

Minutes & Actions

Councillors Present

Abbey: John Durrant, Caroline Hart, Miriam Lynn

Coleridge: Jeremy Benstead, Lewis Herbert

Petersfield: Kevin Blencowe, Ben Bradnack, Victoria Bruce

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

County Councillors: Martin Ballard (Coleridge), Alice Douglas (Romsey), Nichola Harrison (Petersfield)

07/10 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 25 January 2007 were approved and signed as a correct record.

07/11 Matters Arising from the Minutes

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

Cllr Smart said that the proposed land swap with the County Council was not proceeding. Cllr Bradnack said that the issue was unlikely to progress as the Citylife had said that it was minded to make a different application or shed the lease to another unspecified organisation.

- **07/07** Open Forum: Resident 1 Circulation of the Agenda to Residents

Members noted that the resident who had asked for a copy of the agenda to be posted to her had received it, and would like it posted to her earlier in future.

- **07/07** Open Forum: Resident 2 50 Mill Road - Change of Use

Cllr Bruce said that the Enforcement Officer was in negotiations with the owner of the property.

Cllr Bradnack said that this was the same position as two months ago; he would also take it up with the Enforcement Officer to progress.

07/12 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from County Cllr Paul Sales. Members noted that City Cllr Ben Stafford had resigned from the Council as he was now working and living elsewhere.

07/13 Declarations of Interest

A Code of Conduct personal and prejudicial interest was declared as follows

Councillor	Issue/ Application
Smart	07/0116/FUL Garage block between 27 and 29 Galfrid road As Executive Councillor for Housing and as the Council was partner to the applicant

Councillor Smart took no part in the discussion and did not vote on the application indicated.

07/14 Police Update

Members noted that, owing to operational constraints, the Police had been unable to provide a representative to attend the meeting.

07/15 Open Forum

• Resident 1 Development Site on Young Street

The resident asked for an update on progress on the site.

Cllr Bradnack said that the site had now been sold with planning permission which meant that work could commence on the approved plan. It had deteriorated since last reported on and he had brought it to the attention of the Enforcement Officer.

County Cllr Harrison said that she had been pursuing the issue with the Enforcement Team and trying to identify the owner of the site. She suggested that she and Cllr Bradnack could share information once it was available.

• Resident 2 Parking Restrictions on Coleridge Road

The resident said there was a problem with areas of Coleridge Road where the traffic was impeded by the parked vehicles. This was particularly a problem for emergency vehicles and it would be helpful to have parking restrictions introduced and enforced at particular points. Members responded as follows:

County Council Highways Maintenance Budget

County Councillors said that, arising from the above comment, there were unlikely to be any new traffic improvements work commissioned in the current or following year because of the financial difficulties that the County was experiencing which would have county-wide implications in a number of areas, not just the one being discussed. There was to be an announcement by the Leading Group about its intentions regarding the next year's budget and how it proposed to finance highways maintenance and repairs.

A report would be made to the next meeting on any further information on the issue of Coleridge Road and on the wider issue of County wide Highways Maintenance funding.

• Resident 3 Section 106 Agreements

The resident asked for an explanation of the term S106 Agreement which was used in planning application reports.

The Chair gave a brief explanation and said that he would be pleased to explain in more detail after the meeting.

• Resident 4 Lack of Street Lighting on a section of Mill Road

The resident said the work to provide street lighting on a section of Mill Road where there was none was said to have been a high priority for some time, although no progress had been made.

County Cllr Ballard said that the issue of lighting was linked to a scheme to replace and improve all street lighting within the County. This was being considered for funding under a Public Finance Initiative project and it was unlikely that smaller projects would be addressed until this was in place.

Both County and City Councillors said they were aware of the issue of the lack of lighting and would continue to pursue it with officers. It was unlikely the likely cost of the project (last estimated at £210,000) would mean that it would not be possible to fund it from other budgets, such as community safety.

- **Resident 5 Entitlement to Use of Taxi Card Scheme**

The resident said that a friend had been told that, despite being registered as a blind person, she was not entitled to use of the Taxi Card Scheme as she was working, indeed she needed the taxi card scheme to enable her to continue to work.

Members said that as always resources needed to be prioritised to benefit those in most need. It was a means tested benefit and it was to be regretted it could not be applied to keep help people in work. The resident was entitled to appeal the decision and should do so, and also seek advice from the Citizens Advice Bureau and other advisory organizations.

On the wider point of claiming allowances, Members agreed that residents who were eligible for benefits should do so where possible. Many did not claim despite being eligible, for various reasons, and this had a negative affect on the grant allocated to the City from central government funds.

- **Resident 6 Annual Cost of Rough Sleepers Budget**

The resident asked what the Rough Sleepers budget was for the year. The current 'open purse' policy could not be continued as the Police had already warned that it could not enforce any further areas covered by Section 30 orders.

Cllr Smart said that the Council worked in partnership with a number of organizations and that it sought to prioritise costs where most needed.

The Chair said that information on spending on Rough Sleepers could be made available, the issue raised was wider than could be dealt with during the Open Forum and it would be better to leave it to a later meeting of the Committee at which all parties involved could participate in a full discussion.

- **Resident 7 Robert Sayle/Hollands/Brookfields site, Mill Road**

The resident had put forward a number of questions before the meeting:

A. The Planning Brief: We welcome the Brief, and the planners' time in explaining it to us. We will be reporting the results of the survey of residents soon, but as a starting point, we would like to see:

1. A significant green space at the front of the development, to mirror Ditchburn Place on other side of bridge. To create better housing environment, and to alleviate very urban feel to that end of Mill Rd.
2. A very high quality design reflecting the high standards that the City Council has set itself re sustainable buildings and sustainable communities. Pushing the boundaries to create a model for other developers.
3. The affordable housing element spread more evenly amongst other groups in need in Romsey. 40% student housing may do little for social cohesion in the area, and may have a negative impact on the whole development.

Do Councillors agree with these objectives? How will they help us realise them?

B. Improving the site now: Recognised by everyone that it is a mess and leaves the area looking run down. We are liaising with the site owner and Romsey Garden Club to improve the

small garden, but would like to know if Council can help with quality hoardings (we know of a recommended supplier who can attach pictures?)

How can they help?

C. Improving Burnside and beyond as a green lung for high density population of Mill Rd. Planners told us this had to be a council priority to attract Section 106 money. Is it? How do we make it a priority?

Cllr Smart said that it would be difficult to respond to this number of questions in any depth at this meeting. They had been passed on to the Planning Officers who would take them into account and respond.

Cllr Herbert said that he had been pressing for a Master Plan on use of the available Health Service Land.

Members said they would welcome the results of survey and keep residents apprised of further progress with planning for the site.

- **Resident 8 Increased Rubbish and Bins on the Streets of Romsey**

The resident, representing Romsey Action, said that there was clearly a problem with increased rubbish and the presence of bins on the streets in Romsey. Residents would like to know what was being done to identify and address the specific issues facing waste removal in Romsey. What could residents do to support initiatives, for example, set up a message line to enable them to report problem areas.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services, Cllr C Rosenstiel, pointed out that there was a Hotline number, 458282, which residents could ring to report problem areas. Members said they felt there had been some improvement and encouraged residents to use the Hotline and report problems so that they could be taken into account as well as dealt with by the service.

- **Resident 9 50 Mill Road – Enforcement Problems**

The resident thanked Cllr Bruce for following up the problem with 50 Mill Road and asked members to consider whether there was sufficient funding for the Enforcement Service as it had not been able to follow up reports from residents that the approval was not being complied with.

- **Resident 10 Street Drinking Ban and Byelaw**

The resident reminded members that the Council had sought approval to a Byelaw to respond to the problem of street drinking and associated concerns. The Council had as an interim solution, agreed the declaration of areas eligible to increased police powers under Section 30. Recent quarterly reports by the police have indicated an influx of streetlife people from the other cities and town experiencing similar problems. In the light of the unresolved issue of street drinking and the evident growth in the numbers of people living on the streets or in hostels, what steps was the Council proposing to take?

Members outlined the action taken by the Council following the submission of the application to approve a Byelaw and its subsequent progress. In the interim, Government proposals to empower councils further in this respect were in the form of a Bill before Parliament to be considered in due course. Changes in legislation arising from this would have to be taken into account. Members would report in due course on its implications for the Council and the City. as the legislation progressed.

- **Resident 11 Sheltered on Housing Mill Road**

The resident asked what the Council's commitment to Sheltered Housing on Mill Road was.

Cllr Smart said that there were plans to refurbish the existing housing but because of its structure this had to be given careful consideration. Residents in need of sheltered housing would continue to be taken account of.

