarify if larger vehicles access issues for Stone Street/Ainsworth Street had been resolved; or if further work was required as part of a reserve list project.

- (ii) Minor Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) works were separate issues to the Highways Authority's statutory responsibility for double yellow lines etc maintenance. It was not advisable to use EIP funding for maintenance work.
- (iii) Referred to a briefing note tabled at EAC giving an update on existing EIP schemes.

ACTION POINT: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to provide Councillor Kavanagh with an update on the County Council South Area Parking Review.

Councillor Johnson requested that access to green area in Silverwood Close be added as a reserve project to the list set out in Section 3 (Table 3.0) of the Officer's report.

ACTION POINT: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to liaise with Bob Carter regarding council maintenance staff access to Silverwood Close green area.

ACTION POINT: Councillor Moghadas to liaise with Project Delivery & Environment Manager to confirm if Greville Rd/Charles St still required a TRO.

Councillor Hart requested that the proposed introduction of double yellow lines to protect the turning circle on Rayson Way close to the bus stop be added to a reserve list.

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

- (i) To approve the delivery of the minor traffic regulation orders listed in Table 3.0 of the Officer's report, at an estimated cost of £6000, funded by the remainder of the East Area Committee 2011/12 joint minor highway works budget.
- (ii) To approve the additional TRO projects proposed by Councillor Johnson and Councillor Hart as reserve projects.

13/46/EAC Planning Applications

13/46/EACa 13/0095/FUL - 159-161 Coleridge Road

Councillor Blencowe sought clarification from Councillor Kavanagh if he was speaking as a member of the public or a Ward Councillor on this application. His representation had been submitted before he stood as a County Councillor. Councillor Kavanagh confirmed he was speaking as a member of the public.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of two 1 bed flats and one 2 bedroom house at land to the rear of 159 - 161 Coleridge Road, following demolition of the garage to the rear of 161 Coleridge Road.

The City Development Manager tabled a colour location map and referred to a traffic survey on the amendment sheet. Officers were unable to verify the traffic survey, so it did not affect their recommendation.

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

- Mr Brajdic
- Mrs King
- Mr Kavanagh

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Residents felt it appropriate to develop the site in the past; but not now due to parking issues.
- (ii) Raised specific concerns regarding:
 - Access – queried if this would be more appropriate from Coleridge Road.
 - Traffic levels and noise.
 - Overshadowing.
 - Overlooking.
 - Proximity of buildings in the application to existing neighbours.
 - Development not in keeping with character of the area.
 - Over development of site.
 - Damage to tree roots.
 - Historic objections had not been addressed by the new application.
- (iii) Took issue with details in the Officer's report.
- (iv) Queried:
 - If the area was subject to drainage issues.

- If the application met Local Plan requirements. For example, had an archaeological assessment been undertaken as per Local Plan Policy 3/11.
- Methodology and accuracy of parking survey.

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

The Committee:

Resolved (4 votes to 4 – and on the Chair's casting vote) 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:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 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 or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between Mon 8am - 5:15pm, Tues, Thurs & Fri 9am - 5:15pm, Weds 9am - 6pm.

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 6 September 2013, 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, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/8, 3/12, 5/14, and 10/1 the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

13/47/EAC General Items

13/46/EACa 12/1621/FUL - 117 Vinery Road

The Committee received a request to amend the original officer recommendation for demolition of 117 Vinery Road.

The application sought Committee's approval to amend the contributions required for the s106 agreement, so that it contains the financial contributions detailed at paragraph 3.2 of the Officer's report set out below:

"3.2 Below is a table that provides a comparison between the contributions sought within the original report and the contributions which should have been sought. The amended contributions are those which officers consider meet the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

	Original Contribution (£)	Amended Contribution (£)
County Council Waste	1140	950
Life Long Learning	960	800

"

These are considered to be the correct financial obligations and those which meet the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The Regulations mean that no weight should be given to section 106 obligations in determining a planning application unless the obligations sought pass the following tests:

- (a) they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) they are directly related to the development; and
- (c) they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The second recommendation was that the Committee allows until 6 September 2013 to allow sufficient time to agree and complete the s106 agreement.

It was also recommended that the conditions detailed in the planning officer's report of 25 April 2013 continue to apply.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve the changes to the original officer recommendation for demolition of 117 Vinery Road as outlined above.

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm

CHAIR