

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 28TH MARCH 2018

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2245/FUL**

Location: Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

Target Date: 13.04.2018

To Note:

Additional representations:

1. 140 Cowley Road (Camcycles)
2. 6 Golding Road; (Letter dated 22 March 2018 sent direct to Committee members)
3. 113 Gwydir Street;
4. 8 Hooper Street;
5. 14 Hooper Street;
6. 9 Kingston Street;
7. 16 Sturton Street;
8. 18 Kingston Street;
9. 20 Kingston Street x2
10. 119b Mill Road;
11. 21 Sturton Street

I set out below the main issues raised and my response where the issue is not already covered in my report:

Representation	Response
<i>Design, scale, layout and residential amenity</i>	
Revised plans have not addressed original concerns;	The revised plans have addressed the main concerns raised by officers.
The scale and massing should reflect and respect the Victorian heritage and architecture of Hooper Street and Ainsworth Street;	The scale of the proposed development adequately respects the parameters in the SPD. The development nearest to the Kingston Street and Hooper Street properties respects the scale of development.

Concerned with the loss of tree due to new proposed dwelling on Hooper Street;	The loss of the tree does not outweigh the overall benefit of the proposed development. Also additional trees are proposed to be planted within the site.
Concerned with the potential impact on residential amenity and the character of the Conservation Area from the revised design of B.09 in terms of its 3 storey height and proximity to the boundary with Kingston Street;	B.09 has been revised to address concerns with its height and proximity to the boundary with Kingston Street. I do not consider the revised design of B.09 would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.
B.09 will cause look of privacy and loss of light;	There are no windows that would enable direct views into the adjacent rear gardens. The daylight and sunlight assessment concludes the impact from B.09 would comply with BRE guidance.
B.09 conflicts with the SPD;	The height and form of B.09 has been reduced and revised. It is important to balance the impact on adjacent residents with the desire to have a feature building at the entrance into the site. The revised B.09 is considered to be an appropriate balance. The SPD is a guide and not prescriptive document.
Concerned with the potential impact from noise and disturbance from the proposed ground floor uses in B.09;	Building noise insulation condition has been recommended to mitigate any noise impact.
The proposed change in material from red brick to buff on B.09 is welcomed;	Noted.
The use of dark grey brick on Kingston Mews is not appropriate in terms of outlook from the existing dwellings Kingston Street and in this conservation area;	The use of grey brick would introduce contrast and give identity to the site. This brick type has been used elsewhere to good effect. I have nevertheless applied a materials condition.
Concerned with the proposed tree adjacent to B.09 will reduce light to the back of the houses in Kingston Street;	It is difficult to quantify loss of light from a tree. Details of the precise landscaping will be submitted as part of Condition 17 (landscaping).
Concerned with the lack of detail in the supporting Transport Assessment in terms of mode split estimates which are skewed towards non-car modes, junction capacity analysis is unreliable; and traffic signals should be introduced to mitigate accidents;	Transport team comments to be reported orally.
The loss of two units does not overcome the concerns with density;	The density of the site is acceptable.
B.05 is still too tall and is not in keeping with the area;	B.05 has been reduced in height and is considered to be acceptable.

Open space remains inadequate;	The proposal is compliant with the SPD on open space.
The Hooper Street garages would be overlooked by B.08 and B.07 would appear dominant from Hooper Street – both should be reduced by 1 storey;	B.08 would provide nature surveillance over the garage block which would improve security. B.07 would be four storeys which is compliant with the SPD and set approx. 52 metres from the nearest house in Ainsworth Street.
Still too much car parking on the site which will cause more congestion;	It is expected that most of the journeys from the site will be by walking and cycling. Transport team comments to be reported orally.
B.05 and B.02 are out of character and need to be reduced in height as they will be highly visible from the bridge;	These two buildings have been carefully tested through views assessment.
High boundary wall between Kingston Mews and Kingston Street properties is unacceptable;	The rear boundary wall to the Kingston Street properties will be brought down to 2 metres in height as part of the Party Wall Agreement.
<i>Other issues:</i>	
The new space for the WRC is not appropriate as it is not of the same size as the original building and so cannot offer the same services;	The CWRC has been relocated and are in talk with other similar services to collocate. The Council is assisting them in the process.
The CWRC should be returned to the site;	As above. Also the proposal includes community space.
The application should be withdrawn or delayed because the split in applications does not consider the whole site;	The proposed development makes suitable provision for the YMCA proposal without prejudicing it. The Transport Assessment takes into consider the proposed YMCA use.
Disappointed 119 Mill Road has been omitted from the property list and the planning details for 119b are incorrect as they should relate to have been 119 Mill Road;	This is not a material planning consideration.
The removal of the brick pillar and the 11 metres section of the bridge would require permission from the land owner (Network Rail);	Agreed. The applicant will need to seek approval from the landowner to make these alterations.
Safety and security issues for users of the private roadway to 119 and 119b and beyond;	The Highway Authority has not raised any highway safety concerns with the users of the private road.

