

## Minutes & Actions

### Councillors Present

**Abbey:** John Durrant, Caroline Hart, Miriam Lynn

**Coleridge:** Jeremy Benstead, Lewis Herbert, Ben Stafford

**Petersfield:** Kevin Blencowe, Ben Bradnack, Victoria Bruce

**Romsey:** Sarah Ellis-Miller, Raj Shah, Catherine Smart

**County Councillors:** Alice Douglas (Romsey), Nichola Harrison (Petersfield)

### 07/01 Minutes

The minutes of the meetings on 30 November and 6 December 2006 were approved and signed as a correct record.

### 07/02 Matters Arising from the Minutes

#### 06/48 Question on Former CRC Site at York Street

Cllr Bradnack said that he had been told by the developer that work was to begin on the site within the month.

#### 06/49 Newmarket Road – Cambridge East Sustainable

The Chair said that the discussion about proposals for the future transport structure would be continued through the City and County Councils committee process. Any further developments would be brought back to East Area Committee as the issue progressed.

### 07/03 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from County Councillors Ballard and Sales.

### 07/04 Declarations of Interest

There was no declaration of personal or prejudicial interest.

### 07/05 Regular Police Update

Inspector Gregory gave an oral update outlining developments in policing in the Area and other issues covering the following areas:

- The extension of the S.30 Dispersal Order to include additional areas.
- Changes in the composition of the street life group and its dispersal to Mitcham's Corner and the Guildhall.
- Current levels of staffing in the section, a list of the East Neighbourhood Team would be circulated to members to keep them updated.
- Details of the Increase in offences across the city, household burglaries had increased significantly.
- Improvements in the service keeping victims of crime informed of progress in dealing with the offence.
- Drugs offences acted on in the City, a small proportion of which were in the East.
- The need to ensure feedback from residents on issues which affected them

## Questions from Residents

Inspector Gregory responded to a number of questions and comments from residents which included:

- What were the differences between so-called recreational drugs and other forms of drugs and where were users getting them from.
- What were the Police aiming to do about
  - cyclists, riding without lights at night, and generally flouting traffic regulations; and
  - motorists parking in cycle lanes and causing cyclists difficulties.
- Does the area of the S.30 Dispersal order now cover Mill Road Cemetery where streetlife people were congregating in numbers.
- Streetlife people in other areas were being associated with vandalism and minor offences; it would be helpful if information on how police were combating this were to be circulated through Residents Associations and other means.
- As was being done in the North Area, it would be constructive if Police were to take a lead from comments from residents in the East Area and focus resources on prioritised areas.
- Meetings with residents' groups were taking place and these would also help police prioritise action.
- The approval of a Licensing application by the City Council for a new Wetherspoon's premises at the Leisure Park contrary to police recommendation was of great concern to residents.
- Concentration of street life drinkers at the Mace shop in Mill Road was disadvantaging regular customers and the elderly and other vulnerable residents reliant on the service there.
- Police, along with residents, had the option of asking for a review of an existing licensed premises if they felt there was sufficient cause, if they were experiencing problems in the city centre perhaps that would be an option for them to take up.

The Chair thanked Inspector Gregory for his update and responses to questions.

### **07/06 St Matthew's Piece Land and Citylife Community Innovation Centre**

The City Council's Chief Estates Surveyor, Desmond Hirsch reported on the land ownership dispute between the City and County Councils that might have a bearing on the Citylife scheme that was recently granted planning consent. The disputed land was immediately to the south of the Howard Mallet Centre.

The details had been discussed by the City Council's Customer Services & Resources Committee on 14 November 2006 where it had reported on behalf of the Head of Property and Building Services that the City and County Council's property officers proposed a negotiated solution whereby the City Council would gain ownership of the adjacent 'new' Public Open Space recently identified in the Local Plan in exchange for surrendering part of the disputed 'old' open space so that the development can proceed. The area to be acquired was considerably larger than the area that would be surrendered. The County's claim to further land between the two areas that would be exchanged would also be withdrawn.

