PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - 6th December 2017

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/0974/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 18 Chesterton Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 12.09.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1527/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 213 Mill Road

Target Date: 28.11.2017

To Note: The cycle parking spaces for the retail unit are in accordance

with the comments from the Highways Authority, not one space short of their recommended number, as incorrectly stated in

paragraph 8.45.

Amendments To Text:

Change paragraph 8.45 to read:

6 no. Sheffield hoops would be provided at the front of the building for the staff and visitors to the retail unit. This was increased during the course of the application and is in excess of the 3 no. spaces recommended by the Highways Authority. In

my opinion, this is acceptable.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1349/FUL

Location: Brookfields Hospital, 351 Mill Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 17.11.2017

To Note:

The Lead Local Flood Authority has agreed that the drainage condition should be amended to 'prior to first use' as oppose to 'prior to commencement'. Condition 12 has been re-worded accordingly.

Additional comments have been received from the Tree Officer and these have been amended at paragraph 6.7 of the report

Amendments To Text: Paragraph 6.7 should read as follows:

"Because so much amenity space is being lost to hard surfacing the room for replacement trees is limited, especially in the northern, narrowed strip between spaces 70-76 and 77-83, it will be essential therefore to ensure that pit design allows replacement trees to establish quickly and thrive without damage to adjacent hard surfaces. Tree pit design should be included in the Hard and Soft Landscaping details.

While I am not able to support the proposal due to the loss of trees and the amenity space required for replacement planting, if the scheme is otherwise acceptable, the arboricultural objection alone is insufficient to justify refusal."

<u>Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation</u>: Condition 12 should be reworded as follows:

"Prior to first use of the proposed development, a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in conjunction with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed. The scheme shall include:

- a) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced

storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change), inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements, together with an assessment of system performance;

- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers
- d) Full details of the proposed attenuation measures
- e) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- f) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- g) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;

In addition, the parts of the existing drainage system that are to be retained will be traced and cleared out to maximise capacity. The location and details of any existing pipes, soakaways or other drainage infrastructure will be clearly marked on a plan of the site. The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason: To minimise surface water flood risk (National Planning Policy Framework 2012 paragraph 103)."

<u>DECISION</u> :			

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: Second

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/0548/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 60 Trumpington Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 05.06.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM:</u> <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1625/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 83 Lovell Road

Target Date:

<u>To Note</u>: The owner of No.87 Lovell Road has submitted an additional

representation objecting to the application. This refers to 2 recent articles in the Cambridge Evening News that are considered to be relevant to this application: The first article, regarding an air b'n'b use at 17 Richmond Road, is argued to be relevant as the impact on surrounding residents arising from the change of use of a family house to short-term lets is considered comparable. The second press article refers to a student

accommodation scheme at St Edmunds College and states that a lack of family housing has become a problem in the city.

The owner has also enclosed photographs to illustrate parking issues in the area, that it is considered would be exacerbated by the proposal, and also showing contractors' mess on the site.

This representation does not affect my recommendation. Whilst there is a policy in the Local Plan that resists the loss of housing (policy 5/4), it does not specifically resist the loss of large or family housing and there is therefore no policy basis for rejecting the application on these grounds. As noted in my report, the

subdivision of large dwellings into smaller units is specifically supported by Local Plan Policy 5/2. If the units were then proposed to be used for air b'n'b purposes, this would require a further application for planning permission. The parking issues reported by local residents and the impact it is felt the development would have upon this situation has been discussed in the report and considered acceptable.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/0898/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 111 Grantchester Meadows

<u>Target Date:</u> 09.08.2017

<u>To Note</u>: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1164/FUL

Location: 11 Chedworth Street

<u>Target Date:</u> 13.12.2017

<u>To Note</u>: One further representation was received from the

owner/occupier of No. 13 Chedworth Street in response to the latest public consultation on the revised drawings showing updated tree information. The representation can be

summarised as follows:

- The apple tree in the garden of No. 11 is not shown correctly in terms of its position and canopy spread. This is a large tree which is visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and from the Lammasfield car park.
- The holly tree in the garden of No. 13 is marked to be 40cm from the fence but is actually 13.5com. The canopy spread is 15cm bigger than show on the drawings.
- There are more stems of the japonica quince than marked on the plans and these are closer to the fence than shown. The canopy is also larger than shown on the plans. Replacement would not be easy and would damage neighbouring tree roots.
- The holly tree on the other side of the lawn of No. 13 has not been shown on the plans.
- Request a tree officer visits the site to assess the conservation value of the trees.
- The extension is still substantial in both height and length and the box shape would be 'ugly'. It would be visible from the kitchen of No. 13.
- Remain concerned about drainage issues.

This representation does not affect my recommendation. I have assessed the impact on trees/shrubs in paragraphs 8.17-8.19 of my report, the design in paragraphs 8.2-8.5 and the impact on the amenity of No. 13 in paragraphs 8.10-8.11. The impact on the drainage infrastructure is a civil matter and not a planning matter for the committee to consider.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1614/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 103 Mill Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 10.11.2017

<u>To Note</u>: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION: THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM:</u> <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1624/FUL

Location: 1-2 Purbeck Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 23.11.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1534/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 4 Green End Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 8.11.2017

<u>To Note</u>: A revised location plan has been submitted to correctly show the host property outlined in blue rather than red. Revised plans have been submitted to show the first-floor roof light on the south elevation being re-located to 1.7m above the finished floor level.

Amendments To Text: None

<u>Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation</u>: The drawing numbers referred to in conditions 8 and 13 should be re-worded to drawing no.'A99-A'.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1697/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 1A and 1B Malletts Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 13.12.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1646/FUL

<u>Location</u>: 30 Dudley Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 13.12.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/0998/FUL

Location: 98 Paget Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 02.08.2017

<u>To Note</u>: I received a further representation from the owner/occupier of

No. 96 requesting that the applicant considers stepping in the side elevation of the proposed two storey extension by 100mm.

I have received amended drawings from the applicant incorporating this amendment. This does not affect my

recommendation which is for approval.

Amendments To Text: None

<u>Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation</u>: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1091/FUL

Location: 8 Mill Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 17.08.2017

To Note: I received revised plans removing the smoking area and cold

store at the rear.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1740/FUL

Location: 31 Peverel Road

Target Date: 15.12.2017

<u>To Note</u>: Consultee response received from Sustainable Drainage

Amendments To Text:

Add a paragraph 6.4 and re-order paragraph numbers below. This paragraph would read:

Sustainable Drainage

6.4 No objection subject to recommended conditions on drainage details.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Recommended 12 to be re-worded to:

No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Site-specific soil permeability testing and calculations in accordance with BRE Digest 365 will be required to demonstrate whether infiltration is feasible. If infiltration is not feasible then suitable sustainable drainage features will be required to restrict the runoff from the site to the greenfield runoff rate. The drainage system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding or flooding of third party land for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include details of all proposed SuDS features, hydraulic calculations and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (National Planning Policy Framework 2012)

And add condition 13 and re-order those below this condition would read:

The surface water drainage scheme shall be constructed in accordance with the agreed details prior to the occupation of the site, and managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (National Planning Policy Framework 2012)

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM:</u> <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: 17/1420/FUL

Location: Brookmount Court

<u>Target Date:</u> 1.11.2017

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

ENFORCEMENT

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>ENFORCEMENT REF</u>: EN/0143/16

Location: 17 Richmond Road

Target Date:

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: Para 1.3 - the premises does fall within a Conservation Area.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>ENFORCEMENT REF:</u> EN/0335/15

Location: 89 Searle Street

Target Date:

<u>To Note</u>: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