Site plan is still incorrect as it includes part of the private access road to 119 and 119b Mill Road and beyond, and this is pending a Land Registry judgement;	The judgement has been made in favour of the City Council.
The applicant cannot ask for the adoption of an existing adopted highway;	The applicant is not asking for the access road to be adopted. It is already adopted land. All planning applications for residential development must include an access to a public road.
The access to 119 and 119b Mill Road should be kept clear with signs and road marking;	There is no requirement for road markings to be introduced.
Community facilities are missing;	Community provision is included on the ground floor of B.09.
No justification for having 92 private dwellings on council owned land;	The Council would not be able to fund a proposal for 100% affordable housing on this site without their development partner (Hill).
The application disregards the junction improvement requirements set out in policy 23 (draft Local Plan);	Junction improvement works have been proposed to improve highway safety.
No details of measures to introduce safe pedestrian and cycle crossing along Mill Road;	As above.
Traffic calming measures will be needed to reduce speed of vehicles and motorbikes that cut through the gap opposite the Petersfield pub;	No traffic calming measures are proposed and there is no cut through within the site opposite Petersfield.
Access safety issue compounded by addition of 2 visitor car parking spaces alongside the former library;	The Highway Authority has not raised any highway safety concerns with these spaces.
Has the Council give consideration to reducing affordable housing to 40%?	SPD requires 40% affordable housing but CIP agreed to increase this to 50% in view of the acute need for affordable housing in the city.
No parking for existing/future users of the former library provided in the current application;	This is because the former library building is not part of the application. There would be no change to the current parking arrangement for the former library.
There is no mention in the current application of the former library to its restoration and repair for viable reuse;	This is because the former library is not part of this application. It is owned by the County Council.

The bollards are poorly spaced and would be impassable to people riding tri-cycles, adapted cycles for disability or pulling trailers – some bollards are unnecessary and should be removed. Those that remain should be made of rubber or plastic;	The precise position of bollards will be submitted as part of the hard and soft landscaping condition.
Concur with the Highway Development Management’s comments regarding cycle access;	This has been addressed. The doors now open inwards.
Heritage surface course not suitable for all weather usage by certain cycles;	The use of heritage surface is suitable for all round movements. It would not be appropriate to change this to accommodate certain cycles at the expense of the surface appearance.
Both ends of the CT need to be conditioned so they remain open to public at all times;	The interim position is to gate off both ends of the CT until such time it is ready to open.

Further information provided by the applicants

The applicant has submitted the following additional information:

Further clarification on the CWRC. Most of which is confidential but it does confirm that the Council have been assisting the CWRC to relocate offering several alternative locations;

Updated overshadowing study for the revised B.09 building – it shows that the revised design would not cause significant levels of overshadowing on the Kingston Street properties;

Updated daylight and sunlight assessment also submitted. The technical analysis shows that 220 out of 222 windows assessed (99%) and 131 of the 131 rooms tested (100%) within the neighbouring buildings will satisfy the BRE guidelines. Of those that do not the impact is considered to be minor due to the excellent retained levels, or because the reductions are only marginally over the 20% recommended within the BRE guide. For sunlight, all 191 of 191 south facing windows assessed, meet the BRE guidelines for Annual Probable Sunlight Hours.

Updated plan showing the doors for the cycle stores opening inwards to mitigate conflict with users of the Chisholm Trail;

Updated Townscape and Views Assessment and four updated CGI views of the proposed development following revisions to the proposed development;

New Drainage Strategy which includes additional SuDs features.

