

PLANNING

2 March 2022

10.00 am - 1.55 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), D. Baigent (Vice-Chair), Dryden and Porrer

Councillor Dryden left after the vote on item 21/04948/S73

Also present (physically): Councillor Ashton

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Aaron Coe

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Planner: Laurence Moore

Planner: Dean Scrivener

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**22/32/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood and Thornburrow. Plus Alternates: Herbert and Page-Croft.

22/33/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Smart	22/36/Plan	Personal: Has Travis Perkins shopping/loyalty card.

22/34/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 12 and 14 January 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

22/35/Plan 21/01625/FUL - Church Hall

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for refurbishment, reconfiguration and extension of the existing chapel building to create an improved day nursery facility with external play area and 13 residential apartments (following part demolition), together with associated landscaping and infrastructure

Ms Robertson (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Chapel Street:

- i. Following the last planning meeting, the owner had reached out to the local community to tell us that she was responding to our concerns with a new plan for fewer, smaller flats. We were cautiously optimistic. Had now been advised by the Council that no new plans have been submitted.
- ii. Therefore, concerns remain unchanged from the last meeting:
 - a. It was over development of the site
 - b. It was not suitable for a narrow, already well used road, with the parking, movements, bins, cycles, deliveries etc for the nursery and the flats all through the small frontage onto Chapel Street. Nursery users already regularly park dangerously and illegally. More residents would make this much worse.
 - c. The noise issues remain from the rooftop nursery for all local residents. We know it is not a playground but it is open air for multiple use. The noise assessment was done inaccurately and in lockdown thus was not a fair assessment. Many current residents are at home during the day, either due to work or shifts.
 - d. All local comments (those in Chesterton) are against (or neutral).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of High Street:

- i. Re-iterated points made by first Objector.
- ii. The application was too large for the site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from CamCycle:

- i. The Applicants claimed there were 16 cycle parking spaces for the residences. However, the room provided for cycle parking can only accommodate 14 spaces according to the Local Plan specifications. As such, this renders several spaces wholly unusable.
- ii. There are only four cycle parking spaces for the nursery, a rather low number, especially for Cambridge.
- iii. Access to both cycle parking rooms required passage through multiple sets of doors, which is particularly difficult for people using cargo cycles or towing trailers to transport children, as many would do.
- iv. The Applicants have placed bins behind those nursery cycle parking spaces. This means that the bins will be inaccessible during most times that any cycles are parked here, an environmental health hazard.
- v. Asked that the Officer recommendation for refusal be upheld and that one of the reasons for refusal should be the failure to comply with Local Plan Policy 82, due to non-compliant cycle parking design and inadequate quantity.

Councillor Ashton (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. In response to comments on social media: Councillors Bird and McQueen were in favour of the development on site in principle, assuming appropriate planning conditions were met.
- ii. The Committee suggested conditions which would make the application more acceptable when they considered it 14 January 2022. The Applicant responded to these and hoped details could be considered today but the Planning Officer advised they could not be.
- iii. The Applicant has listened to concerns raised by objectors and Councillors .
- iv. The City has a history of redeveloping sites.
- v. The building was not fit for purpose at present. The Applicant wanted to refurbish it so it can be fit for purpose in future.
- vi. Queried if a Heritage Officer had visited the site to investigate access concerns listed in the Officer's report.
- vii. Suggested the building was redeveloped as proposed in the application today in case another development was proposed in future that tried to fit more buildings onto the site.

The Committee:

Resolved (2 votes to 2 – and on the Chair’s casting vote) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report.

22/36/Plan 21/01137/FUL - 511 Coldhams Lane

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2no. buildings for use as a builders' merchant (sui generis) for display, sale and storage of building timber and plumbing supplies, plant and tool hire, including outside display and storage area along with storage racking, along with access and servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, means of enclosure and associated works.

The Planner updated his report by referring to updated Condition 13 wording and the additional condition details on the amendment sheet.

The Area Development Manager further amended the additional condition by stating it should include the implementation of the routing plan.

