

EAST AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 18th FEBRUARY 2010

Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 09/1017/EXP

Location: 163-167 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 14 January 2010

To Note:

1 Further representation received

Owner of 162 Coleridge Road

The following comments are made:

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Entrance to the site is dangerous and inadequate for fire engines.
- Loss of light to the rear of number 162.

Officer Comments

- The first 2 points have been adequately considered within the main Committee report.
- With regard to the amenities of number 162, this issue was closely considered in the determination of the initial application 06/0534/FUL. It was considered that whilst there would be some overshadowing and presence from the building to the rear of number 162, this was not considered so harmful as to justify refusal. The fact that another new building has been constructed to the south of number 162, after the original application, does not in my view alter this assessment.

Amendments To Text: No amendments.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 09/1135/FUL

Location: 710 Newmarket Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 1 February 2010

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: Nothing

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 10/0019/FUL

Location: 42 St Barnabas Road, Cambridge

Target Date: 5 March 2010

To Note: Further letters of opposition to the proposed development have been received from the following addresses:

38, 44, 46 and 56 St Barnabas Road
25 Devonshire Road.

The grounds for opposing the application can be summarised as:

- No significant difference from previous application recommended for refusal by officers.
- Worse yet than that previously recommended for refusal by officers; tests against the Certificate of Lawfulness limitations, allowing more to be built, begins to make the planning process farcical. The Certificate of Lawfulness has to be challenged – unreasonable onus upon neighbours to have to enter a legal challenge
- The point is made that the legislation as drafted is ambiguous and that clear guidance is not available; with no legal precedent having been set the interpretation of the legislation remains open to debate
- The proposed extension is too heavy and substantial and will be unduly dominant; out of keeping with and will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of terrace and the Conservation Area. It is out of proportion and will set a precedent for super-sizing the street;
- Another letter states that the proposal is too high and projects too far into the garden and rehearses the 'coherent design of the terraces', which is one aspect that makes the St Barnabas Road buildings 'worth looking at closely for the quality of their detailing' (Mill Road and St Matthews Conservation Area Appraisal 1999)
- the Lawful Development Certificate at least allows a break in the building

- along the common boundary;
- undue haste in the preparation of the report – late comments will not be given sufficient weight;
 - the proposal is considered to offend local plan policy, in that the physical presence of the proposal will have a severe adverse impact upon the amenity of a neighbouring property, and there will also be harm arising from noise and disturbance.
 - General concern about the number and scale of extensions built in the rear gardens of houses in the Conservation Area – progressive erosion of the Victorian design
 - The proposal will not have a positive impact on its setting.

Some photographs received from 40 St Barnabas Road will be displayed at Committee.

Amendments To Text: Nothing

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:
