

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 3rd February 2021

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Circulation: First Item: 5
Reference Number: 20/01972/OUT
Address: Netherhall Farm Worts Causeway
Determination Date: 28.02.2021

To Note:

- An additional representation has been received confirming holding objection by residents of the Netherhall Farmhouse, Netherhall Grange and The Cartlodge. Concerns were raised in relation to the emergency route, in terms of its operation and the variance between access design and illustrative masterplan. Officers note the level of detail required by the representation will be subject of reserved matters and that only the access design 19/124/TR/020 is recommended for approval at this outline stage. The illustrative masterplan is an indicative plan and the overall scheme including required detailing of the route's layout and landscape will be subject of reserved matters.
- The Local Highways Authority (Major Development team) has confirmed to be satisfied that the applicants have thoroughly explored all potential points of pedestrian and cyclist connection towards facilities north of the site.
- The County Council's Archaeological Officer has submitted further comments to confirm that the revised applications do not alter the advice previously issued on 23/09/2019, including the required conditions.
- The City Council's Neighbourhood Community Development team have submitted further comments reiterating their preference for a community space (D1 use) to be provided on the GB2 site. In the event this does not come forward, the team have updated their request for off-site contributions towards (i) community facilities within a 1-mile radius of the site, within the city boundary; and/or (ii) new equipment or small improvements of facilities in the Queen Edith's ward. Amended planning obligation in the next section.
- Pre-commencement conditions have been amended following discussions with applicants. Agreed

amendments are set out in the next section.

Amended conditions:

Condition 25

Removal of the text 'includes soil management plan and'.

Condition 26

Removal of the text 'The electric vehicle charge point parking spaces shall be exclusively reserved for electric vehicle charging', as this applies to non-residential areas and the application is for the residential use only.

Condition 34

Removal of the text 'including their accurate location'.

Condition 35

Excluded in its integrity as evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to improve pedestrian and cyclist connectivity.

Condition 36

Title amended to replace 'Pavement' to 'Footway'.

Condition 38

Condition wording amended to correct the typo and replace 'Stagey' with 'Strategy'.

Amendments to
Text:

Amended planning obligation:

- Community Facilities: Financial contributions to be calculated proportionately to the number and size of dwellings approved with each reserved matters application, towards the provision of a Community Facility (including equipment) within D1 use class of the Use Classes order 1987, with amount of gross internal floor area to be provided by the City Council which fulfils the community needs of the residents of GB1 and GB2. Where the Community Facility at GB1 / GB2 is not provided, the money is to be allocated towards the provision of and / or improvement of Community Facilities ~~and equipment at~~ **within a 1-mile radius of the site and within the City boundary** ~~within Queen Edith's, Trumpington and/or Cherry Hinton wards and / or new equipment or small improvements for community facilities within Queen Edith's ward.~~

Pre-Committee
Amendments to

As above.

Recommendation:

Decision: APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement and the conditions (as amended).

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Circulation: First Item:
Reference Number: 20/03501/FUL
Address: Land at Barnes Close
Determination Date: 13.10.2020

In light of some third parties not being able to attend Planning Committee to make representations in front of the Committee, statements have been submitted. These are in full below.

Statements

To Note:

1. Annex 232 Peverel Road: Supporter raising question. *“Regarding the Car Club (car sharing scheme) space allocated on the site: This car club space is currently allocated to the Enterprise Car Club scheme -- a partnership with Cambridge City Council and Enterprise Car Club. Allocated to the parking space (here and at several other points around Cambridge), Enterprise Car Club have provided a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle. Since December 2020, I have been liaising with the Enterprise Car Club management, as a car club scheme member. Their position appears to be that the car also works on petrol so it does not need to be charged and therefore it is not a matter for them to sort out a plug in the parking space. Practically, this means the Car Club space is occupied by a car with an incredibly inefficient petrol engine and heavy, permanently drained batteries filling the boot -- entirely counterproductive to an environmentally friendly car sharing partnership with the city. It would be a terrible outcome if the council and developers did not seek a better solution to this --- at least, for the purposes of this site plan, addressing it in this site design. Please consider power provision to this space.”*
2. 7 Barnes Close: *“Please do take into consideration the impact that this will have on the residents of*

Barnes close, especially the residents and children who live directly next to the proposed pods.