Mr Rainbird (Applicant’s Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Ashton (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Local residents did not see any benefits from the application.
- ii. The application would exacerbate existing traffic issues. There would be extra traffic and vehicle movements.
- iii. There was another retail unit on this site, which would further negatively impact traffic flow. Took issue with Highways Authority comments that issues would be mitigated.
- iv. Referred to concerns raised by the Traffic Officer and Drainage Officer.
- v. A periphery road could mitigate traffic issues. Queried if developers would put in a proposal for an appropriate route to their sites.
- vi. Had no issue with builders’ merchants, but queried if this was an appropriate use for the site.
- vii. A similar proposal (Peterhouse Technology Park) was turned down in Cherry Hinton as it was considered overbearing and would cause traffic issues.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative requesting parking provision for cargo bikes and tricycles.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 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 planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet (updated Condition 13 wording and the additional condition including the implementation of the routing plan);
- ii. an informative be included on the planning permission requesting parking provision for cargo bikes and tricycles.

22/37/Plan 21/04948/S73 - 149 Cherry Hinton Road

Objections were withdrawn after the agenda was published. Officers recommended changing the recommendation delegated powers as a consequence of the reason for bringing the item to Committee had evaporated with the withdrawal of the objections.

This proposal for Officers to determine the application in accordance with delegated powers was **carried unanimously**.

22/38/Plan 21/02332/FUL - Anstey Hall

The Committee received an application for change of use of Anstey Hall from a wedding venue use Class formerly D2 (now sui generis) with associated guest accommodation (Use Class C1) which is now collectively sui generis, to use as student accommodation (Use Class C2) for Sixth Form students taught at Dukes Education's St Andrews College, Cambridge.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. to include an informative requesting parking provision for cargo bikes and tricycles.
- ii. Ensure wording was consistent between Conditions 9, 11 and s106 Agreement.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) 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 prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [with delegated authority granted to Officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on terms considered appropriate and necessary];
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- iii. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to amend wording to ensure it was consistent between Conditions 9, 11 and s106 Agreement;
- iv. an informative be included on the planning permission requesting parking provision for cargo bikes and tricycles.

22/39/Plan 21/02333/LBC - Anstey Hall

The Committee received an application for change of use of Anstey Hall from a wedding venue use Class formerly D2 (now sui generis) with associated guest accommodation (Use Class C1) which is now collectively sui generis, to use as student accommodation (Use Class C2) for Sixth Form students taught at Dukes Education's St Andrews College, Cambridge.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative reminding the Applicant to seek further planning permission if the Applicant wished to hang anything on a wall.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) 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 the informative reminding the Applicant to seek further planning permission if the Applicant wished to hang anything on a wall.

22/40/Plan 21/01279/FUL - Land At 64 Cromwell Road

Withdrawn by the Applicant.

22/41/Plan 21/04576/S73 - 1 Redfern Close

The Committee received a S73 application for variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and the removal of condition 5 (surface water drainage) of planning permission 18/0560/FUL (Erection of 1 x 3bed detached dwelling, with associated access and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing garage of No.1 Redfern Close.)

The Planner updated his report by referring to the following updated condition wording:

Condition 5 (Surface Water Drainage): The proposed drainage scheme shall be carried out in accordance with drawing reference 2664-99 and 2664-02

Reason: In the interests of surface water management (National Planning Policy Framework 2012).

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) 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 the amendment to condition 5 (with delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the condition).

22/42/Plan 21/05482/ADV - Fronting No. 676 Newmarket Road

Withdrawn by the Applicant.

22/43/Plan 21/05484/ADV - City Adshel Bus Shelter O/S Tesco, Newmarket Road

Withdrawn by the Applicant.

22/44/Plan 21/03799/S106A - Former Scotsdale Nursery and Laundry Site

The Committee received an application for modification of planning obligations contained in a Section 106 Agreement dated 21 September 2016 made between (1) Cambridge City Council, (2) Swiss Laundry Ltd, (3) Turvill and (4) Barclays Bank.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Tavistock Road:

- i. Objected as did not feel informed enough about the proposal.
- ii. There was scant information about the application.
- iii. The opportunity had been lost for people to get on the housing ladder.

The Area Development Manager clarified the recommendation was to vary the s106 deed of variation.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) to delegate Officers the authority to complete the s106A Deed of Variation in accordance with the Officer report and the application.

The meeting ended at 1.55 pm

CHAIR