The recommendations which had been approved by the Executive Council for Customer Service and Resources, Cllr Rod Cantrill were:

- 1 Following appropriate advertising, to fully consider the public's response before finally approving or rejecting the recommended package of disposal and acquisition together with approving any leasehold commitments that may be necessary.
- 2 In the event of proceeding the Director of Central Services is authorised to complete the

necessary disposal and acquisition (with or without additional leases).

- 3 In the event of opting not to dispose, that the Director of Central Services is authorised to draw on Property Strategy funds to finance adjudication and asked to report through the budget monitoring process.

As part of asserting its rights against the County Council, the City had asserted that the disputed land was public open space. Following the logic that the disputed land was part of the park, the Council's Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that any exchange of land would be a disposal governed by the public open space notice procedure under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972.

The Chief Estates Surveyor, the Council's Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Cllr Cantrill will attended the meeting to present the Council's approach to the situation. Members of the public were invited to comment and ask questions on the issue. Cllr Cantrill emphasised that no decision had been made about this issue as he had felt it appropriate to consult local residents and the community in general before committing the City Council. The officers pointed that, if pursued the dispute with the County Council would need resolution by the Land Tribunal and might be seen to be wasteful of both authorities' resources.

The officers and Cllr Cantrill responded to questions and comments from residents and members which included:

- On whom would the maintenance costs of the disputed land fall?
- If the planning application relating to the Howard Mallett building had been refused, the applicant would have had the right of appeal, how would this have affected the dispute?
- What was the source of the dispute and who was responsible for the oversight which led to it?
- Residents felt strongly that the city council's claim to the land which would preserve the original Piece in perpetuity should be contested. They were not opposed to the Citylife proposal but felt that the land was of paramount importance to the community and there were alternative sites available to Citylife.
- The decision to approve the application was based on an undisclosed political agenda by the Liberal Democrats.
- It appeared that the proposal by Citylife was a commercial one, whereas the Piece was for community use and the former Howard Mallett building had complied with that.
- The suggestion that the two authorities resolve the situation by litigation was mystifying to the ordinary residents who assumed that the authorities were to represent their best interests and which meant not getting involved in expensive and wasteful legal disputes with each other.
- A petition in support of the continued community use of the Piece and the Centre had been compiled by young people.
- What were the designations of the various pieces of land under discussion and what part did the Local Plan play?
- Had the Head of Active Communities been consulted about the future maintenance of the land?
- If the footprint of the proposed Citylife building was reduced so that it did not impinge on the disputed land would not this provide a solution?

Cllr Cantrill emphasised that the issue was not a political one, and that there was every intention of avoiding a contentious legal solution, if possible; however there were differences of view between the two authorities and both were bound to uphold the integrity of their resources. In view of the Executive Councillor for Arts and Leisure's interest in the land, he would be consulting her, as well as having internal consultations with all relevant officers. The solution of reducing the size of the building had been considered, the applicants had said that

it would reduce the scope of the facilities available and would impair the success of the project and had not been offered as a solution to the problem.

A representative of Citylife, Tim Jones, confirmed that the project was not commercially orientated and was intended as a community facility. He said that he hoped to remain in good relationship with the local community and had useful discussions with PACT.

County Cllr Harrison pointed out that the Conservatives were the majority party in the County and she therefore could speak for them in this matter. It would have been useful if the authority had been represented to speak about the issue, the City's officers had offered the opportunity to the County's officers. She clarified her position in discussions that had been held at the County Council's Cabinet and the City Council's Planning Committee meeting. She would continue to support the Citylife project in the interests of local disadvantaged people.

Officers reminded the meeting that the two authorities were currently negotiating with each other and in such circumstances, neither side were able to fully disclose their arguments so as to achieve the best possible outcome.

Members discussed the comments and suggested that the Committee make a recommendation to the Executive Councillor to assist him in considering the issue.

