

PLANNING4 September 2019
10.45 am - 4.50 pm**Present:****Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Green, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe**Officers:**

Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly
 Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
 Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
 Senior Planner: Emily Burton
 Senior Planner: Alice Young
 Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
 Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson
 Planner: Mary Collins
 Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
 Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
 Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**19/41/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Lord, McQueen and Page-Croft. Councillor Thornburrow attended as the Alternate.

Councillor Sargeant left after the consideration of item 19/52/Plan.

19/42/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillors Baigent and Smart	All	Personal: Member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Smart	All	Member of bus users' group.
Councillor Green	19/44/Plan	Personal: Owns a small guest house.
Councillor Green	19/45/Plan	Personal: Knows one of the

		objectors. Did not take part in the consideration of this item.
Councillor Thornburrow	19/45/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Spoke as a Ward Councillor and took not part in the consideration of this item.
Councillors Smart and Tunnacliffe	19/47/Plan	Personal: Member of 'Friends of Mitcham's Corner.

19/43/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June and 3 July 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

19/44/Plan Planning Application 18/1002/FUL - 211 - 213 Newmarket Road And 2 Godesdone Road

The Committee adjourned 10:00am until 10:45 whilst Officers and the Chair considered an allegation of procedural and factual errors regarding the consideration of this application.

The Delivery Manager said the complaint was made verbally just prior to the committee's meeting beginning. As the complaint was not made in writing and delivered before Committee. The concerns would be addressed in the Officer's introduction to the application.

The Legal Advisor said the Committee had sufficient detail and facts in the Officer's report enabling it to come to a decision today. A verbal complaint had been made today. Information regarding the application had been in the public domain for some time so there had been sufficient time for the complaint to be put in writing prior to this meeting.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission. The application had been reported to the 17 June 2019 Planning Committee with an Officer recommendation of approval. During the consideration of the application, Members of the Committee raised a number of concerns about the proposal. Members' concerns were sufficient for a move to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation. Members therefore resolved in favour of a 'minded to refuse' decision contrary to the Officer's recommendation resulting with the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP) being applied.

The Committee gave three reasons on which it was minded to refuse planning permission and which are set out in the Officer's report.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing buildings at 211-213 Newmarket Road and construction of a hotel (C1 use), with change of use and conversion of 2 Godesdone Road to C1 use, and provision of associated infrastructure.

The Committee received the Principal Planner's assessment of the three minded to refuse reasons. The Officer corrected a typographical error in the planning report: the loading bay was on the opposite side of the road to the location given in the report and further towards Number 4.

The Chair asked the Committee if they had sufficient information to consider the application today in light of the verbal complaint, or if they wished to defer the application to seek further information. The Committee **unanimously resolved** to consider and determine the application today.

The Committee discussed the following points:

- i. Concerns had not been addressed relative to surface water and foul water drainage.
- ii. The application would not alleviate traffic problems in the area. There was an expectation of higher numbers of cars/people visiting the site if it became a hotel (compared to its current usage).
- iii. Local residents could be disturbed by:
 - a. Taxis dropping off visitors.
 - b. Hotel guests smoking and talking outside the hotel as it had no café/amenity area where guest could congregate.
- iv. Queried if the application was for a super-budget hotel as costs were similar to 'normal' hotels.
- v. Disagreed there was unmet demand for (super budget) hotels in the city. The Hotel Future Study was out of date.

The Principal Planner responded to Councillors:

- i. The Committee were asked to consider the 'minded to refuse' reasons as set out in the Officer's report. All concerns should have been raised and discussed at the 17 June Committee so Members could set out reasons why they were minded to refuse, and confirm which, if any of these were still relevant. New reasons should not be introduced now.

Anglian Water had made a representation, which focussed on surface water.

The Officer:

- i. Recommended an additional foul water drainage condition in response to the representation.
- ii. There were low visitor numbers to the site when Coopers traded from the site. The site had an A1 use so a new user could have higher throughput of visitors (under the existing use).
- iii. The hotel could instruct taxis to drop-off customers in Newmarket Road to minimise disturbance to neighbours although such a requirement would be difficult to enforce. There were no Highways Authority objections to the application.
- iv. The application was described as a super budget hotel. It was similar in cost to others but had fewer facilities.
- v. The Hotel Future Study stated demand for budget hotels had been satisfied. However, Officers were aware that circumstances had changed since the study was commissioned. A business case was also set out in the Applicant's report, so there was a need for overnight accommodation.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 3 – and on Chair's casting vote) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to (1) the conditions recommended therein; (2) the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement securing the planning obligations identified in the Officer's report; (3) the additional conditions recommended within the Highway Authority's consultation responses; (4) a condition requiring foul water drainage details.

19/45/Plan Planning Report - 18/1058/FUL - 60 Trumpington Road and 2 Nightingale Cottages

Councillors Green and Thornburrow neither participated nor voted in the determination of this application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of the former Zahza Grill Restaurant and replacement with 4 terraced dwellings, along with access, parking and landscaping. First floor rear extension to No.2 Nightingale Cottages, with new front door and removal of existing lean-to element.

The Committee noted the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from local residents.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Residents of North Cottages did not object to some development of the site and had worked with the Developer.
- ii. The disputed boundary of the site remains unresolved.
- iii. The proposal would be overbearing.
- iv. Massing of building would be out of keeping with area.
- v. Access for emergency vehicles would be lost.
- vi. Would result in loss of light for neighbours.
- vii. Proposal fails Government guidelines on access arrangements.

Rupert Kirby (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow (the Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. Building proposed to be demolished was a safeguarded Public House and was afforded special protection by policy 76 the 2018 Local Plan.
- ii. Lack of viability of the Public House had not been demonstrated.
- iii. The view of North Cottages from the Public House currently enjoyed some screening.
- iv. The proposal would have a negative impact on North Cottages and in particular No 1.
- v. Dispute over boundary needed to be resolved.
- vi. Existing Hedge should be retained.

The Committee:

Resolved by 4 votes to 0 (unanimous of those taking part in the determination of this item) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers.

19/46/Plan Planning Report - 19/0183/FUL - 3 Saxon Street

Withdrawn from the Agenda

19/47/Plan Planning Report - 19/0046/FUL - The Tivoli, 16 Chesterton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for alterations and repairs to the building including reinstatement of frontages and side walls, bricking up of some openings, replacement windows and fire escape. Creation of second floor element and enclosed roof terraces to first and second floor. Part change of use of the existing building to recreational uses.

The Committee noted the Amendment Sheet.

Oliver Trezise (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the visual impact of proposed plan on the roof of the building. An amendment to condition 13 was agreed regarding the visual impact of plant located on the roof on visual amenity of local residents. This was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the amendment to condition 13 concerning the air conditioning plant.

19/48/Plan Planning Report - 19/0400/FUL - 348 Milton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey dwelling to the rear of 348 Milton Road.

The Committee raised concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles. An informative regarding mitigation measures was proposed which was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including an informative relating to fire access.

19/49/Plan Planning Report - 19/0707/FUL - 62-64 King Street

The Committee received a retrospective application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective change of use from A1 to A1 with an associated A3 or A4 use in the alternative.

The Committee noted the 3 additional conditions proposed by the Environmental Health Department regarding noise, use of the courtyard and plant, as detailed in the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Concerns regarding noise and anti-social behaviour in a largely residential area.
- ii. Alcohol consumption and associated problems.
- iii. Evening and late-night noise disturbance.
- iv. Impact on nearby social housing.
- v. Concentration of similar food and drink establishments in a small area.
- vi. Obstruction of the footpath.
- vii. Smoking outside the front of the building.

Sam Owens (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers including three additional conditions relating to (1) the hours of use of the courtyard; (2) playing music in the courtyard; and (3) plant noise insulation.

19/50/Plan Planning Report - 19/0252/FUL - 342 Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the replacement of existing outbuilding to two storey annex to the rear of the garden.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 2) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

19/51/Plan Planning Report - 18/1319/FUL - 24 Elfleda Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a 2 bedroom bungalow in the rear garden of 24 Elfleda Road.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The Officer's report was incorrect in suggesting that loss of light to neighbours would be insignificant.
- ii. The proposal would result in significant loss of afternoon and early evening light to number 25.
- iii. The proposed roof height would be overbearing to number 25.
- iv. The existing fence was of a wire construction and allowed light through. Replacing this with a board fence would result in a feeling of enclosure.
- v. Treatment of the boundary was unclear.

In response to concerns raised by the Committee, the Officer proposed additional conditions regarding (1) boundary treatment and (2) hard and soft landscaping.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the

Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers including the addition of conditions regarding (1) boundary treatment and (2) hard and soft landscaping.

19/52/Plan Planning Report - 19/0555/FUL - 84 Ditton Lane

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the sub-division of the existing site to build new one and a half storey 2-bed detached dwelling to the rear, and bike store.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Local residents do not feel they had the chance to respond to the application due to very limited advertising of the plans.
- ii. Development would increase parking pressure.
- iii. Building on a blind corner would endanger local children on their way to school.
- iv. A single storey unit would be more appropriate.
- v. Building could be located further back in the site.

Chris Todd (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed a boundary treatment condition regarding low level planning and landscaping should be added to the Officer's recommendation, which was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and subject to two additional conditions relating to (1) hard and soft landscape and (2) boundary treatment, as follows:

14 No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed

planting to the front of the property to provide defensible space. The planting adjacent to the northern elevation shall be kept at a low level to ensure it does not restrict visibility of the footway.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

15. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

19/53/Plan Planning Report - 18/1712/FUL - 198A Kings Hedges

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extensions to existing development of flats (including an additional floor) to create three additional flats and one duplex unit.

In response to concerns raised by the Committee, the Officer proposed additional conditions regarding (1) boundary treatment and (2) soft landscaping, which were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including additional conditions relating to (1) boundary treatment and (2) soft landscaping.

The meeting ended at 4.50 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING

2 October 2019

10.05 am - 6.10 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Lord, McQueen, Page-Croft, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Councillors McQueen left after the vote on item 19/0902/FUL.

Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown

Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton

Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward

Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Senior Planner: Alice Young

Planning Enforcement Officer: John Shuttlewood

Planner: Mary Collins

Planner: Nick MacDermott

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/54/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Green and Baigent. Councillor Thornburrow attended as the Alternate.

19/55/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Sargeant	19/58/Plan	Personal: Member of Camcycle and Cambridge Area Bus Users Group.
Councillor Smart	19/60/Plan	Personal: Used to work for Disability Cambridge and

		knows the people who live next to the development but no representations had been made to him.
Councillor Thornburrow	19/63/Plan	Personal: Would speak as a Ward Councillor and not as a Committee Member.

19/56/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 August 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

19/57/Plan 19/0340/FUL - John Banks Honda 444 Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of student accommodation with 154 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings). Together with ancillary accommodation comprising common/study rooms, laundry room, management office, plant room, bin and bicycle enclosures, landscaping and associated infrastructure including a Sub-Station.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to amended conditions on the Amendment Sheet. Details had been changed in response to comments from consultees that had been received close to the committee date.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a Camcycle Representative.

- i. This application was not truly sustainable.
- ii. People would have difficulty accessing the site by bicycle.
- iii. It would be difficult to access the Chisholm Trail.
- iv. If the application were to be approved, the following might be appropriate to secure by condition:
 - a. Power assisted cycle storage facilities.
 - b. A toucan crossing near the site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a Cambridge Past, Present and Future Representative.

- i. CPPF did not object to the application of itself.
- ii. Expressed concern that modern flats were being installed behind the Leper Chapel. This would cause harm to the setting of the chapel, as referenced in the Urban Design Team's comments (P38 of the agenda pack).
- iii. The city was growing, this development could impact on its character. Any harm done to the historic character needed to be mitigated in some way.
- iv. If this application were approved some form of compensation was required to mitigate its appearance in the setting of the Leper Chapel, plus the local distinctiveness provided by Barnwell Lake and the adjoining meadows.

Mr Pittock (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to remove reference to "local" in "local resident streets" in the student management plan to mitigate parking across the city.

The amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the drainage management scheme should be in place prior to commencement.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer's report, subject to:

- i. The conditions recommended by the Officers.
- ii. The prior completion of a S106 Agreement to secure:
 - a. The financial contributions specified in paragraphs 8.32 – 8.34 with delegated authority for officers to negotiate an appropriate financial contribution for a toucan crossing (if required) as described in paragraph 8.35; and
 - b. A planning obligation which secures the planning objectives in the

Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 46 and its supporting text (For the avoidance of doubt these objectives are: the securing of a formal agreement and appropriate controls, to ensure the development is solely occupied by the identified institution, Anglia Ruskin University, during term time and to ensure Proctorial control over the ownership of cars by students occupying the development.); and

iii. The following additional conditions:

Environmental Health conditions

Plant noise condition

Prior to the installation of plant, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

Acoustic assessment compliance

The noise insulation scheme and mitigation requirements as stated within the Cass Allen “noise assessment” revision 2 dated 4th March 2019 (RP01-18774) shall be fully implemented, maintained and not altered.

Artificial Lighting

Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded).

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Alternative ventilation scheme

Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of an alternative ventilation scheme for the accommodation units 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. 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.

Drainage Conditions

Surface water drainage scheme

No development, apart from above ground works and demolition, hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with Cambridge City Council local plan policies, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Flood risk and drainage strategy prepared by Richard Jackson (ref: 48949) dated March 2019 and shall also include:

- a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including 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 and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions, pipe reference numbers, green roof, permeable paving and rain gardens;
- d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
- e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- f) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- g) Temporary storage facilities if the development is to be phased;
- h) A timetable for implementation if the development is to be phased;
- i) 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;

- j) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- k) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water
- l) Formal agreement from a third party if discharging into their system is proposed, including confirmation (and evidence where appropriate) that sufficient capacity is available.
- m) The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG.

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development.

Management and Maintenance

No development, apart from above ground works and demolition, hereby permitted shall be commenced until details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason

To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publically adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Foul Drainage

No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development

Green Roof Policy

Notwithstanding the approved plans, all flat roofed elements within the development shall be green or brown roofs. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of these green or brown roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include details of build-ups, make up of substrates, planting plans for biodiverse roofs, methodologies for translocation strategy and drainage details where applicable. The green roofs shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of responding suitably to climate change and water management (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 31)

Management Condition

The development shall be occupied and managed only in accordance with a Student Housing Management Plan that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of occupation of the development and shall prohibit students from owning cars within the city.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and impact on the local highway network (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 46 and 81).

19/58/Plan 17/0869/FUL - 19-21 Godesdone Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a residential development containing five units (one 2xbed flats, three 1xbed flats and one studio unit) following demolition of the existing buildings on site.

The Principal Planner made reference to amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

Peter McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 2) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (unanimously) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The proposal by virtue of the lack of external amenity space for flats 3, 4 and 5 fails to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity for future occupants of these units. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 50 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
- ii. The proposal harms the character of the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area by virtue of the scale and bulk of the proposal which would be out of proportion with the traditional forms of this part of the Conservation Area. The eaves and ridge height would interrupt the predominant roofline and would be unduly visually dominant. The presence of dormer windows on the front elevation would be out of character with Godesdone Road which forms part of the Conservation Area. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 61 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

19/59/Plan 18/1661/FUL - 44 George Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing house and replacement with two new dwellings (1 one-bedroom house and 1 two-bedroom house).

The Planning Officer referred to further letters of objection. Details of the properties and a summary of the objections was contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident on behalf of themselves and a neighbour.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. This was the third planning application on this site.
- ii. Overlooking into rear garden was cited as a reason to reject an earlier planning application in respect of the property.
- iii. Impact on the amenity of the neighbour's garden.
- iv. Obscure glass was not sufficient to prevent overlooking.
- v. The developer had not meaningfully consulted with neighbouring residents.

- vi. Net loss of 2 parking spaces, which would add pressure to on-street parking where 100% of spaces were occupied overnight.
- vii. Overdevelopment of the site.
- viii. The development did not meet the Lifetime Homes requirement.
- ix. The development would remove a 3 bed house and replace it with a 2 bed house and a 1 bed unit.
- x. Disagreed with the case officer's summary report, it did not accurately reflect the significant overlooking of the Objector's house.

Dan Brown (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Dalzell (West Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Residents had raised concerns with him.
- ii. Noted the Applicant's comments and acknowledged that he had attended a resident's meeting and wanted him to continue to work pro-actively.
- iii. Overlooking.
- iv. Overdevelopment of the site.
- v. Referred to unit 2, which included a fourth level as a basement, noting that no planning use had been specified for it.
- vi. Referred to paragraph 8.6 of the Officer's report which dealt with space standards.
- vii. Commented that unit 2 could be advertised and sold as a 2 bed property, whilst permission would be for a 1 bed property.
- viii. Noted there was no ensuite in unit 2, which might be expected in a 1 bed property, but instead the bathroom and toilet are shown separate.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/60/Plan 19/0902/FUL - 23A Hooper Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use from existing automobile repair shop (vacant unit) to a mixed use Class B2 (microbrewery)

and Class A4 (drinking establishment) and installation of cycle storage facilities.

The Planning Officer referred to amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The primary issue was noise concerns from large numbers of people drinking outside and inside where there was poor insulation.
- ii. Authorities were aware of noise issues as complaints had been made.
- iii. Questioned if anyone would like a drinking establishment at the back of their garden.
- iv. Referred to Environmental Health Officer comments in paragraph 6.4 of the report.
- v. Commented that current provider did not stop customers drinking on the street when the weather was fine, so gates / fences were required.
- vi. Commented on a discrepancy in the hours of operation between paragraphs 8.18 and 10.5 of the officers report.

Sam Calverley (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer explained the discrepancy in the hours of operation and confirmed (with reference to the Environmental Health team's comments) that the hours conditioned were correct.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers including the verbal update to correct a typographical error on condition 11 be amended to read:

11. The premises shall be operated and used for the purposes as details/defined within the Planning Statement; Ref: Calverleys Brewery, 23a Hooper Street, Cambridge (prepared by Maidenhead Planning and dated 4th June 2019) and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Class A4 or B2 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)

Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to the Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) without the granting of a specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

Councillor McQueen left the meeting after the consideration of this item and did not return.

19/61/Plan 18/1828/FUL - 80 Chesterton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a new two storey dwelling.

Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded an additional landscaping condition to restrict car parking.

The amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by all present) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers with three additional conditions:

17. Prior to the occupation of the development, a landscape scheme to prevent off-street car parking outside the new dwelling, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved landscape scheme shall be installed prior to occupation of the new dwelling. The landscape scheme shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: in the interest of visual amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 61)

18. Prior to occupation of the development, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. The boundary

treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy and to ensure it allows movement of hedgehogs (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 70).

- 19 Prior to the occupation of the dwelling, a plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird boxes on the new building. The bird boxes shall be installed prior to the occupation of the new dwelling and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: to provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site (Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 70).

19/62/Plan 19/0212/FUL - Oakley Lodge, 627-631 Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use from Hotel (C1 Use) to House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (sui-generis).

The Senior Planning Officer referred to the amendment contained in the amendment sheet.

John Dadge (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

19/63/Plan 19/0511/FUL - 10 Chaucer Road

Councillor Thornburrow left the Committee table for the determination of this item taking no part in it other than to address the Committee as a Ward Councillor. She moved to the public seating area.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing indoor swimming pool and linking conservatory, and demolition of single storey garage and storage shed. Internal alterations to York House, including replacement of windows. Erection of 2 storey side extension containing private swimming pool and fitness room. Erection of detached single storey, oak framed garage and detached outbuildings.

The Planning Officer referred to amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Circulated an additional site plan.
- ii. The property was a Building of Local Interest.
- iii. A private leisure facility was proposed to be built.
- iv. The proposal was a large addition, over 29 metres long, over 2 floors.
- v. The position of the development along the boundary was troublesome.
- vi. Referred to impacts detailed on the shadow diagrams during the month of March.
- vii. Height, length and position of development would create shadowing.
- viii. Questioned if the development was fair or reasonable.
- ix. Referred to pumps / boilers being positioned on the boundary and the potential for vibrations and noxious gas from these structures.
- x. Development was contrary to the Southacre Conservation Area plan.

Alison Wilkinson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow (Trumpington Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to Local Plan policies 55 and 58 and context of development.

- ii. The development was within the Southacre Conservation Area.
- iii. Development should preserve or enhance existing conservation Area.
There were no public benefits which outweighed the harm proposed in this development to the neighbours of the Southacre Conservation Area.
- iv. The scale of the development was large and would double the footprint of the existing building.
- v. Increasing plot density.
- vi. Chaucer Road had a discreet character area.
- vii. Both properties were examples of Edwardian Arts and Craft buildings.
- viii. Questioned whether the development preserved the setting of both of the historical buildings.
- ix. Referred to policy 197 of the NPPF.

The Committee took a vote on the officer's recommendation and this was lost by 2 votes to 3.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 2) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (by 3 votes to 2) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The proposal, by virtue of its bulk, scale, mass, proximity to 12 Chaucer Road, including the introduction of three boiler flues to the common boundary, would result in an un-neighbourly form of development, causing an unacceptable and overbearing impact, overshadowing and consequent loss of amenity to the occupiers of 12 Chaucer Road, contrary to policies 55 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
- ii. The proposed development, by virtue of its bulk, scale and massing would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the South Acre conservation area, contrary to policies 55, 58 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

19/64/Plan 19/0469/FUL - 101 Perse Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use to an 8 bed (10 person) HMO (sui generis), together with erection of two-storey side and rear extension, single-storey front and rear extensions, rear roof extension, and detached cycle store in rear garden.

The Planning Officer referred to an amendment contained in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Did not object to people extending their properties but this development was solely for profit.
- ii. There could potentially be 10 vehicles at the property, so parking could be an issue. Questioned where the vehicles would be park.
- iii. Commented that plans did not show the children's play area and noted that existing resident's parked on a public footpath.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/65/Plan 18/1552/S73 - 8 Seymour Street

Determination of this application was deferred to allow for the provision of further supporting information and plans to clarify the impact of the development on adjoining residential windows.

19/66/Plan 19/0169/FUL - 18 Eltisley Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought retrospective planning permission for a single storey rear extension and decking.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. No consultation had taken place.
- ii. Assumed work would be minor and similar to other work which had been completed elsewhere on the street.
- iii. Had approached planning enforcement who confirmed that a retrospective planning application was required.
- iv. Had lost the chance to be involved in the development of the application due to delays.
- v. The scale of the glazing was visually dominant at the rear and side of the house.
- vi. The decking increased the overlooking.
- vii. Disagreed with the officer's statement that the extension did not significantly adversely impact on neighbour's amenity.
- viii. Suggested as a compromise the glazing was replaced.

The Applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The main issue to be considered was privacy between two terraced properties in a Conservation Area.
- ii. Applicant believed they were able to undertake the development under permitted development rights following advice from the planning department, however was subsequently advised by officers that the development was not permitted development and that a retrospective application would need to be submitted.
- iii. Noted that the properties were late 19th / early 20th century and may require some updating for modern living.
- iv. Referred to Cambridge Local Plan policy 58 and paragraphs b) and e); which dealt with use of materials and the impact on the surrounding area and neighbouring properties and amenity value. He thought this was a balanced judgement. He noted that one Ward Councillor took a different view but his view was that the application did not meet requirements contained in policy 58.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved (by all present) to grant the application for retrospective planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

19/67/Plan 19/0992/FUL - 2 Green End Road

The Committee agreed by a majority vote to defer determination of this application, applying the 6pm Committee cut off.

19/68/Plan Cambridge Science Park

The proposal seeks to provide a framework through a s106 Agreement which will manage car parking on the Cambridge Science Park and encourage a modal shift away from single car use. A Member Briefing on the proposal was delivered to the Cambridge City Council Planning Committee in September 2019. If the proposal was agreed the framework would be a material planning consideration on planning applications for providing a car parking cap for any future schemes on the Science Park.

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planning Officer.

A member of the public made the following comments:

- i. Their aim was to reduce pollution.
- ii. The report stated that car parking would increase.
- iii. The Principal Planning Officer referred to a Member Briefing which members of the public were not able to attend.
- iv. Commented that the report stated it would take 8 years to restore car parking levels to that pre-development.
- v. There was no mechanism for reporting back to the Committee.
- vi. There was no mention of a s106 Agreement in the report and this only appeared in the recommendation.
- vii. Noted that the application would link into work being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership in relation to transport provision.
- viii. Questioned how the matter would be enforced.
- ix. Asked the committee to reject the recommendation.

Guy Kaddish (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the Officer's report:

- i. The report did not take into account the Climate Emergency which the Council had declared.
- ii. Increased car parking may encourage members of the public to use their cars.
- iii. The s106 Agreement was a way to change policy so that the number of parking spaces could be reduced without putting the applicants in breach of planning conditions.
- iv. Understood only half of the car parking spaces on the Cambridge Science Park were utilised.
- v. Questioned parking controls on the site.
- vi. Questioned if there were any limits on the number of car parking spaces on the Cambridge Science Park.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Members' questions:

- i. The proposed s106 Agreement (to be executed by Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and the landowner) would form a material consideration in the determination of any future planning applications within the red line of the Science Park .
- ii. The North East Cambridge Area Action Plan should include transport guidelines for future development.
- iii. The s106 Agreement seeks to limit the number of car parking spaces going forward.
- iv. South Cambridgeshire District Council had a policy requirement to provide 1 parking space per 30sqm, Cambridge City Council had a requirement to provide 1 parking space per 40sqm, the Hub had a requirement for the provision of 1 parking space per 45sqm.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 0) to delegate authority to officers to negotiate, secure and complete, the S106 Agreement for car park management on the Cambridge Science Park.

The meeting ended at 6.10 pm

CHAIR