

## PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 25<sup>th</sup> April 2018

### Amendment Sheet

### MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1372/FUL

Location: 291 Hills Road

Target Date: 30.05.2018

#### To Note:

Further representations objecting to the proposal have been received from the owners/occupants of the following addresses:

- 14 Birch Close
- 29 Garden Walk
- 29 Urwin Gardens

The representations raise issues relating to principle, demolition and character which have been addressed in my report, and the application of the affordable housing policy and further concerns about highway safety, which I have addressed below.

#### **Affordable housing**

Third party representations have raised concerns about the assessment of the proposal against Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/5 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008). Policy 5/5 sets a threshold of proposals with 15 or more dwellings or on sites of 0.5ha or more providing 40% affordable housing. As set out in paragraph 8.4 of the officer report the proposal does not trigger this requirement.

The third party objector has referred to the Affordable Housing SPD (2008) which states in relation to policy 5/5 that: *“In considering whether a development meets the threshold for providing affordable housing, it is the net increase in the number of dwellings on a site that will be considered, except where the site consists of the site of a single dwelling (discounting any subsidiary dwellings such as those for a dependent relation or domestic assistant), when the gross number of new dwellings will be considered. The intention is to lessen the financial penalty involved in the redevelopment of existing housing areas and buildings, which are often built to low sustainability standards and which often use land inefficiently, but not to incentivise the loss of large single-family dwelling houses which are limited in numbers within the City.”*

It is the third party objector's view that under the SPD, the gross number of dwellings

should be used. In this case, there would be 15 units which under the SPD would trigger the 40% affordable housing requirement.

The Policy Team has been consulted and has provided a response. In summary, this states 'It is the Council's view that the wording within the SPD with regard to the loss of large residential units has consistently not been applied in the determination of planning applications'. Their response refers to an application at No. 149 Histon Road (14/1254/FUL) for 15 dwellings following demolition of a building in residential use. Affordable housing was not sought on this proposal.

Notwithstanding this, the Council's view is that policy 5/5 should be given most weight as the adopted Development Plan policy. Although the wording of policy 5/5 is not prescriptive about how to calculate the net or gross increase, the Council has consistently applied this as the net increase, which is an approach generally adopted by other local planning authorities.

The Affordable Housing SPD (2008) is adopted guidance however is considerably outdated. The wording referred to above is inconsistent with Development Plan policies as there are no policies within the adopted Local Plan (2006) that resist the loss of large family dwellings or which seek to make most efficient use of land. Moreover, this wording is not carried forward into the draft Affordable Housing SPD (June 2014) which has been subject to public consultation and is expected to come forward following adoption of the emerging Local Plan.

For these reasons, it is officer's view that policy 5/5 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008) have been correctly applied and the proposal does not trigger affordable housing requirements. It is for members to decide the weight to be accorded to the SPD in determining this application, however officers would remind members that supplementary guidance does not have the same legal status as the development plan.

## **Highways**

County Councillor Taylor and City Councillor Moore (Ward Councillors) have raised concerns about traffic congestion, accidents, air and noise pollution in the hospital area, as well as parking and traffic. Their concerns are based on the junction being already over capacity at the morning and evening peaks, as well as the cumulative impact of other developments within the vicinity adding to traffic congestion. Their concerns can be summarised as:

- Highway safety issues from vehicles exiting the proposed access turning right onto Queen Edith's Way.
- Awkward traffic movements from the exit onto Queen Edith's Way would impact on safety of pedestrians as there is no pedestrian crossing on Queen Edith's Way.
- Impact of delivery vehicles and refuse lorries blocking traffic.
- Clarification of traffic movements during peak hours.

A response from the Highways Authority was received which reiterated their

previous consultee responses. In summary:

- Whilst the proposal increases the density of the site it is still, in numbers very small and it is the overall impact of the development that is assessed.
- Not considered that right turns would cause severe detriment to highway safety.
- Parking provision, of itself, does not generate trips; it is the land use, in this case residential, that does that. In Cambridgeshire a single dwelling would, on average, be anticipated to generate 8.5 trips. That is an overall figure, and flats, generally, generate fewer trips than houses. The figure relates to all trips, by any mode of transport. However, using that figure of 8.5, to err on the side of caution, 10% of those trips would occur in each of the peak hours. In Queen Edith's 40% of work trips are by motor vehicle. Using this figure to generate the morning and evening peak generation this estimates the number of motor vehicle movements as  $15 \times 8.5 \times 0.1 \times 0.4$ , which equals 5.1. Whilst this is an incremental increase in traffic, the Highways Authority would not regard it as a significant increase in the overall traffic levels and is not one that would impact upon capacity when the junction is modelled, being well under the level of sensitivity of the modelling.
- In regard to pedestrian access to the site, the pedestrian crossing facilities at the Hills Road/Queen Edith's Way/Long Road junction are retained and all movements previously catered for remain possible. The only issue is the degree of detriment resultant from a possible increase in pedestrian movements crossing Queen Edith's Way to access the south side of that road, or the eastern side of Hills Road. Again the Highways Authority does not consider that this impact is severe and an objection on these grounds sustained. Similarly, with the increased number of servicing movements.

For these reasons, the assessment within the officer report remains unchanged.

## **Demolition**

A representation has been received from Jon Harris (Flat 2, 24 Green Street) in his capacity as a member of the Council's Design and Conservation Panel, who gave his view that while presently enjoying no statutory status, and not lending itself to substantial extension or subdivision, it is worthy of preserving as a family home. In summary this is on the grounds of:

- The house should be considered in relation to No. 289, the former coach house to the rear, the site of "The Orchard", 287A, and the elements of historic planting which remain in the garden.
- The building doesn't aim for architectural statement, but is fresh, comfortable and all of a piece with interesting and elegant original features.
- The building has been underpinned and appears to be in healthy condition.
- The building forms a full stop to the succession of Edwardian houses along this part of Hills Road.
- The connection to the historic Hiam family.

A representation was received from John Preston (6 Golding Road) as the former Historic Environment Manager, Cambridge City Council who commissioned the Suburbs and Approaches studies, who concurred with the assessment of significance from Jon Harris. He goes on to say that, had this information been available during the Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches study, he would have expected the study to include specific reference to 289 and 291 as an architectural composition. In his view, No. 291 and its garden are of considerable local historical interest and should be considered as non-designated heritage assets.

A response from the Conservation Team has been sought and will be reported as an update to the committee.

Amendments To Text:      None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Removal of the recommended public art condition 31 which was listed in error and was not referred to within the assessment. Officers do not consider a public art strategy is required in order to make the development acceptable.

Minor corrections to wording of conditions to remove typographical errors.

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION:      First

ITEM:                      APPLICATION REF:              17/1757/FUL

Location:      283 Queen Edith's Way

Target Date:              02.05.2018

To Note:      Nothing

Amendments To Text:      None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:      None

**DECISION:**

---

## MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 18/0086/FUL

Location: 25 Hale Street

Target Date: 27.4.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: Paragraph 8.12: refers in error to Hale Street, should read:

“The application site is situated to the north of [7 and 8 Clare Street ]. The proposed garden room is separated from these neighbours by the width of Clare Street. Although one of the objections to this application points out that Clare Street is quite a narrow street it is not significantly narrower than other similar streets in the surrounding area (two cars' width and pedestrian footpaths).”

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

### **DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 18/0127/S73

Location: 23 Baldock Way

Target Date: 02.05.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

### **DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 18/0092/FUL

Location: 16 Thirleby Close

Target Date: 02.05.2018

To Note: A revised site plan has been submitted which moves the bin collection area further to the front of the site; away from plot 1.

Two additional representations have been received from 21 Thirleby Close. These reiterate previous comments and include some minor changes to previous representations. Photographs are also included.

An additional comment has been received from the Historic Environment Team (County Council). An additional condition regarding archaeology is recommended.

Amendments To Text:

#### **Historic Environment Team (Archaeology)**

6.9 No objection: Our records indicate that the proposed development is located in an area of high archaeological potential, situated within 100m of the known former course of Akeman Street, a major Roman routeway which ran north from Cambridge towards Ely and on to the coast at Brancaster. We do not object to development from proceeding in this location but consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through the inclusion of a negative condition.

7.5 Two additional representations have been received from 21 Thirleby Close. These comments reiterate previous points and go into some further detail. Some photographs are also included. The additional information can be summarised as follows:

- Concerned about access by large emergency vehicles
- Disagree with the agents assessment regarding the need for parking

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: An additional condition regarding archaeology is recommended.

19. No demolition/development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological works has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/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.

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.

A brief for the archaeological works can be obtained from this office upon request.

Reason: To protect potential features of archaeological importance, Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/9.

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/2261/FUL

Location: 45 Nightingale Avenue

Target Date: 07.03.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 18/0119/FUL

Location: Pavilion, Chesterton Recreation Ground

Target Date: 27.04.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 18/0076/FUL

Location: Field House, Conduit Head Road

Target Date: 27.04.2018

To Note: A daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report has been submitted.

Two additional representations have been received from 3 Bradrushe Fields. These reiterate previous comments after reviewing the minor revisions to the scheme and the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report. Photographs are also included.

The Ecology Officer has reviewed the Ecology report; an additional condition is recommended.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: An additional condition regarding ecology is recommended.

11. No development shall take place (including any demolition, ground works, site clearance) until the results of the DNA Great Crested Newt surveys have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority, along with any necessary method statements for demolition, construction and proposed mitigation.

The content of the method statement shall include the:

- a) purpose and objectives for the proposed works;
- b) detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives (including, where relevant, type and source of materials to be used);
- c) extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- d) timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;
- e) persons responsible for implementing the works;
- f) initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant);
- g) disposal of any wastes arising from works.



The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To comply with policy 4/6 of the Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/2231/FUL

Location: 92 Norfolk Street

Target Date: 27.04.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/2250/FUL

Location: 20 Kinnaird Way

Target Date: 27.04.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 17/1615/FUL

Location: 156-158 Mowbray Road

Target Date: 26.04.2018

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---