

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 7th February 2023

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Circulation: First Item: 1
Reference Number: 22/03076/FUL
Address: Edeva Court Cambridge
Determination Date: 31 August 2022

An amended site plan has been received by Officers which now correctly shows the garden area of Flat No.3. No changes are proposed to the existing flats so this is for clarification.

Comments from Building Control have now been received. They clarified the following:

To Note:

- as it is an existing building a lift would not be required under part M;
- A dry riser would only be required if access from the fire appliance to the furthest point in the furthest flat is over 45m;
- The proposed cladding achieves A1 classification for reaction to fire which is the highest performance;
- Questions about the external corner detail regarding the cavity barriers as there are requirements to be met;
- Would like to see a fire test certificate for the external wall;
- All of the above would be checked as part of the procedure in assessing compliance with the regulations.

Amendments to Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item: 2
Reference Number: 22/02936/FUL
Address: 208 - 208A Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge

Determination Date: 22 August 2022

To Note:

Amendments to
Text: None

Pre-Committee
Amendments to
Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item: **3**

Reference Number: 22/01971/FUL

Address: 346 Milton Road Cambridge

Determination Date: 21 June 2022

To Note:

Amendments to
Text: None

Pre-Committee
Amendments to
Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item: **4**

Reference Number: 22/04705/FUL

Address: Clare College Sports Ground, Bentley Road

Determination Date: 20 December 2022

To Note: Visualisations and additional winter views have been provided.

Amendments to
Text:

Para 8.32 to read as follows: There is no objection raised by the Council's Conservation Officer in terms of impacts upon nearby heritage assets whilst the proposed building would have very limited impact upon users using the adjacent public right of way (PRoW) to the west along Hobson's Conduit with the existing boundary treatment being retained and enhanced tree cover proposed along this western boundary. Visualisations have been provided in support of the application and no objection is raised by the Landscape Officer in terms of impacts upon landscape and townscape character due to the modest height and

existing vegetation.

Para 10.0 Planning Conditions

Following amendments to recommended conditions:

6) include text “or as soon as reasonably practicable” after “commencement of development”

7) amend condition to read “Within 6 months of completion of the training facility building, a BRE issued post Construction Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, indicating that the approved BREEAM rating has been met. If such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.”

18) include text “new” before “artificial lighting” and “external lighting”

19) amend condition to read “Prior to development above slab level, details of the sedum roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details of the sedum roof shall include means of access for maintenance, plans and sections showing the make-up of the sub-base to be used and include the following:

- a) Planted/seeded with an agreed mix of species within the first planting season following the practical completion of the building works,
- b) The sedum roof shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency,
- c) A management/maintenance plan approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority,

All works shall be carried out and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.”

20) amend condition to read “The development, hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Plan and Biodiversity Metric 3.1 (dated 21st October 2022). Prior to development above slab level (apart from demolition), an implementation, management and monitoring plan (including identified responsible bodies) for a period of 30 years for on-site proposals as appropriate. The BNG Plan shall be implemented in full and subsequently managed and monitored in accordance with the approved details. Monitoring data as appropriate shall be submitted to the

local planning authority in accordance with DEFRA guidance and the approved monitoring period / intervals.”

21) amend condition to read “Prior to any installation of boundary treatments, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments (including gaps for hedgehogs) to be erected shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

22) amend condition to read “The development shall not be occupied or the permitted use commenced, until details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of cycles for use in connection with the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the means of enclosure, materials, type and layout of the cycle store. A cycle store proposed with a flat / mono-pitch roof shall include plans providing for a green roof. The cycle store and green roof as appropriate shall be provided and planted in full in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation or commencement of use and shall be retained as such.”

Pre-Committee
Amendments to
Recommendation: None

Decision: Approve

Circulation: First Item: 5

Reference Number: 22/03811/FUL

Address: Kings College, Kings College Chapel Kings Parade

Determination Date: 18 October 2022

Further Third-Party Representation received in support.

To Note: As is well known by any regular visitor to the college, and as shown on the photographs, the roof is barely visible from the grounds or most other angles. There is limited visual impact. I am aware the college has made significant efforts to date on sustainability grounds, e.g. new buildings being constructed to Passivhaus standards, and so this change is in line with an overall program of activity. Similar installations have appeared elsewhere, e.g. Salisbury Cathedral, so this change is not without

reasonable precedent.

