

EAST AREA COMMITTEE

27 October 2011

7.00 - 10.51 pm

Present: Councillors Blencowe (Chair), Benstead, Brown, Herbert, Marchant-Daisley, Moghadas, Owers, Pogonowski, Saunders, Smart

County Councillor: Sadiq

Officers: Tony Collins (Principal Planning Officer), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Andrew Preston (Project Delivery & Environment Manager), Kulbir Singh (Advicehub Partnership Development Manager) and Trevor Woollams (Head of Community Development)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

11/52/EAC Apologies For Absence

Councillors Bourke, Harrison, Hart, Sedgwick-Jell, Wright

11/53/EAC Declarations Of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Herbert	11/59/EACd	Personal: spoke as Ward Councillor in previous iteration of application. Did not participate in the decision making or vote.
Councillor Moghadas	11/61/EAC	Personal: Her children attend St Paul's Primary School
Councillor Brown	11/62/EAC	Personal: Wife is an advisor for Cambridge Advice Bureau
Councillor Moghadas	11/64/EAC	Personal: Resident of Greville Road

11/54/EAC Minutes

The minutes of the 18 August 2011 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment on page 7:

“The committee observed the Officer’s report contained a typographical error on P29 as Cheddars Lane was ñet in Abbey ward.”

11/55/EAC Matters & Actions Arising From The Minutes

- (i) **11/39/EAC Matters and Actions Arising From the Minutes “Action Point: Head of New Communities Service (County) to bring future reports to EAC for review of potential projects that could be supported by East and South Corridor funding.”**

Committee Manger has invited Head of New Communities Service to 15 December 2011 EAC.

Head of New Communities Service to bring future reports to EAC for review of potential projects that could be supported by East and South Corridor funding.

- (ii) **11/40/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Romsey Ward Councillors to respond to Mrs Richardson’s pavement concerns raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillors to follow up with Highways Authority to ascertain who are the landowners with maintenance responsibility ie shop owners or Highways Authority.”**

Councillor Saunders said that Councillor Bourke had discussed this issue with the Highways Authority and improvements were underway.

- (iii) **11/40/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Councillor Marchant-Daisley to respond to Mr White’s Hector Peterson playground concerns raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillor Marchant-Daisley to liaise with environmental improvement officers.”**

Relevant officers were in the process of identifying funding for improvements.

- (iv) **11/40/EAC Open Forum “Action Point: Coleridge Ward Councillors to respond to Mr Woodburn’s bike rack concerns raised in ‘open forum’ section. Councillors to ascertain if cycle parking facilities removed as part of the Cherry Hinton Road Post Office environmental improvement project can be re-instated.”**

Councillor Owers has responded to Mr Woodburn. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager was addressing the issue. Cycle racks were expected to be implemented as the final part of the project.

- (v) **11/41/EAC ARU Parking in Guest Road “Action Point: ARU parking in Guest Road to be revisited at a future EAC meeting.”**

Councillor Blencowe has liaised with Councillor Harrison. Residents were invited to address this item through the public Open Forum at a future East Area Committee (EAC) if the issue persisted.

- (vi) **11/42/EAC Tree issues and Tree Protection Orders “Action Point: Green Space Manager to respond to Mr Catto’s Riverside Conservation Area tree concerns raised in ‘tree issue’ section. Green Space Manager to liaise with Mr Catto post EAC.”**

The Green Space Manager has responded to Mr Catto.

11/56/EAC Open Forum

1. **Mr Image queried the progress of implementing and maintaining of double yellow lines at the entrance to Ainsworth Place and Stone Street. He asked if the Highways Authority held the budget for this.**

Councillor Marchant-Daisley understood that implementing and maintaining double yellow lines for Ainsworth Place, Fairsford Place and Stone Street had been agreed as Environmental Improvement Projects.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley undertook to clarify with Project Delivery & Environment Manager the position concerning implementing and maintaining double yellow lines for Ainsworth Place, Fairsford Place and Stone Street Environmental Improvement Projects.