Additional consultee comments:

Highway Engineer:

- Latest plans remove doors opening outwards onto Chisholm Trail;
- The two access points shown should be provided;
- The sett paving not proposed to be used within the area offered for adoption;
- The proposed forward visibility splays are acceptable;
- Not clear what is proposed for houses by way of cycle parking – provision in the back garden is not recommended in the Draft Local Plan;
- Access to the ramped steps and lift to the basement is through 2 sets of doors this may not be acceptably convenient;
- How steep is the ramp?

Officer Note: The Highway Engineer is content with the outstanding aspects of the highway works in terms of highway safety. I have concluded in my report that provision of cycle parking is acceptable. Cycle parking needs to conform to the current standard as the Draft Local Plan has yet to be adopted.

County Transport Assessment Team:

Transport team comments to be reported orally.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)

LLFA team comments to be reported orally.

Sustainable Drainage officer

The surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development is unacceptable on the basis it is unsustainable and has not demonstrated that the drainage hierarchy has been followed. The infiltration tests demonstrate that the infiltration is feasible across the site. However the strategy has only made provision for infiltration in some areas amounting to 12% of the total site area. One of the primary constraints for the inclusion of SuDS within the proposed surface water drainage strategy, is the density of the proposed development.

The proposed drainage strategy has also not identified the volume required to be stored should the proposed pump fail; therefore it has not been demonstrated if this

volume can be stored within the site safely. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the flood risk to people and property from infrastructure failure has been mitigated.

If officers are minded to approve the application then the following condition is recommended. However the suggestion of conditions should not be considered supportive of the proposed development.

1. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until surface water drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

a. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and

b. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

c. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

2. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until foul water drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, they should also be submitted to Anglian Water and their written acceptance of the scheme submitted to the local planning authority.

3. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

Drainage

I will provide a commentary on drainage issues as part of my presentation in the light of feedback from County Officers if available.

Policy Officer

Comments regarding Protection of Existing Facilities (Paragraph 6.17)

Policy 5/11 Protection of Existing Facilities

Development leading to the loss of a Community Facility will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the facility can at least be replaced at its existing level and quality within the development, or be relocated to another appropriate premises, or site of similar accessibility for its users.

It is understood that CWRC have provided the following within the facility on a city-wide basis:

- Offices and meeting rooms, which can be hired by the local community.
- Career coaching courses, such as career guidance, assertiveness and psychology;
- 'Dawn Project' – supporting women going through the criminal justice system;
- Previous crèche facilities that may have been unused for 18 months

On this basis the Council considers the facility to be D1 as it complies with the criteria within Policy 5/11 Protection of Existing Facilities of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. This policy identifies that community facilities meet the varied needs of residents of Cambridge for health, education and public services as well as social, religious and cultural activities (paragraph 5.19). The basis for community use is also defined as core uses within the D use Class (paragraph 5.22). In Planning Policy terms, all above uses could constitute community facility provision.

In addition to the requirements of policy 5/11 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the similar requirements of Policy 73 in the emerging Local Plan (yet to be adopted). Attention must also turn to the Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief whereby consideration should be given to the re-provision of CWRC, including whether co-location with other community activities is appropriate, or whether separate standalone facility is more suitable. This was approved at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 22 March 2017. The document will be carried forward for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) at the same time as the emerging Local Plan.

The appropriate relocation of the facility has been referenced within the application's Planning Statement and a result of the proposed development CWRC have agreed to relocate to an alternative premises within Cambridge.

To ensure compliance with Policy 5/11 the applicant will need to ensure that it has addressed criterion b) of the Policy:

b. the facility is to be relocated to another appropriate premises or site of similar accessibility for its users; or

Assessment could include evidence to demonstrate that the facility is relocated to at least the existing scale, range, quality and accessibility for its users and that it is retained within the city or the contiguous urban area.

The Facility provides a city-wide function, as such, the relocation within the Cambridge area is considered compliant with the policy and is accessible by public transport. There is however, concern that the replacement floorspace is much reduced to that of the original facility and the quality of the facility is currently unknown.

Officer update note – Protection of Existing Facilities/Relocation of the CWRC/Provision of new community facilities/Commuted sums from other development

Policy 5/11 of the Local Plan permits development which leads to the loss of existing community facilities, only when the facilities are replaced on the site or relocated or where the need for the facility no longer exists. The presence of the Cambridge Women's Resource Centre (CWRC) on the site means that this policy is engaged.

Policy 5/12 supports the provision of new community facilities and Policy 5/14 refers to the expectation that new development which will lead to increased demand for community facilities will make provision or contribution towards community facility provision.

The above policies are reflected in the draft SPD which (at paragraph 4.5.6) refers to potential re-provision of the CWRC as either a facility which is combined with other community facilities or freestanding and provision of new hall/meeting room space.

The proposed development must comply with this policy background unless 'material considerations' suggest otherwise.

The DCMU team has considered the demands for new community facilities arising from the new residents of the scheme. This has resulted in the recommendation of £256,770 towards community meeting space on the site. This would address the requirements under Policy 5/14.

The need to address the relocation of the CWRC needs to be considered separately to this contribution.

Planning permission has been granted to demolish all the buildings on the site at March 7th Planning Committee (under planning permission 17/2192/FUL), and the

Women's Resource Centre has secured alternative accommodation which they will move into on 31st March.

The CWRC do not currently occupy the full extent of the three storey building in the northeast corner of the site; their current activities are carried out from the first floor. The last use of the ground floor was as a crèche and the second floor has been sublet. On the basis of the information that has been provided to me I have regarded the whole building having a D1 Non- residential institution use. The floorspace of the building is 442 sq metres.

Policy 5/11 requires the facility to be relocated to another "appropriate premises or site of similar accessibility". The facility provides a city wide function and so the relocation within Cambridge area is compliant with policy as it is also accessible by public transport, car or cycling. It is also my understanding that the CWRC are engaging with other similar services to collocate with the City Council assistance. Therefore the site is unlikely to be a permanent location.

The site which the CWRC has moved to is smaller in floorspace than the existing site. The new location provides 85sqm of floorspace whereas the current site provides a total of 442sqm of floorspace. Therefore there is a quantitative net loss in D1 community floor space from the site. I have assessed below the issue of loss of D1 floor space from the site.

The proposal includes provision of 51sqm of D1 (or B1) use on the ground floor of block B.09. Through the s106 Agreement additional D1 floorspace can be secured on the remainder of the Mill Road Depot site (within the 'YMCA' site). The floorspace of this building amounts to 250sqm over two floors. In combination these two buildings would provide just over 300sqm of floorspace. If this is compared with the amount of existing D1 floorspace (442sqm) there would be a deficit of between 142sqm and 192sqm depending on whether the B.09 block is used for B1 use or D1 use. If the floorspace that is to be occupied by CWRC on their new site from March is netted off then the deficit in floorspace terms would be between 59sqm and 107sqm.

Policy 5/11 refers to alternative provision being 'to at least its existing level and quality' not specifically to floorspace. In my view the quality of new floorspace would be much higher than is currently available and for this reason the 'deficit' in floorspace is acceptable in planning terms.

In my opinion provided that the s106 Agreement secures the commuted sum for new community facilities on the Mill Road Depot site and the provision of 250sqm of new community space also on the Mill Road Depot site then planning policies will have been complied with.

Although there are no fully detailed proposals for the second part of the Mill Road Depot site ('YMCA') it is worth noting that when this proposal comes forward it will have to comply with planning policy which is likely to include re-provision of the existing community facilities from the YMCA Parkside Piece site.

In addition to this, if on-site community facilities are not brought forward on the Ridgeons site a commuted sum payment will fall due towards community facilities at the Mill Road Depot site.

In combination the Mill Road Depot site is likely to provide a significant quantity and quality of community facilities floorspace.

Provision of health services (NHS)

The existing GP practices do not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development. The development could generate approximately 419 residents and subsequently increase demand upon existing constrained services. Therefore a developer contribution of **£66,079** towards Petersfield Medical practice is required to mitigate the impact of the development.

Amendments To Text:

Paragraph 2.7 – third sentence revised to “B.02 and B.05 would contain *separate dedicated* cycle lifts to the basement to provide ease of access”

Paragraph 2.15 second bullet point, replace ‘*fifth floor*’ with ‘*sixth floor*’;

Paragraph 8.33 second bullet point is incorrect. The 200mm reduction in height of B.09 was from revised proposal that was presented at the Development Control Forum on 14 February 2018. B.09 was amended further following the forum meeting and the total reduction in height from the original design of B.09 (flat roof) to the top of ridge of the amended design (pitched roof) is a 1.7 metres.

