

**NORTH AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 7<sup>th</sup> January 2010**

**Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 09/0876/FUL

Location: Corona House, 1 Corona Road

Target Date: 13.11.2009

To Note:

1. Following completion of the Committee report, a letter was received from the applicants' agents forwarding details of crimes and incidents in Corona Road supplied by the Architectural Liaison Officer at Cambridgeshire Constabulary. This letter and its attachment are attached to the amendment sheet.
2. The DCF minutes are also attached to this amendment sheet

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 09/1089/FUL

Location: 21 Belvoir Road

Target Date: 19.01.2010

To Note:

Since the completion of the Committee Report a number of letters have been received from local residents. These are set out below.

Amendments To Text:

Section 7

Additional letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of the following properties:

19 Belvoir Road  
23 Belvoir Road

The following issues were raised:

Reiteration of previous reasons for objection – scale of extension, proximity to neighbours, overshadowing, impact on privacy, design and appearance, outlook, inappropriate materials and inaccuracies in the documents submitted by the applicant.

It was hoped that the issue of the enforcement notice would be the end of the story.

Letters of support has been received from the occupiers of the following properties:

1 Aylestone Road  
25 Belvoir Road  
27 Belvoir Road  
31 Belvoir Road  
64 De Freville Avenue

The grounds of support are as follows:

There are many loft extensions in the area that collectively add colour and fabric to the area and overlooking to neighbours is no worse than that experienced from existing two and three storey houses.

The works are sympathetic with other works that have been carried out in Belvoir Road.

The extension is essential to provide family accommodation, the garden space has been respected, the view from the street is unchanged, the extension is modest in comparison with others in the street, the Council should support families and other approved development in the area has affected the community in a greater way.

The extension is appropriate to its surroundings. (2)

The materials are acceptable and match existing to the front.

Many residents do not wish to live in a Conservation Area.

A letter has been received from David Howarth MP following correspondence to him from the occupier of 21 Belvoir Road.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

## **DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:                    APPLICATION REF:            09/0942/FUL

Location:        179-185 Chesterton Road

Target Date: 16.12.2009

### To Note:

The applicants have been unable to agree an appropriate level of trip generation for the new development and therefore it is not possible to provide the information that is missing from paragraphs 8.36 to 8.45 at this time and it is unlikely that the s106 Agreement will be completed by 7 January 2010.

For this reason Members are requested to grant delegated powers to officers to conclude the negotiation of the s106 Agreement in relation to transport and public realm contributions as necessary. The length of time for negotiation of the s106 also needs to be extended. I have made changes to the recommendation in these regards.

Issue was raised at Chairs Brief regarding the size of vehicle servicing the shop. The local Highway Authority has responded:

*“Regarding the issue of limiting the size of delivery vehicles, I am assuming that this is regarding the obstruction resulting during delivery, and risk to cyclists seeking to pass.*

*The size of delivery vehicle, once you reach the sizes practical for servicing this site, dictates the length of vehicle, rather than the width, whereas the obstruction issue relates mainly to width, and cyclists being squeezed by vehicles trying to pass at the same time.*

*There is also the issue of vehicle doors opening suddenly in the path of cyclists, but this relates more to light vehicles, where the frequency of event produces a more significant risk.*

*The carriageway on Chesterton Road is more generous than , say Mill Road, and there would be less of a need for cars to squeeze past on a constrained carriageway.*

*Therefore, unless the view were to be taken that servicing is unacceptable and refuse on that basis (which I consider would be problematic to justify, given that the*

*site has serviced previously from the front, and has no other realistic alternative) the size of vehicle is not really the issue, as it will be bigger than a light van.”*

Amendments To Text:

5.3 PPG 4 has been superseded by PPS4.

PPS4 sets out the government’s planning policies for economic development, which includes development in the B Use Classes (offices, industry and storage), public and community uses and main town centre uses. The policy guidance sets out plan making policies and development management policies. The plan making policies relate to using evidence to plan positively, planning for sustainable economic growth, planning for centres, planning for consumer choice and promoting town competitive town centres, site selection and land assembly and car parking. The development management policies address the determination of planning applications, supporting evidence for planning applications, a sequential test and impact assessment for applications for town centre uses that are not in a centre and not in accordance with the Development Plan and their consideration, car parking and planning conditions.

Having reviewed the content of PPS4 I have reached the view that this policy guidance does not alter my recommendation.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

**DELEGATED AUTHORITY** to enable officers to complete negotiations on the s106 agreement in relation to transport and public realm contributions.

**APPROVE** subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 15 February 2010 and subject to the following conditions:

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 09/1024/EXP

Location: Camflat Roofing Ltd, Sandy Lane

Target Date: 28.12.2009

To Note: Nothing.

Amendments To Text: None.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

## **GENERAL ITEM**

Request for discharge of Section 106 obligation so that the guest house does not have to be operated by the original applicant or immediate family only at 61- 63 Milton Road, Cambridge

In the light of advice from the City Council's Solicitor a minor change to the recommendation is recommended as follows:

That the Council agrees to enter into a Deed of Discharge with the applicant.

This will allow the correct legal procedure to be followed.