EAC returned to this question under agenda item 11/64/EAC.

2. **Mr Rogers asked if the City or County Council held budgetary responsibility for implementing flowerbeds in Whitehill Close, and contact details of a specific officer to liaise with concerning the flowerbeds.**

Councillor Pogonowski undertook to clarify with Project Delivery & Environment Manager the position concerning implementing flowerbeds in Whitehill Close, and contact details of a specific officer to liaise with.

EAC returned to this question under agenda item 11/64/EAC.

- 3. Mr Gawthrop raised resident's concerns about the length of EAC meetings:**
- (i) Expressed concerns about late finishing times.**
 - (ii) Suggested holding separate planning and community meetings.**
 - (iii) The current format did not reflect the needs of members of the public and so were not conducive to democracy.**

Councillors noted that local residents were unhappy with the length of EAC meetings and wanted shorter ones. Councillors also observed that the North Area Committee pilot was trialing different ways of working, and it was envisaged that good practice would be shared with other Area Committees. Examples of options included changing start times plus splitting planning and community meetings.

Councillor Pogonowski proposed to discuss future arrangements for EAC meetings at the next EAC meeting 15 December 2011.

Action Point: EAC Councillors to discuss proposed alternative future arrangements for EAC meetings.

- 4. Mr Taylor noted that planning application 11/0710/FUL 103 Mill Road (Sainsbury's) was a separate issue to the transfer of land to the public highway in order to facilitate access to a loading bay. He queried if the land transfer was still relevant, as the planning application had been turned down. If this is not the case, funding allocated for a public consultation could be reprioritised.**

Councillor Brown indicated that the process was still on going as Sainsbury's had the option to lodge an appeal.

Action Point: Councillor Blencowe undertook to liaise with Councillor Cantrill (Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places) to ask Sainsbury's to reaffirm their intention to seek a loading bay before any public consultation was conducted on the matter.

5. **Mr Taylor referenced comments made by Councillor Blencowe at Council regarding his intention to seek section 30 dispersal powers in Norfolk Street and Burleigh Street. Mr Taylor suggested using alternative powers instead.**

Councillor Blencowe said that he would discuss the need for section 30 dispersal powers in Norfolk Street and Burleigh Street with Police Sergeant Stenton, to see if there was any evidence that they were required, prior to pursuing a request to implement them if appropriate.

6. **Mr Ousby, Ms Lindsay and Ms Owles raised points on behalf of Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT):**
- **Funding was allocated to Petersfield in lieu of land at St Matthews School.**
 - **PACT noted that the funding had been allocated to the City Council by the County Council. This had gone into a general City Council pot, rather than a specific Petersfield fund.**
 - **As Petersfield residents, PACT questioned if they or others in the City would benefit from the funding.**
 - **The transfer of funding to a general City Council pot meant that several Petersfield community projects could no longer go ahead, which was of concern to PACT.**
 - **PACT suggested that the funding allocation process favoured faith group, rather than community group projects.**

Councillors Brown and Marchant-Daisley said that £55,000 of the funding would be spent in Petersfield ward. Councillors Blencowe and Marchant-Daisley undertook to clarify how the remaining £164,000 funding would be allocated.

Action Point: Councillors Blencowe and Marchant-Daisley undertook to clarify how the £55,000 and £164,000 payments in lieu of land provision in Petersfield ward would be allocated. That is, in a ward specific or general fund.

11/57/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.

11/58/EAC Planning Items

11/58/EACa 11/0066/FUL - 1 Hemingford Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective application for the change of use from domestic dwelling C3 to HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) (sui generis).

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

- Mr Stentiford
- Mr Garstone

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Concerns that the application would exacerbate existing parking issues.
- (ii) Queried if the building was suitable for the application as more bedrooms were proposed than the current number of tenants. Queried if this would lead to an intensification of the site and be detrimental to the character of the area.
- (iii) Concerns about noise and impact on neighbouring amenities. Current residents of 1 Hemingford Road did not take sufficient care of the property's garden, which had a detrimental impact on neighbour's views. Current residents of 1 Hemingford Road also blocked the pavement with their bins. Any intensification of the site by granting the application would exacerbate these issues.
- (iv) Suggested that residents concerns about other applications in the area were pertinent to this one.
- (v) Queried suitability of access to the site.
- (vi) Suggested the application would be too tall and overshadow neighbours.
- (vii) Suggested there was a lack of cycle parking provision.

The Principal Planning Officer responded that:

- The application met appropriate planning policy parking standards.

- The dwelling was suitable for use as a house of multiple occupation (HMO) for 7 people or less. The precedent had been set by other properties in the area.
- Whilst management issues such a noise and poor garden maintenance could be material planning considerations, the current problems are largely a HMO management issue, and could be addressed by a suitable condition.
- Concerns regarding a lack of cycle parking provision could be addressed if a gate was put in the replacement fence.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 3) 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, ENV7.

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/11, 4/11, 4/13, 5/1, 5/7, 8/2, 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.

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.

11/58/EACb 10/1030/FUL - 1 Hemingford Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a proposed single storey rear extension.

The committee received representations in objection (as set out above in 11/59/EACb) to the application from the following:

- Mr Stentiford
- Mr Garstone

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment that the HMO limit should explicitly say that only 7 people could occupy the property.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 3) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda without the necessity of a Section 106 agreement. Informative to be added to decision notice reminding applicant of upper limit of seven occupants for the extended building.

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, ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/7, 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.

11/58/EACc 11/0201/FUL - 1 Hemingford Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for an annexe extension to provide 2 bedrooms, a studio and shower room with a link to the existing building.

Mr Carpenter (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

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

- Mr Stentiford
- Mr Garstone

The representations reiterated the following issues:

- (i) Concerns regarding views from neighbouring properties.
- (ii) The application sought more bedrooms than were required for existing tenants, which implied intensification of use.
- (iii) Application design out of character with neighbourhood.
- (iv) Concerns about parking, refuse arrangements and sustainability issues.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Applicant and Objector comments by stating that the flat roof was one of various concerns with the application, hence the recommendation to refuse.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission as per the agenda. Officers were asked to discuss planning obligation implications and seek approval from Chair and Spokes for approach to be taken on this issue in the event of appeal.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its disproportionate length and scale and flat roof design, would result in a poorly designed extension, which does not reflect the form of the main house. The extension would dominate the relatively narrow garden area and would detract from both the character and appearance of the number 1 Hemingford Road and the

character and appearance of the Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset and as such is contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 4/11 and 5/7.

2. The proposed extension, by reason of its disproportionate length, scale, height on the common boundary of number 3 Hemingford Road, would result in an unneighbourly development creating an unreasonable sense of enclosure for number 3 Hemingford Road to the detriment of the amenities, which the occupiers of that property currently enjoy. As such the proposal has failed to respond positively to the site context and is poorly integrated, which in so doing is contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 4/11 and 5/7.
3. The proposed extension provides insufficient external space, for both private amenity space and essential ancillary refuse and bicycle storage facilities for future occupiers. The amenity of bedrooms 1 and 2, which are served only by lightwells is also unacceptable. As such the design of the extension is poorly integrated with its context and is contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/14 and 5/7.

11/58/EACd 11/0664/EXP - 187 Cherry Hinton Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of 187 Cherry Hinton Road and the erection of a three storey house of flats in its place, together with the erection of 4 semi-detached houses at the northern end of the site in place of the garages. (An approved road off Cherry Hinton Road serves the houses and flats. 14 car parking spaces and 7 bicycle parking spaces will be provided).

The committee received a representation in objection to the application from the following:

- Mr Wigglesworth

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Expressed concerns about the application and over development of the site.
- (ii) Suggested that bike storage provision was insufficient in the previous and current applications.
- (iii) Queried if the plans in the Officer's report were accurate.
- (iv) Expressed concerns about refuse arrangements and storage areas.

Lewis Herbert (Ward Councillor for Coleridge) addressed the committee about the application.

- (i) Referenced concerns raised regarding the previous iteration of the application and stated these were still pertinent as they had not been addressed. Particularly with regard to the second access road, and rear properties having no gardens. It was felt the design may breach planning policy due to concerns relating to cycle provision, and lack of amenity space.
- (ii) Stated the Officer's report omitted pertinent information concerning maps, comments from objectors, plus the Planning Inspector comments relating to the previous and current applications.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0 - unanimously) to defer the application until 15 December 2011 East Committee meeting because of insufficient information. Officers were asked to ensure that full drawings of the previously approved development were available on the website. Also that appropriate drawings, the previous decision notice, and the Inspector's decision letter were attached to the December agenda, plus to clarify the position about the access drive and the site boundary. This item would be taken as the first planning application at the next meeting.

Councillors Herbert withdrew from the discussion and did not participate in the decision making for this item.

11/58/EACe 11/0659/FUL - 25 Romsey Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a three storey house on land next to 25 Romsey Road with parking space and refuse/cycle store.

The Principal Planning Officer proposed an amendment that 2 new conditions be inserted regarding planning obligation funding and the need for new drawings setting out window and door designs.

These amendments were carried unanimously.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda with the following additional conditions:

No development shall take place until clear drawings detailing the side elevation windows at a scale of 1:50 or greater have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Windows shall be installed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. (East of England Plan (2008) policies ENV6 and ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/11)

Committee also agreed the following authority:

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning and 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 31 December 2011 it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for open space/sports facilities, community development facilities, education, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with policies 3/8, 5/14, 3/7, 3/12 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; and policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and Cambridge Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010).

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, 3/8, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 4/11, 4/13, 5/1, 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.

11/59/EAC Items for Decision / Discussion Including Public Input

11/60/EAC Consultation on Capital Grant Application by Centre at St. Pauls

The committee received a report from the Head of Community Development regarding an update of the Capital Grants Programme, plus an application by the Centre at St Pauls in Hills Road for consideration by the East Area Committee. To date, £410,602 has been committed from a capital budget of £800,000.

An update on the East Area Committee's Capital Grants Programme was shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

The grant application from the Centre at St.Pauls was for a contribution of £34,800 from the City Council to improve community facilities by modifying and upgrading the main hall. A project appraisal for the Centre at St.Pauls' application was shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

Members considered the grant application as set out in the Officer's report. The Head of Community Development responded to Member's questions about what the project and funding aimed to achieve.

Councillor Smart observed typographical errors in (P22) Appendix A of the Officer's report and asked for these to be amended.

EAC resolved (unanimously) to recommend to the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health that a capital grant of £14,800 be awarded to the Centre at St Pauls for the improvement and refurbishment of their main hall, subject to compliance with the Council's legal agreement.

11/61/EAC Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) Kiosk Location

The committee received a report from the Advicehub Partnership Development Manager regarding implementing Advicehub touch screen kiosks in the East Area.

Kiosks were being implemented across Cambridgeshire. 14 Kiosks were in place at present, consultation was being undertaken on proposed locations for more. Suggested locations included council buildings (eg Mandela House), libraries, CAB buildings and community centres. Cambridge City Council has funded a total of 8 kiosks (Community Development Grants) to be sited in Cambridge city.

Advicehub was a National Lottery funded project to promote partnership working and improve the provision of advice to people, particularly if they could not meet advisors. Kiosk information could be 'personalised' to area needs to include details of local community and advice organisations.

Locations where kiosks were situated would be responsible for on-going maintenance costs when National Lottery funding ceased 2012. This was expected to be £700 - £1000 per year.

Posters in community buildings etc would advertise local kiosks, the CAB website provided a comprehensive list.

EAC were invited to suggest potential kiosk locations to the Advicehub Partnership Development Manager. Locations with high footfall were suggested. Kiosks could be moved between locations if one was found to be

unsuitable. The Advicehub Partnership Development Manager would visit proposed sites to ascertain their suitability.

Action Point: EAC Councillors to suggest potential kiosk locations to the Advicehub Partnership Development Manager (Kulbir@advicehub.org).

11/62/EAC Community Development Grants

The committee received a report from the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation regarding Community Development and Leisure Grants.

Members considered applications for grants as set out in the Officer's report. The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation responded to member's questions about individual projects and what funding aimed to achieve.

The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire Community Foundation undertook to provide Councillor Hart, Pogonowski and Wright with further information concerning the Little Bookworms project (ref WEB31987).

Resolved (unanimously) to approve the grant allocation as listed below Mill Road Winter Fair and East Barnwell Childminding Group.

Community Development current applications.				Available: £11,625	
CCF ID	Group	Project	Requested £	Recommended from Area Committee Grants £	
WEB 27551	Mill Road Winter Fair	purchase of signs for community fair.	850	850	
WEB 33372	East Barnwell Childminding Group	ride-on toys, scooters & sports equipment.	657	657	

11/63/EAC Environmental Improvement Programme

The committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager regarding the Environmental Improvement Programme.

The County Council has recently made the decision to request commuted sums to fund their increased maintenance liabilities created by City Council funded projects within the highway.

This decision affected an existing Environmental Improvement Project that had been approved for delivery. Approval of further funding is therefore necessary to enable this project to be delivered.

The County Council has also approved a joint highways budget with the City Council to fund minor schemes within the highway.

East Area Committee has been delegated the £7000 share of the County Council's £25,000 total contribution, to prioritise schemes and provide match funding from their Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) budget.

Existing Schemes: Progress

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager referred to progress on approved schemes as set out in his report.

- (i) No Waiting & 1hr Parking Restrictions (Coleridge Area).
- (ii) Ditton Walk/Newmarket Rd Planting.
- (iii) Riverside Railing Refurbishment.
- (iv) Silverwood Close and Whitehill Road Estate Verge Parking Prohibition.
- (v) Tree Planting on Chalmers Rd & Greville Rd.
- (vi) Stanley Rd/Garlic Row.
- (vii) Brooks Rd/Perne Rd Verge Parking Prohibition.

Existing Schemes That Require Decisions

Members considered a number of schemes put forward for consideration, a number of which required approval.

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

- (i) Noted Member's concerns regarding maintenance liabilities associated with the Chalmers Road and Greville Road Tree Planting Scheme.
- (ii) Details in the Officer's report regarding Ainsworth Place, Fairsford Place and Stone Street reflected information presented at the Area

Joint Committee, prior to funding being delegated to Area Committees. The Officer noted that residents now viewed these projects as priorities, which superseded previous comments to the contrary.

Action Point: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to add Ainsworth Place, Fairsford Place and Stone Street EIPs to priority list for action.

- (iii) Noted Councillor Pogonowski's request to add flowerbeds in Whitehill Close to the list of priorities for the next financial year as the list had closed for the current year.
- (iv) Noted Councillor Sadiq's request to add maintenance costs to future EIP reports.

Action Point: Project Delivery & Environment Manager to add maintenance costs to future EIP reports.

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

- (i) To select minor highway schemes, taking into account those identified in Appendix B of the officer's report (except Charles Street/Greville Road as this has already been funded), for further development and consultation, with a view to providing £7000 in match funding from the EIP budget.
- (ii) To defer until further information was available whether to fund a £11,235,84 commuted sum to the County Council for the increased maintenance liabilities associated with the Chalmers Road and Greville Road Tree Planting Scheme from the EIP budget, and revise other project budgets accordingly.
- (iii) To defer until further information was available whether to fund Ditton Walk/Newmarket Rd Planting, as this would be affected by the same maintenance considerations as the Chalmers Road and Greville Road Tree Planting Scheme.

The meeting ended at 10.51 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank