

**PLANNING**6 August 2014  
9.30 am - 2.30 pm**Present:** Councillors Dryden (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Gawthrope, Hart, Pippas, C. Smart and Tunnacliffe**Officers Present:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell  
 Head of Joint Urban Design: Glen Richardson  
 City Development Officer: Sarah Dyer  
 Principal Planning Officer; Toby Williams  
 Principal Planning Officer: Tony Collins  
 Senior Planning Officer: Catherine Linford  
 Senior Conservation & Design Officer: Jonathan Hurst  
 Senior Planning Officer: John Evans  
 Planning Officer: Lorna Gilbert  
 Planning Officer: Amit Patel  
 Planning Officer: Sav Patel  
 Conservation & Design Officer: Lindsey Weaver  
 Legal Advisor: Cara De La Mare  
 Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****14/37/PLAN Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Hipkin

**14/38/PLAN Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Smart	14/0713/FUL	Personal: As a former Executive Councillor launched the scheme.
Councillor Pippas	13/1207/FUL	Personal: A Hotelier by occupation
Councillor Dryden	Diversion of Public Footpath No 47	Personal: Board of Governors for Addenbrookes Hospital

**14/39/PLAN Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2014 were approved and signed as a correct record.

**Re-Ordering Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

**14/40/PLAN Planning Applications**

**14/40a/PLAN** 14/0657/FUL: Combined Colleges Boathouse, Logans Way  
The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing single storey boathouse and erection of new two storey boathouse for Combined Colleges together with associated landscaping works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr MacTaggart.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Residents were not opposed to the redevelopment of the site and welcomed improvements to the facilities acknowledging the current building was unattractive.
- ii. Expressed concern at the choice of design and proposed that the new two story boathouse should be reduced in height and 'block' facing the riverside.
- iii. Stated the building would be two meters higher than the neighbouring properties and would have a negative impact on the surroundings.
- iv. Deemed the balcony at 5.3 metres in height as excessive.
- v. Stated that the visualisation in the application was misleading such as twenty meters high trees shown on the drawings which do not exist, thus reducing the impact of the height of the building.
- vi. Suggested the roof structure should be changed.
- vii. Visually sensitive site on a tree lined frontage and the impact should be minimal.
- viii. The riverside is an important gateway to the City that is well used every day.

- ix. Urged the Committee to reject the planning application with its current design.

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

Councillor Manning (East Chesterton Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee regarding the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Asked the Committee to consider an additional comment in Condition 15 to include a 24 hours a day, seven days week contact telephone for residents.
- ii. Welcomed improvements to the boathouse.
- iii. Asked the Committee to reject the application on the basis of the height of the proposed design.
- iv. Overbearing in design with a 34% increase in height compared to the current building.
- v. The reason for the erection of a new boat house was to improve facilities; the increase in height has nothing to do with the improvements but is an architectural choice.
- vi. Stated that the height of the building goes against 6/2 Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

#### The Committee:

Councillor Blencowe proposed an additional condition to include a contact telephone number for neighbours 24 hours a day, seven days week and a scheme for noise control.

**Resolved (unanimously)** with amendment to condition 15 to read that prior to occupation a Management Scheme for the approved Boathouse shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Management Scheme shall include a contact for neighbours 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and a Maintenance Scheme for the ground floor doors to ensure that they are quiet when in operation.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

An additional informative is to be added to read as follows:

Suggested opening hours for the Boathouse shall be included in the Management Plan required by Condition 15.

**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 report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and the additional condition.

**14/40b/PLAN 14/0543/FUL: 1 Milton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of student accommodation comprising 211 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings) and a commercial unit to be used for Class A1 food retail purposes, together with bicycle and car parking and associated infrastructure.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Lorne Williamson and Councillor Richard Robertson.

The representations covered the following issues:

Lorne Williamson

- i. Not against the proposal in principal but questioned if it was necessary to included additional retail space in the application.
- ii. Stated that empty retail spaces can have an adverse impact to the area.
- iii. Reminded the Committee that that there were two large retail outlets that had been empty a year and up to three years in the area.
- iv. Suggested that the empty retail units could be used for student facilities.
- v. Advised the Committee that there was already an adequate supply of retail provision to service the area.

Councillor Richard Robertson (speaking as member of the public).

- i. Object to the location of the proposed food store which would create an increase in vehicle traffic which could obstruct the cycling lanes and pavements when parking outside the store.

- ii. The delivery bay is at the front of the store, rather than the back or side of a store in front of a busy highway.
- iii. The location of the loading bay would mean that delivery lorries would have to drive across the highway and cycle lane to access the bay.
- iv. The development of student accommodation would bring an increase in cycle use and pedestrians on what is already a busy road.
- v. The Highways Engineer states the location of the servicing access for the food store is less than ideal (8.70 of the Officer's report) which is an understatement.
- vi. The proposed build of the store was unnecessary.
- vii. Requested that the Committee consider the following amendments to the application:
  - Security bollards in the loading bay should be kept erect and locked at all times (other than when deliveries are taking place) to stop the loading bay being used as a parking space.
  - Access to the loading bay doors at the North End of the loading bay which can only be accessed from the South. This means the lorries will be round the wrong way. The delivery doors into the shop need to be reversed.
  - The shop doorway opens up into the delivery bay and these doors should also be reversed to open inwards. This is also recommended by the Highways Engineer (6.1 of the Officer's report).

The Committee received representations in support to the application from James Cope-Brown and Steve Pellegrini.

The Chair asked the Committee to note a written statement of support from Vanessa Ward.

Justin Bainton (Applicant's Agent) then addressed the Committee in support of the application.

#### The Committee:

Councillor Hart proposed that additional conditions should be included for the security bollards to be locked when not in use and for the service doors to be changed.

**Resolved (unanimously)** that the bollards shown on drawings no. 110-00-Rev32 shall be installed prior to occupation and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the availability of servicing space and to prevent ad hoc parking in the interest of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 8/2)

**Resolved (unanimously)** that prior to the commencement of development hereby approved (excluding any pre-construction, enabling works or piling, or demolition) full details of the service doors for the food store shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that deliveries do not impact on the highway network. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 8/2)

Additional informative:

The Management Plan required by condition 8 shall include arrangements for the beginning and end of term.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 November 2014, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer, including the additional conditions and amendments of conditions 7, 20 and 24.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

The following minor changes are made to the recommended conditions:

Condition 7:

Split into two conditions as follows:

7a. Prior to the commencement of demolition hereby approved (excluding any pre-construction, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to

protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

- 7b. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction enabling works or piling, but excluding demolition), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

Condition 20:

Wording amended to:

Prior to the construction of any external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, samples of the materials to be used for construction of the external surfaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

Condition 24:

Wording amended to:

No development shall commence (excluding demolition and enabling works) until details of facilities for the covered, secured parking of bicycles



for use in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

**14/40c/PLAN 14/0506/FUL: 121 Chesterton Road Report**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the proposed conversion of ground and first floor to 1 retail unit (Class A1) (Non Food) (1,227m<sup>2</sup>/13,204ft<sup>2</sup>) and 2 retail units (Classes A1 (Non Food), A2, A3, A4, A5 and/or D1 medical practitioner use only in the alternative), including ground floor extension (1,078m<sup>2</sup>/11,600ft<sup>2</sup>). Retention of existing first floor car park (27 spaces). Proposed vehicular access and servicing arrangements from Chesterton Road.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 November 2014 and for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Additional condition:

‘No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction/finishing of the external surfaces (including the film treatment) of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)’

**14/40d/PLAN 13/1207/FUL: DoubleTree By Hilton, Granta Place**



The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the proposed conversion of existing leisure centre to form 13no additional bedrooms including removal of pyramidal roof and re-cladding of existing facade. Erection of third floor extension to provide 16no additional bedrooms and associated works.

The City Development Manager informed the Committee that a petition in objection had been received consisting of three hundred and twenty eight signatures from the Residents Association of Old Newnham.

Mark Savin (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Peter Singleton and Caroline Gohler.

The representations covered the following issues:

#### Peter Singleton

- i. Support the Officer's report that the proposed development would result in a loss of leisure facilities to the area.
- ii. There would be an increase in visual mass and scale which would start to intrude on the green belt into the City.
- iii. The amended design brings an additional material (zinc) to the proposed development which is already a mix of materials and would not enhance the property.
- iv. The additional rooms would create an increase in traffic to what is already a busy road.
- v. A decrease in traffic would enhance the area.
- vi. Asked the Committee to reject the application.

#### Caroline Gohler

- x. The design does not reflect the setting and the surroundings.
- xi. Would have a negative impact on the green belt and protected area.
- xii. The proposed design has the potential to be highly visible and has no relationship with the surrounding area.
- xiii. Would not enhance the conservation area.
- xiv. Would result in a leisure facility that is used by local residents.
- xv. Not impressed with the quality of the proposals.

Councillor Cantrill (Ward Councillor for Newnham) addressed the Committee regarding the application:

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The development sits in a site which is highly sensitive.
- ii. The site is an iconic setting in a conservation area.
- iii. The site is a unique green route into the City.
- iv. The current proposals, although modest, do not meet the standards raised by the Inspectorate to one of the previous applications.
- v. The form and details of the proposals does not enrich the relationship between the built form, design and the natural environment.
- vi. The proposed conversion would see a loss of community leisure facilities that have been used for a long period of time by the public.
- vii. The leisure facilities are used by all age ranges and abilities by Cambridge residents, not just those local to the hotel.
- viii. The wet provision (swimming pool) is a critical facility for the area.
- ix. The hotel is currently advertising the leisure facilities seeking non-members.
- x. Urged the Committee to reject the application for the reasons highlighted, but particularly due the loss of the leisure facilities.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1 with 1 abstention)** to refuse 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.

**14/40e/PLAN** 14/0653/FUL:Former Villa Service Station, 57 High Street, Trumpington

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 14 flats, car parking, landscaping and associated works.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Garth Norman and Mr Evans:

The representations covered the following issues:

Garth Norman

- xvi. Stated that the proposed is an improvement on what was there before but objected to the height of the development which would look directly into neighbouring properties, resulting in a loss of privacy.
- xvii. The proposed development would bring an increase in traffic. The highways were already busy, particularly during the school drop off and pick up time
- xviii. The proposed development had insufficient car parking spaces.
- xix. The Village Hall was a well-used community hub which also brings an increase in traffic to the area and drivers looking for parking spaces.

Mr Evans

- i. The proposed development of a three storey building overlooking a thatched copy would be out of keeping in terms of design and scale in a conservation area.
- ii. There had been no consultation with local residents.
- iii. The traffic survey was not a true reflection on the movement and parking of traffic.
- iv. Reiterated that there was an absence of parking spaces for residents in the area.
- v. Six car parking spaces were not enough for the proposed development.
- vi. The village hall was used on a regular basis which brings additional traffic, cyclists and pedestrians to the area. With an increase of motorists looking for parking spaces this could have a negative impact on the hall and the facility could be lost.

Paul Belton (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Councillor Smart proposed an additional condition for a travel plan regarding public transport be considered for inclusion.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to additional condition to secure a Travel Plan for future residents.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 1 October 2014 and for the reasons set

out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and the additional condition.

**14/40f/PLAN** 14/0159/FUL: Anstey Hall Farm Barns, Grantchester Road, Trumpington

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 5 November 2014, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Amendment to condition 14 (underlined and in bold for reference) to read:

'No development shall take place 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 (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant; and cross-sectional plans and detailed layout plans and mitigation measures (removing the proposed rumble strip) for the construction of the access road to demonstrate that adjacent trees will not be adversely affected including details of measures to ensure that the stability of the listed wall is

safeguarded. 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. It shall include a reinforcement and new planting on and near to the edges adjacent to the eastern side (next to the cemetery) and the southern edge (adjacent to the housing site).

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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

**14/40g/PLAN** 14/0160/LBC: Anstey Hall Farm Barns, Grantchester Road, Trumpington

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for the demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for listed building consent in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers.

**14/40h/PLAN** 14/0505/S73: Aldi, Unit 1, 157 Histon Road

The Committee received an application for variation of planning permission conditions.

The application sought approval to vary condition 14 of planning permission C/95/0110 to allow delivery hours to between 07:00hrs and 21:00hrs Monday to Saturday and 09:00hrs and 17:00hrs on Sundays and Bank Holidays (Amended description).

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for a variation of planning conditions in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**14/40i/PLAN** 14/0564/FUL: Hills Road, Sixth Form College

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing single storey sub-standard teaching accommodation (The Stable Block) and construction of a new three storey classroom teaching block, including minor external landscape works to the frontage with Hills Road, and immediately around the footprint of the new development.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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.

**14/40j/PLAN** 14/0493/FUL: 297 Histon Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for temporary change of use from A1 (shop) to D2 (assembly and leisure).

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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.

**14/40k/PLAN** 14/0922/FUL: Westminster College, Madingley Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a new building comprising study centre, library, radio and tv studio, meeting rooms, 7 study bedrooms, 2 fellows flats together with alterations to the Grade II listed boundary wall and external works and tree and shrub planting.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the applications 14/0922/FUL & 14/0923/LBC from Mr Hallawell.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The character and appearance of the building should be preserved and questioned if the proposed development would augment this.
- ii. Stated that the alterations to the boundary wall would not enhance the listed boundary wall.
- iii. The grade II boundary wall was unique.
- iv. Questioned why the new pedestrian access that was to be cut through the boundary wall needed to be 3.5 metres wide, which was described as excessive.
- v. Described the wall as an uninterrupted composition between Lady Margaret Road and Pound Hill.
- vi. With pedestrian access through gates to the University from Lady Margaret Way questioned why more access was required.
- vii. The proposed works could bring potential damage to the trees.

Dr Ed Kessler, Director of the Woolf Institute addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

#### The Committee:

**(Resolved) unanimously** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 1 September 2014, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers.

#### Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Trigger points for conditions 6 (Insulation), 7 (Plant Insulation), 9 (Landscape), 10 (Landscape) and 12 (Cycle parking) to read **Prior to occupation of the building**, rather than prior to commencement of development.

#### **New condition 16**

Prior to the occupation of the building hereby approved, full details of a travel plan detailing the measures taken to promote sustainable travel modes shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with that agreed.



Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable travel modes for future users of the building, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/3.

### **New Condition 17**

Prior to the commencement of development and with reference to BS 5837 2012, details of the specification and position of all protection measures and techniques to be adopted for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval in the form of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP). The agreed measures shall be carried out during the course of the development.

Reason: In order that adequate provision is made for the protection of mature trees, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4.

### **New Condition 18**

Prior to commencement, a site visit will be arranged with the retained arboriculturalist, developer and Local Planning Authority Tree Officer to agree tree works and the location and specification of tree protection barriers and temporary ground protection. The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: In order that adequate provision is made for the protection of mature trees, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4.

### **14/40I/PLAN 14/0923/LBC: Westminster College, Madingley Road**

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the applications 14/0922/FUL & 14/0923/LBC from Mr Hallawell. The representation is listed under application 14/0922/FUL

Dr Ed Kessler, Director of the Woolf Institute addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for listed building consent in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**14/40m/PLAN 14/0770/FUL: 191 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for material alterations to consent 12/0966/FUL - Reduced height of the ground floor undercroft. Re cladding of concrete pillar. Revised proportions of the shop front feature. Removal of fan light above side doorway to the rear wing of 191 Mill Road. Repositioned chimney and fenestration to the rear wing of 191 Mill Road.

The Committee:

*Committee Manager note: Councillor Pippas did not take part in the vote as he had left the room at the start of the Officer's report.*

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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.

**14/40n/PLAN 14/0713/FUL: Ditton Fields Nursery School, Wadloes Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 9 number family dwellings (6 flats + 3 houses) with mixed tenure (6 number Affordable + 3 number Private). Associated car parking and cycle parking and private and shared amenity space.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 30 November 2014, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers.

**14/40o/PLAN 14/1051/S73: Station Area Redevelopment, Station Road**

The Committee received an application for a reserved matters variation of conditions.

The application sought approval for a variation of condition 50 of the reserved matters consent for Block A1/A2. The application related to a Minor Material Amendment (MMA) to full planning permission 12/1608/FUL comprising an alteration to condition 50 (approved drawing numbers) to enable the reorganisation of the approved roof plant layout including provision of plant at roof level and the introduction of a 2m high roof plant screen.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for a variation of condition in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**14/41/PLAN      General Items****14/41a/PLAN 14/1060/NMA: Station Area Redevelopment, Station Road**

The Committee received an application for a non-material amendment (NMA).

In July 2013 full planning permission was granted for an office/retail development on Blocks A1/A2 of the CB1 Station Area Redevelopment. An application for a non-material amendment (NMA) had been submitted which sought the following changes to the approved plans.

- i. Split of the approved single core into two parts to improve the escape strategy and servicing of the building.
- ii. Slight increase in the building envelope to rationalise the dimensions of the building.
- iii. Maximisation of the active frontage on the northern façade.
- iv. Amendments to the basement layout.
- v. Introduction of two doors on the western elevation of the ground floor.
- vi. Reduction of double height space at the first floor level on the southern side (subsequently clarified as reduction of the size of the reception area).
- vii. Reduction in size of basement.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** 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.

**14/41b/PLAN** LGO Complaint: Victoria Street

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services which referred to planning application 14/0342/FUL, which had been considered by West / Central Area Committee (WCAC) in April 2014.

The application for a two storey rear extension was approved by Members of the Committee. But it had subsequently emerged that there were errors in the handling of the application, specifically that a material issue was not drawn to the Committee's attention.

This report asked Members to consider whether the decision taken and the planning permission issued should stand or be considered for formal revocation.

The Committee received written representation in objection to the application from Heather Whitaker and Ms Cleverly.

Both representations were read out to the Committee in full. Copies can be viewed at the following link:

<http://mgsq1mh01/documents/b8351/Amendment%20Sheet%20and%20associated%20documents%2006th-Aug-2014%2009.30%20Planning.pdf?T=9>

The representation covered the following issues:

Heather Whitaker:

- i. Victoria Street is in Cambridge's Conservation Area, is listed and designated a Building of Local Interest (BLI), a fact that has been overlooked to date.
- ii. Believes that planning permission would not have been granted by WCAC Committee if the correct information had been brought to their attention.

- iii. Asked the Committee to remove planning permission totally and in a way that ensures it cannot be resurrected.
- iv. Stated that any new planning application should be heard afresh
- v. Goes against the City Council's own rules in determining what is permissible for Buildings of Local Interest.
- vi. The size of the proposed extension is too large and obtrusive.
- vii. The proposed extension would encroach upon the neighbouring space by its proximity.
- viii. The style and materials are out of keeping with neighbouring properties and extension.
- ix. Expect the decision relating to this application to be consistent with No 17 Victoria Street, planning application 13/0727/FUL.

Ms Cleverly:

- i. Questioned why the Committee would consider the application without the benefit of the Ombudsman's Report, as it was expected very soon.
- ii. Stated that the current report to be considered by the Planning Committee contained more mistakes, false assumptions and blatant bias.
- iii. Recommended that planning permission was revoked.
- iv. Stated that the six week period for seeking Judicial Review had not expired.
- v. The sole argument for failing to revoke permission was with regards to compensation and it would be the tax payer who would suffer.
- vi. Had WCAC Members been aware of the status of the building they would have had to take account of Policy 4/12 Cambridge Local Plan.
- vii. Put forward answers to the following four key questions highlighted in the Officer's report:
  - *Would Officers have made the same recommendation on the understanding that 14 Victoria St. is a BLI?*
  - *Is there any harm to the amenities of neighbours that has not already been duly considered?*
  - *Would the committee have reached the same decision had they been aware of the status?'*
  - *'Is the revocation in the public interest?'*

Mr Knowles (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously) to:**

- i. Note the contents of the report and the investigation that had taken place
- ii. Not to revoke the planning permission granted under reference 14/0342/FUL.

**14/41c/PLAN** Proposed Diversion of Public Footpath No 47, Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

*Committee Manager note: This item was chaired by Vice Chair, Councillor Blecove, as Councillor Dryden had left the meeting.*

The Committee received an application for a public footpath diversion order.

The application sought approval for an order to divert part of Footpath No 47 Cambridge as set out in the report of the Asset Information Definitive Map Officer.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for a public footpath diversion in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officers.

The meeting ended at 2.30 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank