

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 1ST FEBRUARY 2017

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1389/FUL**

Location: Mount Pleasant House, Mount Pleasant

Target Date: 27.10.2016

To Note:

-Discussions are on-going between the County Council Transport Team and the applicant's transport consultants regarding the cost of the delivery of the cycle lane on Castle Street.

-A plan has been submitted by the applicant's transport consultants showing the provision of a single-stage designed crossing for pedestrians and cyclists at the top of Mount Pleasant. The delivery and cost of this is yet to be agreed with the County Council.

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: Delegated authority is sought for officers to finalise and agree the details of the transport related mitigation, its cost, method of delivery and timing of provision.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1764/S73**

Location: Gonville Hotel, Gonville Place

Target Date: 03.01.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1760/FUL**

Location: 2 Sturton Street

Target Date: 29.11.2016

To Note: Additional correspondence from the Environmental Health Team dated 23.01.2016 confirming position of acoustic fence and use of first floor flat roof for maintenance and storage acceptable. Recommended condition to restrict roof top to maintenance and storage only, excluding storage of waste.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Amendment to condition 7:

7. The first floor flat roof area shall not be used for any purpose other than maintenance and storage (excluding storage of waste).

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

Amendment to recommendation to remove erroneous reference to S106 Agreement in Section 10.0:

APPROVE subject to the following conditions.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1002/FUL**

Location: 19 - 21 Godesdone Road

Target Date: 02.08.2016

To Note:

Third party representations have been received on the amended plans from the following:

- 12 Godesdone Road;
- 17 Godesdone Road;
- 62 Beche Road;
- 64 Beche Road;
- 68 Beche Road;
- 70 Beche Road;

I set out below a summary of the representations received:

Representations	Response
Improve scheme in terms of elevational treatment and massing.	Noted.
Dormer windows are still large – should match other front elevation dormers on Godesdone Road and Beche Road.	The dormers on the front elevation have been reduced to acceptable levels so they no longer dominate the roofscape.
Whilst the scale of the proposal is an improvement it remains a large development.	The scale of the development has been reduced to respond to the constraints of the site.
No mention of what materials will be used in the construction.	I have recommended a materials condition so details are submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
Size of the apartment still not compliant with national space standards.	The national space standards are not statutory requirements. Also there are no internal space standards in the current Local Plan (2006).
Would like confirmation the rooflights would be above head height to ensure no overlooking.	The applicant has confirmed through the submission of Section Plan that the cill height for the rooflights will be 2.17 metres above internal floor level.
Bin store welcome addition but concerned with the management responsibilities of the bins.	I have recommended a waste management plan condition.
Metal roof profile will appear as a dominant visible feature from no.68 and no.70 Beche Road. Slate would be more in keeping and lead would be acceptable.	I have recommended a materials condition. The applicant will be required to submit samples of the materials to be used for consideration.
Quality of brickwork will be important.	As above.

Ridge is still significantly higher than other dwellings in the area. This is not characteristic of the area and results in breaking up a contiguous terrace.	The properties in Godesdone Road do not have a uniform ridgeline. The proposed ridge would be higher but it is not considered to be by a significant amount such that it would have a detriment impact on the character of the area.
General mass of the building and density of housing is still significantly out of keeping.	The revised scheme reflects the general pattern of development in Godesdone Road.
Massing has been reduced and setback is an improvement but application should be judged against the existing dwellings and not initial scheme.	The proposal has been assessed against the existing built form.
Revised narrow dormer units appear as an improvement from head on views but do little to improve the appearance from other angles.	The dormers have been reduced in size so they appear subservient and sit more comfortably within the roofscape.
Revised building has far too much mass and scale for plot.	The reduced mass and scale reflects the existing built form and site context.
Window detail and cladding inconsistent with street and conservation area.	The window details are entirely in keeping with the area.
Building would tower over no.17 and not keep with the stepped layout of Godesdone Road.	The building has been designed to reduce its impact on the no.17. The footprint of the building is setback from the existing so the occupier of no.17 would have a better outlook.
Building should respond to the rhythm and layout of the street.	In my view it does.
No three storey buildings in the street and so the new building would change this outlook.	The proposal has been designed to appear as a 2 ½ storey building.
Dominant building design is unacceptable.	The design responds to the site context and is acceptable in design terms.
Development will lead to car parking issues due to limited available space.	The site is located within a sustainable location in terms of proximity to shops and services.
Proposed flats very small and cramped.	The proposed flats would provide a good level of accommodation.
None of bathrooms have external ventilation.	External vents could be incorporated in the design of the scheme without having any material impact on the overall appearance. Any material change would require a separate application to be made.
Reduce the ridge height and remove dormers are necessary for this development to be in keeping with the area.	The proposal is acceptable in design terms.

The proposed plans do not show the actual back extensions to no.62 and no.64 and the rear windows of the development will cause overlooking.	There is no requirement to provide this. I have recommended the first floor windows located nearest to the rear elevation of Beche Road properties to be obscure glazed.
No vehicle parking, in adequate cycle parking, totally inadequate amenity space and tiny rooms.	The proposal is acceptable in all these regards.

Amendments To Text:

Urban Design and Conservation Team comments on amended scheme:

The proposed amended scheme is acceptable in terms of design and impact on the conservation area subject to the following conditions:

- Full details of all material, colour, surface finish for windows and doors;
- Rooflight details;
- Dormer details;
- Window details;
- Sample panel of brickwork;

Comments in full:

The submitted amendments (shown in the Proposed Elevations (sheet 1 of 2) drawing 1433-P-201-Rev G, Proposed Elevations (sheet 2 of 2) drawing 1433-P-201-Rev F), First and Second Floor drawing 133-P-011 Rev K) reduce the width of the walling either side of the dormer windows by a further 100mm. We support this amendment which improves the overall proportions of the dormer windows.

The treatment of the side ‘extension’ has been revised, the ground floor bay window has been deleted and black stained timber cladding introduced at first floor level. We support these amendments which improve the subservient appearance of the extension nods to the former commercial use on the site.

The cycle and refuse storage provision is located on plot within the footprint of the site. The refuse store door (vertical timber panelled door) forms a similar style to the ginnel door on the adjacent terrace house and is appropriate to the bin store use. Cycle storage is proposed at the rear of the building with cycles brought through the communal entrance/lobby. This arrangement is acceptable, the treatment of the lobby need to be robust in order to prevent damage to floor and wall finishes.

Conclusion

The approach to break up the development into two elements is supported. The 2.5 storey brick ‘house’ element continues the terrace form to the south whilst the 2 storey side ‘extension’ helps mitigate the buildings greater depth. The 1.5 storey scale of the ‘extension’ and angle of the pitched roof has resolved previous overshadowing concerns.

Subject to conditions, the application is acceptable in design and conservation terms. Planning conditions are essential to obtain acceptable details regarding fenestration, roof ridge and dormers and materials.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Conditions:

Windows and doors

Full details of all windows and doors, as identified on the approved drawings, including materials, colours, surface finishes/textures are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: in the interests of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/4 and 3/12).

CONR02 - (roofing details) - not listed building

No roofs shall be constructed until full details of the type and source of roof covering materials and the ridge, eaves and hip details, if appropriate, have been submitted to the local planning authority as samples and approved in writing. Roofs shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

CONR06 - (dormers) – not listed building

No dormers shall be constructed until full details, at a scale of 1:10, showing the construction, materials, rainwater disposal and joinery of the dormers, including their cheeks, gables, glazing bars and mouldings, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Dormers shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

Window details

No windows shall be installed until drawings at a scale of 1:25 of details of the heads, lintels, jambs, frames, transoms, and mullions have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/11)

Sample (brick specific)

Before starting any brick work, a sample panel of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be

agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12).

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1942/FUL**

Location: 48 New Square

Target Date: 30.12.2016

To Note: A further revised set of drawings has been received to correct an inconsistency in the depth of the Willow Walk building between the proposed floor plans and sections.

Amendments To Text: Paragraph 8.37 – correct an error in the stated number of trees to be removed from 12 no. to 11 no. trees.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1943/LBC**

Location: 48 New Square

Target Date: 30.12.2016

To Note: A further revised set of drawings has been received to correct an inconsistency in the depth of the Willow Walk building between the proposed floor plans and sections.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1674/S73**

Location: 28 Maids Causeway

Target Date: 15.11.2016

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1916/FUL**

Location: 61 Norfolk Street

Target Date: 27.12.2016

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1919/FUL**

Location: Land Rear Of 268 Queen Ediths Way

Target Date: 27.12.2016

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1617/FUL**

Location: 59 St Barnabas Road

Target Date: 02.11.2016

To Note: Councillor Robertson has also requested this planning application be determined at Planning Committee if recommending approval, on the grounds of loss of amenity policy 3/14.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1825/FUL**

Location: 63 Ditton Walk

Target Date: 12.12.2016

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1362/FUL**

Location: Land Adjacent To 99 Kendal Way

Target Date: 11.10.2016

To Note: Comment were received from No. 427 Newmarket Road that

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Condition 11 (Obscure glazing) – the drawing number referenced in the condition 11 (1441-P-001 Rev A) is incorrect and should be replaced with drawing number.1443-P-001 rev A.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1358/FUL**

Location: Garages 1 – 48 Wiles Close

Target Date: 11.10.2016

To Note:

The proposal description should read 20 car parking spaces and not 21 car parking spaces.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/1087/FUL**

Location: 423-425 Newmarket Road

Target Date: 08.08.2016

To Note: Further comment was received from No. 427 Newmarket Road as

there was a slight discrepancy in the Proposed Block Plan 16/1429/05 B in that it did not fully take into account No. 427's ground floor bathroom which transverses the boundary shared with the proposal. The agents have subsequently amended this plan to reflect the outline of this bathroom in Proposed Block Plan 16/1429/05 C and have reiterated via email that it is intended to maintain this neighbours bathroom.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF:

Location: Tanglewood, Gazeley Lane

Target Date:

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

This page is intentionally left blank