No resolution has been decided on additionally parking should the garages be demolished. 2 options were proposed but rejected as this would not benefit the residents. No decision should be made until this has been resolved. Many of the garages are used by residents as there isn't enough parking around the street, this will have a heavy impact on the already very clogged streets. Hill advertise that they use abandoned plots to build pods, yet they are going to knock down well used, needed garages, these were also recently refurbished.

Barnes close is very narrow and often emergency vehicles would struggle to get down the road, how are construction vehicles going to make deliveries etc. Would we be guaranteed access to parking and our homes at all times and have any measures been put into place if any of our vehicles are damaged, as i have said the street is very narrow and large vehicles would struggle to get past our parked cars. The construction workers would also need parking during the day, as many people are now working from home we struggle to get parked and with additional workers trying to park would cause a large issue.

Many other areas have been proposed as a better situated sites, have these been looked at and assessed. There are many abandoned areas around abbey/ cambridge areas which would be much better suited to house the pods rather than a residential street.

The pods are in close proximity of the newmarket road pods, (Within 5 minutes) The already problematic abbey ward shops/area would have to serve both pods, surely this would make sense to spread the pods to different areas to prevent anti social behaviour.

The pods are directly opposite a school and the garage site is a cycle/walking route for people wishing to access Barnwell road. Many school children for Galfrid School, Netherhall and Parkside federation use this every day.

Building the pods will mean the houses (163 to 169) on the west of the proposed site will be completely marooned. There is no access form Barnwell Rd as there are railing's and a traffic island on Barnwell Rd, preventing Emergency vehicles, removals and deliveries. Elderly residents rely on food deliveries at this time and there would be no way of getting to these houses. Has this been considered? Also

street repairs, water leaks, lighting. There would be no access anywhere for these to take place.

While i do agree 100% that these homes are in desperate need to be built for the homeless, Barnes Close is not the place for these to be built. We have elderly and venerable residents in the close an i feel that the pods are just to close and should be in a more spacious area. I also believe that there are still many questions and issues that have not been resolved for the residents.”

- 3. 138 Peverel Road: Objection. “Firstly, I would like to say that I fully support the building of more modular homes for ex-homeless people and would willingly have one beside my house if there was sufficient space for it. I say that to make clear that this is not about the nature of the development or the tenants who will occupy it.*

However, I strongly believe the site selected at Barnes Close Garages is unsuitable for reasons that I hope are fairly obvious: first, it means removing 24 serviceable garages, which represents a loss of community assets and the destruction of something the council has paid money for in the past. Second, it involves the closure of a much used cycle path which my family and others use daily to get to school, work and the supermarket. I don't believe an alternative is being proposed, so we will have to resort to cycling past the front doors of elderly people on the next available footpath. Thirdly, access for construction is down a long narrow road that already has parking problems, which will make life miserable for 20 or more households. Fourthly, the area is already highly developed and building these homes means shoe-horning them into a small space. We all need some breathing space around our homes for our mental and physical wellbeing. Cramming these small homes into a small space is not going to help people's relationships and stress levels. Lastly, this development will have a disproportionate impact on just a couple of homes, which I think is really unfair.

The various shortcomings of the site contrast markedly with the site at Christ the Redeemer where none of these issues presented themselves, as shown in the attached graphical summary.

We are surrounded by underutilised land in Barnwell and Abbey; why are we having to resort to squeezing this development into an already highly developed corner of a housing estate? What about the neglected land by the BT exchange off Fen Road. Why not negotiate to take a small corner of the Qurum of Sainsburys car park? They would hardly notice the loss and none of the negative impacts for the Barnes Close site would ensue - plus you would be achieving your goal of reducing car parking and travel by car.

I appreciate that a rejection would delay the provision of the housing, but I believe your remit is to consider the suitability of the development for the proposed location and not the need for it. Hopefully more suitable sites across the city are also being progressed in parallel with this one.

I appeal to the planning committee to stop and think: could we not do better for our community and the tenants who need this housing than siting it in the proposed location? Would you honestly support this application if you lived at Nr 13 Barnes Close? Please do the kind thing by the neighbours, the tenants and the people of Cambridge - who want to be proud of our city - and reject this application. We can do better."

Amendments to
Text:

Amendment to 8.1: This application is a Regulation 3 application under the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended) due to the land being owned by Cambridge City Council and Cambridge City Council also being the applicant for the proposals. For clarity, the applicant is not the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP). CIP has only acted in the capacity as an agent on this application. As part of the Foundation 200 project by the Hill Group, Cambridge City Council have been gifted 16 modular homes for formally homeless people. The proposed modular homes will be installed by the Hill Group and gifted to and managed by a charitable organisation. The site will be leased by the City Council. The charity who manage the pods will be selected by the City Council in coordination with Hill.

Pre-Committee
Amendments to
Recommendation:

Amendments to conditions:

Condition 10

Amend text from “no4” to “6no”

Condition 14

The cycle / pedestrian paths hereby permitted shall be laid out in accordance with drawing 109-03 dated 15.12.2020 prior to the occupation of the modular units. Throughout the construction of the development a through path for pedestrians and cyclists shall be maintained available for public use. If providing an open route throughout the construction phase of development is not possible, for reasons such as health and safety and / or physical constraints to construction, the justification for this including the timings / periods of closure shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the cycle route is maintained available for public use throughout the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 80 and 81).

Addition of a further condition:

Condition 21:

Prior to the development of the plant room hereby permitted in accordance with drawing 109-03 15/12/2020, full details, including elevations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plant room 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 that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

Decision: APPROVE subject to conditions.

Circulation: First Item:

Reference Number: 19/1221/FUL

Address: Land r/o 29 - 31 Peverel Road

Determination Date: 29.10.2019

The owners of No.33 Peverel Road are unable to attend Committee to make a representation to Members, and have therefore submitted the following statement:

“Ref 7.2 and Ref 8.24

The objections which were resolved in the revised drawings consisted of the building position on plot, 45deg angle and terrace, so these points have been removed, from the first objection to the build.

But my objection to the overshadowing still stands.

To Note:

The position of the new 3 bedroom house I consider to be detrimental to my living environment which includes garden/patio/conservatory due to gross overshadowing. I know conservatories are not classed as habitable rooms in the eyes of planning, but many are built and used for that purpose. I have been enjoying the benefits of the sunlight and view for 40 years at 33 Peverel Road and conservatory for 20 years. Only for my living space to be Dominated and Overshadowed by the proposed dwelling 13.8 mt long x 7.5mt width of which 10 mts protrudes from the back of my house.

According to the Sunpath study and home study I will be overshadowed for 6 months of the year.

To sum up I still think the site is being over developed with

a 3 bedroom family house with the footprint twice the size of surrounding houses.”

Amendments to Text: The Officer report recommends conditions (nos. 18 & 19) removing permitted development rights under Classes A & B. Whilst the reasons are included with the condition, the justification for recommending these conditions hasn't been explicitly set out in the report. For clarification, therefore, it is considered that extensions to the dwelling (including the roof) could be constructed under normal permitted development rights that have the potential to result in harm to neighbour amenity through overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking impacts.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item:
Reference Number: 20/02791/FUL
Address: 196 Green End Road
Determination Date: 17.08.2020

In light of some third parties not being able to attend Planning Committee to make representations in front of the Committee, statements have been submitted. This is in full below.

1. 'Green End Road resident' (objection)

The Summary for the Planning Committee Report has three bullet points and concludes a recommendation for approval. Let us consider each point.

To Note:

Bullet 1:

QUOTE "[The] scale of the development is of high quality". This has no meaning. The report does not say the design will result in a building of high quality. We can only be certain of the quality of the building once it has been built.

*QUOTE "would enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area". This is a purely subjective view by the author of the report. My view is this would ***not*** enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Why should my view and those of local residents be*

less important than someone who doesn't have to live opposite it for the rest of their lives?

Bullet 2:

QUOTE "The proposed development would not have any adverse impact to the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours". On the contrary the development has direct impact on privacy and noise for existing neighbouring properties. This development adds second & third floor balconies, and a high roof terrace. It doesn't even adhere to the existing building line.

All we are left with is QUOTE "acceptable living conditions for the future occupiers". Hardly a high recommendation.

Bullet 3:

QUOTE "residential development on a brownfield site". This detached family home is in a large garden plot which, before the current owner demolished it, had a brick boundary wall. The land around the house is larger than that covered by it. Under the 2012 National Planning Policy Guidance, private garden cannot be classed as "brownfield", and there has been no application for a change of use. If the inclusion of the term "brownfield" was to tick a planning approval box, it should be unticked.

QUOTE "is located in a sustainable location". In other words, it is near the city - as are tens of thousands of plots. The report does not address the damage to the urban canopy talked about in the Cambridge Local Plan, nor the loss of habitat for birds, bees, small mammals, butterflies and so on. Building on gardens to leave an isolated tree and a narrow strip of evergreen shrubs between parking bays does not make an ecosystem that can support most wildlife just mentioned. Repeat this development in a street and watch the further catastrophic decline in bird and bee populations documented by many respected organisations in the UK. By this argument, the development is not itself a "sustainable" one, which must surely be the most relevant factor when considering a planning application?

Please take time to re-read objections lodged by residents to this application during 2020. This has not even touched upon serious safety concerns of having 7 new flats and shop without sufficient off-road parking at a junction and bend on a busy road with double yellow lines and cycle lane, pedestrian crossing and a centre for the blind.

Amendments to
Text:

Landscape Officer Comments (section 6.8)

Amended comments: The amendment layout has

responded to previous comments raised and landscape is happy to support the proposals with recommended conditions.

Addition of further conditions:

Condition 25

Pre-Committee
Amendments to
Recommendation:

Hard and soft landscaping: 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 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 (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. 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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59)

Condition 26

Landscape maintenance and management plan: Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved. 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.

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)

Condition 27

Tree Pits: No development above slab level 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 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59)

Decision:

Circulation:	First	Item:
Reference Number:	20/03020/FUL	
Address:	184 Thoday Street	
Determination Date:	04.09.2020	

The applicant has submitted a representation to the Planning Committee in support of the application. This is copied in full below:

To Note:

“Dear Chair and fellow committee members,

We appreciate you hearing our application today (184 Thoday Street). We have taken the time to comply with the local planning policy requirements and are glad to have support of the planning officer and the planning department.

The application is intended to provide affordable and quality accommodation to support the growing needs of the hospital, university and the medical and research sciences, in the country's leading city. The properties would offer accommodation to first time buyers or renters, which are genuinely affordable without partial ownership or expensive rents (or a combination of both) that the larger developers typically offer.

We appreciate the importance of undertaking the works in a way that would cause least disruption to the neighbours. In order to do this, we would ensure builders comply with the conditions of operating during the permitted hours and keeping deliveries to a minimum. Further, it is our intention to use local tradesmen and suppliers to mitigate disruption but also to help support the local economy, in these challenging times.

It is for these reasons that we seek your support and approval for this application”

Amendment to Paragraph 8.22

Amendments to Text:

8.22 The comments of the Local Highway Authority and third parties with regard to parking capacity on nearby streets are noted, however the site is 500 metres from the Mill Road East District Centre and is approximately 600 metres from bus stops on Mill Road. Taking into account the size of the units as predominantly 1 bedroom, the proximity of the District Centre and the availability of public transport it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a significant increase in parking from upon residential streets.

Pre-Committee
Amendments to
Recommendation:

Decision:

Circulation:

First

Item:

Reference Number: 18/1321/OUT
Address: 72 - 74 St Philips Road
Determination Date: 22.10.2018
To Note: Nothing
Amendments to Text: None
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item:
Reference Number: 20/02954/FUL
Address: 8 Kings Hedges Road
Determination Date: 17.09.2020
To Note: Nothing
Amendments to Text: None
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item:
Reference Number: 19/1670/FUL
Address: 60 Wycliffe Road
Determination Date: 30.01.2020
To Note: Nothing
Amendments to Text: None
Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item:
Reference Number: 20/05247/HFUL
Address: 63 Gilbert Road
Determination Date: 12.02.2021
To Note: Nothing
Amendments to Text: None
Pre-Committee
Amendments to Recommendation: None
Decision:

This page is intentionally left blank