Paragraph 8.44 – revise subtitle to *B.05 (5 storeys with a 4 storey element to the east.*

Delete paragraph 8.58 as it is a duplication of paragraph 8.54

Paragraph 8.11 – additional Head of Term to address provision of

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Section 106

Additional Heads of Terms to be agreed:

Contribution of £66,079 towards Petersfield Medical practice.

Community facilities floorspace (250sqm) to be provided within the Mill Road Depot site (Former Gatehouse space)

Conditions update:

New condition:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the interim use of the 6 metre wide strip of land along the eastern boundary of the site to be used for the Chisholm Trail route as shown on drawing no.17024_07_109 rev P3 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the proposed hard and soft landscaping of this area, boundary treatment at each end and a programme of implementing the interim scheme. The interim scheme shall be installed in accordance with the approved detailed.

Reason: To ensure the land is safeguard for the Chisholm Trail in the long term and but used as part of the approved development in the interim (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/7 and 8/5).

Revised conditions:

The applicant has requested the triggers for certain conditions to be amended to give them the opportunity to start certain works on the site at the earliest opportunity. Having consulted with the consultees, officers have agreed to amend the following conditions.

Change the trigger for **conditions 14 (Building Ventilation), 15 (Noise Insulation), 17 (Winter Gardens) and 21 (Building insulation for ground floor of B.09)** to '*prior to commencement of above ground works*' instead of '*prior to commencement of development/before the development hereby permitted is commenced*'.

Condition 31 (Future Management of streets) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established).

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard.

Condition 35 (Foul water) – amend to read as follows:

No drainage works shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure appropriate foul water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

Condition 41 (Boundary treatment) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of the proposed boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details shall include a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

Condition 43 (sample panel of paving) – amend to reads as follows:

Prior to the installation of any surface material except for access requirements, sample panels for all surfacing types shall be displayed on site to a minimum size of 1.0 x 1.0m and shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Sample panels shall show the proposed laying patterns and jointing. The approved sample panels shall be retained on site during the course of the development unless otherwise agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and detailing of the surface material is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/11).

Condition 46 (Archaeology) – amend to read as follows:

No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- A. the statement of significance and research objectives;
- B. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- C. The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

Condition 50 (Public art) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of above ground works (or in accordance with an alternative timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority), a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include the following:

- a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
- b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
- c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
- d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
- e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
- f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
- g) How repairs would be carried out;
- h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Condition 51 (Fire Hydrants) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants has been implemented in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

In the interests of residential safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7).

To secure the 51sqm of B1 or D1 space on the ground floor of B.09 within the S106.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **18/0002/FUL**

Location: Romsey Labour Club, Mill Road

Target Date: 10.04.2018

To Note:

Addresses of additional representations:

1. 140 Cowley Road (Camcycles)
2. 6 Madras Road

Summary of additional representations:

- Camcycle's original concerns labelled (a) through (e) have been addressed by amendments. However they remain sceptical of the principle of basement cycle parking.
- Visitor cycle parking may be too close to the proposed blue badge parking space. It should be shifted to avoid collisions.

- The design of the proposal is unwelcomed and in direct conflict with preservation of the frontage.
- Façadism is the wrong approach as it holds no value, no appreciation nor any consideration to the cultural significance of this historic landmark building - inside and out.
- This planning amounts to is the on-going, systematic dismantling of our cultural heritage here in Romsey.

Officer response to letters of representation:

- The last three bullet points above regarding the poor design and the loss of heritage/loss of a building of architectural significant have been dealt with in the Officer Report.
- Regarding the second point which indicates conflict between the visitor cycle parking and blue badge parking both the Highway Authority and Landscaping are satisfied that this relationship is acceptable. I share this opinion. The amended proposed cycle parking was considered acceptable in paragraph 8.72 of the Officer Report.

Additional Consultee responses:

Lead Local Flood Authority (Cambridge County Council)

Object to the proposal as outlined in paragraph 6.3.8 of the SPD, brownfield (previously developed land) sites must reduce the existing runoff from the site as part of the redevelopment. Where possible, in order to provide betterment, redevelopments should look to reinstate greenfield runoff rates. The applicant has not demonstrated that the storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off from the critical 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, can be provided on site. The applicant has proposed a below-ground surface water system. This is contrary to paragraph 6.3.23 of the SPD which requires the design and layout of a site to seek to manage and convey surface water above-ground, avoiding the use of underground piping as far as possible. The applicant should revise the surface water drainage layout to include above ground SuDS or provide reasonable justification why this is not possible.

Officer response to additional consultee responses:

- The City Council Drainage Team has no objection to this scheme subject to standard drainage conditions which are number 17 and 18.
- I consider the majority of details sought by this consultee response would be attained via these conditions.
- I am of the opinion as this site is in a central urban location and quite constraint in area it is not realistic to expect the majority of the drainage of surface water to take place above the surface. But conditions 17 and 18 will ensure any systems

used will have to comply with national standards.

Amendments To Text:

A sentence in paragraph 8.10 currently incorrectly reads:

As a worst-case scenario, if 40 students were to own cars at this development, this would exacerbate local parking pressures and cause harm to the residential amenity of local residents, many of whom rely on on-street car parking.

It should be amended to read:

As a worst-case scenario, if 37 students were to own cars at this development, this would exacerbate local parking pressures and cause harm to the residential amenity of local residents, many of whom rely on on-street car parking.

The last sentence of paragraph 8.64 currently incorrectly reads:

In addition, the proposed nursery would be of a greater floor area to the two gymnasiums it is proposed to replace.

This sentence should be removed.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2214/FUL**

Location: Land At Anstey Way

Target Date: 17.04.2018

To Note:

Additional representations:

Additional representations have been received from following addresses on the application since the committee report was drafted:

- 3 Paget Road;
- 13 Paget Road;
- 30 Lingrey Court;

I set out below the main issues raised and my response:

Representations	Response
Concerns that a pavement has been shown on the back edge of the rear gardens of Paget Road properties;	There has been a misunderstanding from local residents about the line shown on the site plan drawings at the rear of the Paget Road properties. The line indicates the existing verge and is not showing a new pavement.
Eastern arm of Anstey Way is not wide enough to allow two vehicles to pass;	The Highway Authority has recommended part of the eastern arm to be widened to 5 metres to mitigate conflict with vehicles entering off Anstey Way and vehicles leaving the site. This has now been proposed.
Parking restrictions need to be introduced to control parking along eastern arm of Anstey Way to prevent the rear accesses to Paget Road properties from being blocked;	Parking restricts issue for the County Highway Authority to decide if residents require it.
A one way loop road for Anstey Way is not suitable;	Agreed. This has not been proposed.
Concerns about not being consulted on the revised plans;	Only residents in Paget Road were consulted on the amendments as they related to the eastern elevation which faces them.

Additional comments on consultees:

Consultee comments:

Landscape Officer:

- Welcome the appoint of a landscape team and the updated landscape proposals begin to deal with the concerns about character of the streets;
- The changes of the highway boundaries have put pressure on constrained external landscaping. This is a concern;
- Disappointed with the loss of trees from the site frontage of Anstey Way;

Highway Authority

- The removal of the trees within the visibility splays is to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority;
- No dimensions have been shown on the drawings but provided the carriageways as far as the entrance to each parking court is provided the highway authority is satisfied the proposed layout would present no significant adverse highway impact;

Transport Assessment Team:

- The proposed number of additional trips from the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the local highway network;
- Car ownership information shows that the proposed 50 spaces is very close to the current level of car ownership and therefore should be sufficient to avoid on street parking being a problem;
- In order to encourage sustainable travel Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) should be installed by the developer at two local bus stops on Trumpington High Street. A maintenance contribution will also be required by CCC.
- A residential Travel Plan will be required;
- No objection to the development proposals subject to a Residential Travel Plan being secured, and RTPI being installed at the local bus stops;

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Conditions update:

Delete **condition 10 (highway works)** as this is a duplication of condition 26.

Add new condition:

Tree Pits:

No development shall take place until full details of all tree pits, including those in planters, hard paving and soft landscaped areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

Amend the following conditions:

Condition 7 (Ventilation scheme) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works above ground, details of an alternative ventilation scheme for the habitable rooms on the south and west façades (as highlighted on provided site plan) to negate / replace the need to open windows, in order to protect future occupiers from external traffic noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation

scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour. Full details are also required of the operating noise level of the alternative ventilation system.

The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be fully retained thereafter.

Condition 15 (Material samples) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works above ground, samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

Condition 17 (Hard and soft landscaping) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works above ground full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

Condition 20 (Public art) – amend to reads as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works above ground (or in accordance with an alternative timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority), a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include the following:

- a) Details of the public art and artist commission;
- b) Details of how the public art will be delivered, including a timetable for delivery;
- c) Details of the location of the proposed public art on the application site;
- d) The proposed consultation to be undertaken;
- e) Details of how the public art will be maintained;
- f) How the public art would be decommissioned if not permanent;
- g) How repairs would be carried out;
- h) How the public art would be replaced in the event that it is destroyed;

The approved PADP shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetabling. Once in place, the public art shall not be moved or removed otherwise than in accordance with the approved maintenance arrangements.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Condition 21 (Bird and bat boxes) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works above ground a plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird boxes on the new buildings. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/7).

Condition 27 (Street Trees) – amend to read as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works above ground details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed street trees within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The street trees shall thereafter be maintained in

accordance with the approved management and maintenance details unless local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/11)

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: **APPLICATION REF:** **17/1896/FUL**

Location: Land to The West Of JJ Thomson Avenue And To The North of University Residences, West Cambridge Site, Madingley Road

Target Date: 05.02.2018

To Note:

Additional representation:

West Cambridge Active Travel (WCAT)

The proposed conditions satisfy our objections about cycle parking.

The University is considering replacing lecture theatres in Mill Lane during redevelopment. All of these will generate new journeys to the site that would not have occurred if the building did not exist. Almost all of these journeys will be by cycle with the remainder by the Universal bus or on foot. This will result in increased cycle traffic on the already congested Coton path and other East-West links to town.

The SFH will provide facilities that will not need to be included in future buildings and so it will not cause a net increase in journeys on a fully built out site.

Officer comments

The proposed building will provide (shared) facilities for the occupiers of the campus so that these will not need to be reproduced in future buildings. As such this will mean no net increase in journeys. Any interim use of the facilities is likely to be connected to West Cambridge Site occupiers. Space required to compensate for any loss of teaching space in the city centre would be found locally (i.e. elsewhere in the city centre) to allow timetabling to work.

The Library space within the SFH will be for the Physical Sciences (Physics) and Technology (Engineering). This library will be replicating Engineering library space elsewhere and is not unique to this site. It is intended to allow those parts of

Engineering which are already on site to access the SFH library facilities. This would mean there would be no requirement to travel off site to Trumpington Street.

Amendments To Text:

Transport mitigation:

Paragraph 8.106: Amended to:

A scheme to enhance pedestrian and cycle connectivity (subject to safety audit) identified for Madingley Road, between JJ Thomson Avenue and Lady Margaret Road.

This is to allow some flexibility on the exact final location of the proposal crossing on Madingley Road (within a defined area).

Paragraph 1.8 – To read **The SFH**...(Not Cavendish III).

Paragraph 6.44- should say SFH and also refer to 7 July rather than 10 August.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

None.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2037/FUL**

Location: 87 East Road

Target Date: 27.04.2018

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Condition 11 should be re-worded as follows:

“Prior to the occupation of each of the commercial ground floor units hereby permitted, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such..

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 6/10)”

Condition 20 should be re-worded as follows:

“Prior to the occupation of each of the commercial ground floor units hereby permitted, details of the location of associated duct work, for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved ductwork shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties and the amenity of the student studio units. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/12, 4/13 and 6/10)”

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2230/S73**

Location: Former Milton Road County Primary School,
Milton Road

Target Date: 15.02.2018

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2225/FUL**

Location: 572 Newmarket Road

Target Date: 04.04.2018

To Note:

An additional representation has been received from 574 Newmarket Road.
 The condition number has been omitted in error in paragraph 8.15
 The assessment of the impact on 574 does not explicitly reference the light impact.
 An additional paragraph has been added to clarify the impact in terms of loss of light

Amendments To Text:

- 7.3 An additional representation has been received from 574 Newmarket Road.
 This can be summarised as follows:
 - *The orientation is incorrectly labelled as north south instead of north north-east south south-west.*
 - *The dropped kerb is an improvement but the lack of parking an issue*
 - *The site appears to have been tidied pre-empting planning permission*
- 8.15 As officers, our advice to Members is that the Council does not have required space standards within our development plan and Government guidance states... I propose condition 3 to ensure the gardens are provided in their entirety and retained for the future occupants of the ground floor flats. In this regard, my recommendation is on-balance.
- 8.9 There were concerns that the ground floor element of the extension would have a harmful impact on the amenity of 574 Newmarket Road. This property has a small conservatory to the rear. The proposal would extend an additional 4m into the garden when compared with the existing extension and would run at full width. The original proposal was to be 3.25m in height and was considered to have an overbearing impact on the conservatory and immediate garden area of no.574. The height of the extension adjacent to this boundary has been dropped to 2.4m. I consider that the revised height would reduce the enclosing impact on the immediate garden area and conservatory of no. 574 and whilst the extension would still result in some enclosure to this space, I consider this to no longer be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal. *The reduction in height adjacent to this boundary would also lessen the impact in terms of overshadowing. This extension would result in some late afternoon shading of the immediate garden of 574 but given the relatively low height of the extension, this would be moderate and not significantly harmful to warrant refusal.*
- 8.26 An additional third party representation has been received from 574 Newmarket Road which I will address in the below table:

Representation	Response
The orientation is incorrectly labelled as north south instead of north north-east south south-west.	I am satisfied that the orientation is correctly shown on the plans. The impact on 573 is addressed in paragraphs 8.9 & 8.11
The dropped kerb is an improvement but the lack of parking an issue	See paragraph 8.22

The site appears to have been tidied pre-empting planning permission	Noted but not material to the consideration of the planning application
--	---

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2198/FUL**

Location: Annexe, 29 Garden Walk

Target Date: 30.03.2018

To Note:

Additional representations:

Letters of support have been received from both adjoining occupiers in Garden Walk - 27 Garden Walk and 31 Garden Walk.

Also from:

36 Garden Walk

37 Garden Walk

69A/71A Garden Walk

71 Garden Walk

Manor Place, King Street, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB1 1LE

9 Bateson Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB4 3HF

7 Albert Street, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB4 3BE

12 Orchard Close, Cottenham

51 Station Road, Fulbourn

Additional letter Against:

12 Stretton Avenue

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2078/FUL**

Location: 67 Norfolk Street

Target Date: 30.03.2018

To Note:

Additional representations:

Objection received from 18 Norfolk Terrace, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB1 2NG

A. This **is** one of the last remaining attractive shops in the neighbourhood. It has always been well supported by the neighbourhood and will be a loss of another facility.

B. This area is already one of the most highly populated in Cambridge. It is conceivable that we have reached saturation point for family homes being turned into flats. Flats of course attract student who are a shifting population not often interested in the community or its upkeep or development.

C. Parking is a huge issue in the area and although there are only plans to issue visitors parking this does add to the congested streets.

Support received from Allia Future Business Centre - Central, 47-51 Norfolk Street, Cambridge CB1 2LD

My view would be to support the use as residential; it seems to me that more residential use meets a known demand whereas retail use seems surplus to requirements.

Amendments To Text: The previous application 17/1141/FUL was refused by Planning Committee on 30th August 2018

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2015/FUL**

Location: 1 Vinery Way

Target Date: 18.01.2018

To Note:

Additional comments from Highway Authority

The Highway Authority comments on the revised layout plan that the application shall be assessed on the basis it provides one off-street parking space, with any obsolete dropped kerb replaced with full face kerb to suit.

Officer's response to the comments

As the one off-street parking space has existed on site, a full face kerb has been there to suit the parking space.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/1533/FUL**

Location: 4 Green End Road

Target Date: 08.11.2017

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **17/2227/FUL**

Location: 184 Gwydir Street

Target Date: 15.02.2018

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

GENERAL ITEM Planning Enforcement Update/Planning Enforcement Delegations

To Note:

Comment from Councillor Herbert:

As Leader of the Council I fully support this increased and clearer delegation that will strengthen the powers of the Planning Enforcement team

DECISION:

This page is intentionally left blank