**Resolved** (by 8 votes to 0), in the light of the vigorous views expressed and comments made by the residents attending the meeting, that the Executive Councillor for Customer Service and Resources be recommended not to proceed with the exchange of land proposed and that the action proposed in recommendation 3 by the Customer Service and Resources Scrutiny Committee be pursued, that is:

- 3 In the event of opting not to dispose, that the Director of Central Services is authorised to draw on Property Strategy funds to finance adjudication and asked to report through the budget monitoring process.

The Chair thanked Cllr Cantrill and the officers for attending and giving the opportunity for public debate of this issue.

## **07/07 Open Forum**

### **Resident 1 Circulation of the Agenda to Residents**

The resident asked whether copies of the agenda could be circulated as a matter of course to her so that if there were issues which she felt were of interest to members of the local community she could inform them and take a collective view.

The Committee Manager explained that the Council was trying to restrict the amount of paper being circulated in view of concerns over waste and the preservation of the environment. The agenda and reports for all the Council meetings were accessible on the Council's website. However he acknowledged that not everyone had access to the technology, and, with members' consent, he would include the resident in the circulation list for agendas.

### **Resident 2 50 Mill Road - Change of Use**

The resident said that 50 Mill Road had been the subject of three refused planning applications for a change of use to hot food, it was currently a computer shop, but the owner had followed up his stated intention to convert it into a café. The lack of enforcement on this issue was of great concern to residents; despite repeated approaches to the relevant section in the Environment and Planning Department, little seemed to be being done. There seemed

to be insufficient resources being devoted to this part of the service.

Several members present said they would take up the issue, Cllr Bruce said she would discuss the issue of resourcing with the Executive Councillor for Planning and Transport.

### **07/08 Environmental Improvements Programme**

The report by the Landscape Architects set out the progress on a number of approved schemes, recommendations for further actions and the current status of the budget for this Area. A number of schemes had been reviewed at a Workshop attended by some of the members on 11 January and recommendations in relation to these were included in the report.

#### **Restoration of Hedgerow in Rustat Road**

Three members of the public spoke about a scheme to restore the hedgerow in Rustat Road, two in favour of its restoration without intervening gaps to allow householders to take household waste and recycling to the collection point and the other who asked that gaps be left for the convenience of residents. A number of issues were rehearsed with members which included:

- The availability of a rear access to residents for the movement of waste and recycling.
- The inconvenience caused by gaps in the hedge being used by cyclists and as dropping off points
- It was explained that an area of hard standing for bin collection at the corner of Rustat Avenue could not be included because bins would block sight lines.
- The petition of 105 signatures in favour of the full restoration of the hedge
- The height of the hedge, which was the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, in accordance with planning permission

After discussion of these issues members

**Resolved** that the restoration of the hedge be carried out as recommended without gaps and with a protective fence and no hard standing at the corner of Rustat Avenue.

#### **Other Schemes**

Cllr Herbert said that some of the pram arms/pinch points which were being considered for removal from footpaths in the city needed further consideration as removal might well not result in an acceptable situation for elderly or vulnerable pedestrians. The officers said that further consideration was being given to formulating a policy which would enable the city to comply with legislation while ensuring that none of the residents were

The other schemes for which approval was sought were agreed as follows

- 1) Barnwell Road lay-byes: Approve the additional cost of scheme which was increased from £18,050 to £20,367, subject to consent by the Highway Authority
- 2) Mill Road Hanging Baskets: Approve the scheme at a cost of £6,961
- 3) New Street: Approve the scheme at a cost of £7,150.
- 4) Budleigh Close: Approve the scheme at a cost of £8,500
- 5) Mobility Crossings: Approve the schemes at Sturton Street (2 crossings) and Gresham Road (1 crossing) at a cost of £2,486
- 6) New projects: Approve the new projects discussed at Area Workshops as set out below:

<b>New Project</b>	<b>Cost Range</b>	<b>Priority</b>
<b>Coldhams Lane Bridge</b> - embankment vegetation management, steps, fencing and surfacing	£10,000 - £30,000	High
<b>Mill Road/Cavendish Road Junction</b> - seating/play area	£10,000 - £18,000	High
<b>Riverside</b> – Repair brick planters at the end of Priory Road	£1,500 - £2,000	High
<b>Occupation Road</b> – lighting and parking	£25,000 - £35,000	High-medium
<b>Peverell Road</b> – bus over-runs	£20,000	High
<b>Norfolk Street</b> – additional cycle racks	£6,000 - £10,000	High
<b>Great Eastern Street</b> - car park re-marking to allow access to play area	£1,000	High
<b>Rawlyn Rd and Rayson Way</b> - broken kerbs	£5,000	High
<b>Coldhams Common</b> - Coldhams Brook path and planting	£20,000 - £30,000	Medium
<b>Ditton Lane Shops</b> - Extend parking area	£3000- £5000	Medium
<b>Cromwell Road</b> – traffic calming	£60,000 - £75,000	Low
<b>Mill Road Broadway</b> – resurfacing, seating, cycle racks.	£80,000 - £110,000	Low
<b>Mill Road Bath House car park</b> – resurfacing	£75,000 - £100,000	Low
<b>Cut Throat Lane</b> (Elfleda Road to Newmarket Road) – private road resurfacing	£65,000 - £80,000	Low
<b>Brampton/Cromwell Road</b> – resurfacing service roads	£100,000 - 150,000	Low
<b>Peverell Road and Whitehill Road</b> – traffic calming	£100,000 - 300,000	Low

## 07/09 Applications for Planning Permission

At the beginning of this item Councillor Bradnack said that he would not be taking part in the determination of planning applications as it would inhibit his ability to represent residents in his ward.

He felt that he lacked expertise in planning matters and that the members of the Planning Committee had acquired such expertise and was the proper body to consider applications. Cllrs Benstead and Hart withdrew from participation in the Committee, as did Cllr Stafford, except as indicated where he acted as a ward councillor representing residents of his ward, and sat with the public.

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

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

<b>9.1</b>	
<b>Application No</b>	06/0138/FUL
<b>Site</b>	7 and 9 Mill Road
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of 2 storey building to provide a single, 2 bed dwelling to the rear of 7-9 Mill Road
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve subject to conditions and to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 28 February 2007
<b>Applicant</b>	Whitfield Associated, The Grange, 20 Market Street, Swavesey
<b>Public Speakers</b>	-
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Approved</b> (by 7 votes to 0) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 28 February 2007. <b>Refusal:</b> Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, 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 28 February 2007, the application will be <b>refused</b> for the reason set out in the report
<b>9.2</b>	
<b>Application No</b>	06/1248/FUL
<b>Site</b>	200A Perne Road
<b>Proposal</b>	Two storey residential development (4no. two bed houses and 2no. two bed flats)
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve subject to conditions and to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 March 2007
<b>Applicant</b>	Park Hill Homes (uk) Ltd, 36A Bell Street, Sawbridgeworth, Herts
<b>Public Speakers</b>	Doreen Brady (resident)
<b>Discussion</b>	Cllr Durrant's recommendation that a further condition relating to visibility splays be included to any permission granted was approved on the Chair's casting vote, the Committee having voted 2 votes to 2
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Approved</b> (by 7 votes to 0) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 March 2007 and an additional condition relating to visibility splays to be drawn up by the Head of Development Control in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson. <b>Refusal:</b> Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Development Services, 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 30 March 2007, the application will be <b>refused</b> for the reason set out in the report.

### 07/10 Future Dates Of Meetings in 2007/08

The Committee noted that at its next meeting, members would be asked to set dates and locations for meetings of East Area Committee in 2007/08. Members were asked to consider possible locations for meetings, taking into account the comments made by the public. A schedule of dates will be circulated in due course.

The meeting finished at 11.35 pm