07/16 Community Development and Leisure Grants 2007-08

Resolved that the following grant applications be approved from the £23,900 available to the Committee:

	Group	Project	Grant £
CD1	Directions Plus	Disability home visiting advice service	1500
CD2	East Barnwell Friendship Club	Summer outing	200
CD3	Friends of Mill Road Cemetery	Insurance and leaflets	281
CD4	Petersfield Area Community Trust	Summer event; newsletter, annual magazine, meeting costs, taxi costs	751
CD5	Romsey Action	Website; family picnic; Mill Road Winter Fair	3080
CD6/1	Romsey Mill (in priority order)	Abbey Social Capital Initiative.	5500
CD6/2		Post transitions group	3200
CD6/3		Romsey Coleridge Youth Group	Defer
CD6/4		Survival group.	0
CD6/5		Weekly dance group	0
CD7	Tuesday Club	Hall hire and outing	360
total			14,872

07/18 Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and a member of staff from Environmental Services attended the meeting to report on the implications of the above act for the city. The report by the Head of Environmental Services set out to

- inform the public of the powers contained in The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act, 2005 (the Act) to deal with nuisance and abandoned vehicles, litter and refuse, graffiti and defacement, waste, dogs and noise.
- inform the public on the council's policy for the use of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) which follows best practice.
- inform the public that income raised from FPNs will be used to protect and enhance the local environment.
- sought residents support for the approach adopted by the council to protect the local environment.

Two enforcement officers would be employed to meet the legislation and residents were invited to help set the service priorities. The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and officer responded to questions from members and residents. These covered:

- What was meant by nuisance parking.
- The Council's recycling programme as the main contributor to the spread of litter, specifically the lack of lids on some of the boxes used.

- Monday collections meant that some recycling and waste was left out over the prior weekend leading to littering, encouraged scavengers and possibly vermin. What were the chances of changing the rota for collection.
- Return of shopping trolleys to points of origin.
- Could other officers of the Council, for example the Rangers and the parking enforcement officers be given additional powers to support enforcement under this legislation.
- What happened when the recycling services refused to collect bins which had been contaminated with other material.
- While the report was a helpful document and illustrated the powers given to the local authority there was little point in providing services that were not supported with an adequate budget.
- What enforcement action had been taken so far, a lot of the enforcement powers referred to were already in existence.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services noted that surveys had identified the need to keep collection bins off streets; however he invited residents to identify other additional priorities. If the service was not working effectively he said that residents should contact ward councillors so that any problems could be followed. Local Authorities were facing problems with financing all its services hence the importance of prioritizing available resources. Prosecutions of a number of offenders were in hand. It was seen as an educative process to encourage residents to adopt a more responsible attitude.

The Chair thanked the Executive Councillor for Environmental Services for attending and invited residents to comment on their experience of the legislation and use the Helplines quoted, and if all else failed, to contact councillors to take up any problems.

07/19 Dates and Locations for Meetings in 2007/08

The Committee agreed the following dates for future meetings in 2007/08 and decided to continue at Cherry Trees Day Center:

2007: 12 July, 6 September, 1 November,
 2008: 10 January*, 28 February, 17 April
 (* same date as North Area Committee)

07/18 Themes for Meetings

The Committee agreed the following themes for future meetings in 2007/08

Climate Change (17 May 2007)
 Response to the concentration of health and social care facilities in the East Area (12 July)
 The impact of the County Council's budget on highways maintenance
 Progress on legislation to deal with Street Drinking (TBA)
 Youth Provision in this area of the city

07/20 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 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.

9.1	
Application No	07/0077/FUL
Site	Garages adjacent to 1 and 2 Headford Close
Proposal	Erection of two 2-bed flats
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions and to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement
Applicant	Cambridge/Flagship Housing Society
Public Speakers	-
Decision	<p>Approved (by 6 votes to 0) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report, to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 13 April 2007 and to the following additional informative: In developing a landscaping proposal for the site, consideration should be given as what planting could be introduced to help the soften the appearance of the new gable as seen from the rear of Howard Close, either within the site or by seeking to supplement the planting immediately adjacent to but outside and south of the rear boundary of the properties in Howard Close.</p> <p>Refusal: 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 13 April 2007, the application will be refused for the reason set out in the report</p>

9.2	
Application No	07/0116/FUL
Site	Garage block between 27 and 29 Galfrid Road
Proposal	Demolition of 16 garages and erection of 4no 4person 2bedroom flats incorporating car parking with access road and retaining an existing footpath. Alteration to external store (29/29a) Galfrid Road
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions and to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement
Applicant	Cambridge/Flagship Housing Society
Public Speakers	-
Decision	<p>Approved (by 6 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, an additional condition relating to visibility splays to be drawn up by the Head of Development Control in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson and removal of the alternative recommendation, the following additional condition:</p> <p>12. No development shall take place until the completion of a deed made pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure to the Council's satisfaction the payment to the Council of £8520 towards formal open space, informal open space and play space.</p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that the development make appropriate provision for public open space (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/9 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/8, and 10/1)</i></p> <p>the addition of standard condition 64 regarding contractors operations as condition 13; and the standard informative regarding the considerate contractors scheme.</p> <p>Refusal: 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 refused for the reason set out in the report.</p>

The meeting finished at 10.45pm