Two Third Party Representations received in objection

- King's College Chapel is one of the most important historic buildings in England, Europe & the world.
- It is a highly prominent focal building of outstanding interest in the Cambridge Conservation Area.
- Sustainable, renewable, green technology is to be greatly encouraged to counter the climate emergency- but only where public benefits clearly outweigh negative impact & damaging harm. There are so many less damaging locations for such installations.
- As it has been established that the black reflective panel arrays can be seen through or above the parapet from around the site, there must be harmful impact to the building, its setting & the wider context.
- Just bringing to mind & imagining the Chapel with new black reflective panels fitted onto the roof, above the historic lead roof, diminishes & defiles the integrity & perception of this unique & beautiful building.
- King's College Chapel is a sacrosanct building- it should be preserved inviolate.

This objection letter is to be read out at committee

Second objection.

a) Significant inadequacies in the application documentation, including i) Inadequate visual analysis ii) Failure to reference a national and international standard of key relevance to this nationally significant proposal
b) The exceptional national significance of this proposal
c) Inadequacies in the application documentation.
The Chapel roof is visible from a limited number of locations, due to the combination of its low pitch and height above surrounding buildings. The Visual Impact Analysis has captured most of these, but there are 2 surprising and worrying omissions: a) The view from Silver Street along Queens' Lane b) The longer view from the riverside path opposite the Garden House Hotel 1 Including many dealings with Kings College's buildings, and urging the College to introduce a Services Strategy 2 I am Heritage Chair of the Sustainable Traditional Buildings Alliance and Vice-Chair of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation's Policy Committee 2 While the photos of the

mock-up are useful, they do not show the full impacts of the proposal under changing light conditions (see Appendix 2). The visual impact assessment does not show light reflecting off either the lead roof or the mock-up array, as would frequently be the case. The proposed array will introduce a different surface, with different reflectivity. The array would have a particularly severe impact on the strong vertical counterpoint which the very ornate pierced battlements provide (light against dark from south, dark against light from north) to the horizontal of the uniform surface of the roof beyond. A flaw, or a contrast, will always attract the eye. I appreciate that this issue has been discussed in a Max Fordham report, but I have not found information to reassure me that the panels will not contrast sharply with the lead roof under at least some light conditions. ii) Failure to reference a key national standard. No reference, in any of the documentation, to a key current British and European Standard, BS EN 16883:2017 “Conservation of Cultural Heritage – Guidelines for improving the energy performance of historic buildings”. This standard sets out a systematic procedure to help facilitate decision-making which could have been very helpful indeed in guiding the College and its advisers decision-making process both in formulating their proposals, and then in presenting them in the planning application: - Neither the Planning Statement nor the Max Fordham report reference this process. Key considerations which I would have expected to be considered in such a process include: a) the potential of the College’s wider estate, rather than its historic buildings, to generate electricity in a less intrusive and harmful way b) analysis of potential alternatives avoiding solar PV on the Chapel (the supporting documents do not consider potential alternatives). National significance of the application a) King’s College Chapel is one of the most outstanding grade I listed buildings in Britain (of such exceptional importance that it should remain inviolate) b) If this application is approved, it will set a precedent which will be cited for solar panels on roofs of listed buildings across the country

Applicant has noted the agenda and has a couple of items to bring to the attention of the committee.

In paragraphs 10.46 and 10.62 the figures that are quoted are from the original submission. Caroe Architecture sent in the revised Max Fordham Chapel Solar PV Assessment dated 06/10/2022, received 04/11/22. This had higher figures in it due to technological improvements to the proposed panels. The correct figures are 128,062 kWh/yr

and 27,188 kgCO2 per year.

The applicant also covered the point raised at paragraph 10.45 about the categorization of roof slopes for suitability for Panels in Max Fordham's Decarbonisation Report. This explains how MF's original categorization did not consider issues such as feasibility / likelihood of consent. When further work was carried out as part of the re-roofing project development works, and so more accurate data could be obtained, this showed that the roofs had greater potential for electricity generation that was initially suggested.

Amendments to Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

Circulation: First Item: 6

Reference Number: 22/03861/S73

Address: 1 Mere Way Cambridge

Determination Date: 25 October 2022

To Note:

Amendments to Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

Decision:

This page is intentionally left blank