# PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - 1<sup>st</sup> October 2014

# Amendment/De-brief Sheet for Minor and General Applications

**CIRCULATION**: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: **14/0649/FUL** 

Location: Cambridge Repetition Engineers Ltd, 2 Greens Road

Target Date: 24<sup>th</sup> June 2014

To Note:

Consultee comments have been received from the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer and Landscaping team. These are detailed below:

<u>Sustainable Drainage Officer</u> Support the drainage proposals.

## Landscaping

We support the overall design of the scheme; however, no provision has been supplied for landscape review. There is a presumption that any vegetation currently on site will be cleared for development and that there are no mature trees. If this is not the case on site, please submit any tree survey information for review.

We feel areas of planting to soften the proposals could be provided and thus would welcome a landscape plan with planting proposals.

As there is not any detail for planting, we recommend conditions are applied to the scheme should it receive planning permission.

Propose Condition 14 – Hard and Soft landscaping implementation: All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with an 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**: To ensure provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscaping in accordance with the approved design. (Cambridge Local

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

#### Amendments To Text:

Updated to reflect Landscaping's comments:

Condition 11: Hard and soft landscaping: 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 (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 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: Application withdrawn

### **DECISION**:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/0453/\$73

Location: 2A Scotsdowne Road

Target Date: 29<sup>th</sup> July 2014

To Note:

The owners/occupiers of the following address has made a representation:

2 Scotsdowne Road

Dear Committee members,

RE: Dormer Window Application at 2A Scotsdowne Road, Trumpington, Cambridge, CB2

I live next door to the above site and I wholeheartedly support the application for dormer windows at the above three properties.

The properties are under way and look very good indeed. As you know we need more housing for people, and by extending into the roof space the applicant has added to the number of people who can be housed there, which I feel can only benefit the community.

The dormers certainly look good too, thus enhancing the properties and beneficially adding to the street landscape.

The dormers only look directly onto one building, a Christian Centre, where they create negligible difference to privacy there as trees planted in the street screen their windows for the most part.

Therefore I would like to support the application, and ask you, as members of the Planning Committee, to look with favour upon the dormer window application when it comes up for your approval on the 1st October.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

#### **DECISION:**

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: **13/1772/FUL** 

<u>Location</u>: The Leys School, Fen Causeway

Target Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2014

To Note:

The following comments have been received from the Nature Conservation Officer:

I am pleased to see that light levels reaching the adjacent Coe Fen Local Nature Reserve have been considered and minimised. The standard they are addressing will minimise light disturbance along this foraging corridor for local bat species. To further reduce the potential for disturbance I would request a condition that the lights be used no later than 9 p.m. This will restrict artificial lighting that occurs during peak bat foraging hours over the summer months (most bat species emerge just prior to or after sunset). Please ensure that the existing mature trees are retained to continue to screen the LNR and specify further appropriate planting of native mature trees and scrub to enhance the screen.

I would also suggest a potential biodiversity enhancement through the installation of woodcrete bat boxes on unlit mature trees along the perimeter. The number, type and locations could be conditioned.

#### Amendments To Text:

#### Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

I recommend the following additional condition:

Prior to the installation of the approved floodlights full details of bat boxes to be installed on mature trees along the boundary shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved bat boxes shall be installed before the approved floodlights are first used and remain in situ in perpetuity.

Reason: To enhance biodiversity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/7)

**<u>DECISION</u>**: The application has been withdrawn.

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/0320/FUL

<u>Location</u>: Payphone Kiosk Adjacent Church Of St Mary The Great,

St Marys Street

Target Date: 11<sup>th</sup> July 2014

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION**:

CIRCULATION: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: **14/0806/LBC** 

Location: Payphone Kiosk Adjacent Church Of St Mary The Great,

St Marys Street

Target Date: 11<sup>th</sup> July 2014

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

#### **DECISION**:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/1163/S73

<u>Location</u>: 21 Victoria Park

<u>Target Date:</u> 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2014

<u>To Note</u>: Further comments have been received from the occupiers of 19 and 23 Victoria Park. The comments can be summarised as follows.

- Concerned about condition requiring building materials to match existing building since there are two existing building types: the original Victorian gault brick with Flemish bond, and a 1980's extension in a rather characterless cheap modern brick (in stretcher bond?). Condition should be changed to say: "The extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external materials to match the *original* building in type, colour and texture."
- Remain concerned about the apparent contradiction between the West and South elevations. Project is going to run into difficulties and will require amendments to the approved plans.
- Still significant errors in the drawings. The 'west elevation enlarged' drawing is not consistent with the approved south elevation drawing because:
  - 1. In the revised 'west elevation enlarged' drawing, the south-facing roof slope of the new extension visually clips the sill of the bedroom window in the original main house.
  - 2. In the approved south elevation drawing, the glass roof of the existing conservatory and the roof of the new extension are shown in one plane and the guttering carries through in an uninterrupted line.
  - 3. The existing conservatory roof, even at its highest point, is seven brick courses lower than the sill of the same bedroom window. This means that the conservatory roof is actually much lower than the roof of the new extension shown on the west and south elevations. This is not a minor error.

Hope Council will not approve drawings with such obvious inaccuracies.

#### **Amendments To Text**:

Insert para 8.5

I accept the case made in the most recent representations and supported by photographic evidence, that there remains an inconsistency between the submitted west elevation and south elevation drawings about the junction between the roof of the approved extension and the roof of the existing conservatory. This inconsistency is not pertinent to the present application, as it relates to a condition about consistency between the west elevation and the plan.

I do accept, however that it may be difficult to construct the roof junction mentioned above without deviating from one or other of the approved drawings. It may be that this matter can be resolved via a non-material amendment application, but I recommend adding an informative to the decision pointing out the discrepancy and indicating that the Council can offer no guarantee that any necessary amendments can be accepted as non-material.

#### Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Substitute 'original' for 'existing' in Condition 3.

Add the following informative: 'The applicant is advised that the submitted west and south elevation plans appear to be inconsistent in their treatment of the junction between the extension and the roof of the existing conservatory. The Council can offer no guarantee that amendments which may be submitted in future to address this issue can be treated as non-material.'

#### **DECISION**:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

<u>ITEM</u>: <u>APPLICATION REF</u>: **14/0860/FUL** 

<u>Location</u>: 113 Histon Road

Target Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014

<u>To Note</u>: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION**:

<u>CIRCULATION</u>: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/0936/FUL

<u>Location</u>: Garages 301 – 326, Hawkins Road

<u>Target Date:</u> 7<sup>th</sup> August 2014

To Note:

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- Hawks = Campkin Resident Association
- 4 Hawkins Road
- 12 Hawkins Road
- 14 Hawkins Road
- 32 Hawkins Road
- 42 Hawkins Road
- 46 Hawkins Road
- 132 Hawkins Road

These representations raised the following additional issues:

- The impact of the lighting of the access
- The safety of the access for school children, pedestrians, and vehicles entering or leaving the site
- The impact on the security of the rear boundaries of neighbouring gardens
- Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the boundary treatment, and how will the boundaries be secured when building works are taking place

#### The impact of the lighting of the access

No details have been submitted regarding how the access will be lit. To ensure that the lighting does not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties I recommend a condition requiring a lighting strategy (14).

The safety of the access for school children, pedestrians, and vehicles entering or leaving the site

The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposals on highway safety grounds. The site, and the adjacent site is currently used by parents to drop off and pick up their children, as there is a gate into the School from the application site. To prevent the developed site from being used, it is proposed that a pedestrian gate will be installed on the adjacent site to provide access to the School.

Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the boundary treatment, and how will the boundaries be secured when building works are taking place

The rear gardens of the neighbouring boundaries would be made secure following the demolition of the garages. No details have been submitted to explain how this will be done and I recommend that these details are required by condition (15).

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

I recommend the following additional conditions:

14. Prior to commencement of development a lighting strategy for the site, including the access road, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the site is adequate lit and that the lighting does not have detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 3/7 and 4/13)

15. Prior to the demolition of the garages details of the method of securing the rear gardens of the neighbouring houses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

<u>Reason</u>: To ensure that the neighbouring properties are secure when building works are taking place. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7)

#### **DECISION**:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 14/0854/FUL

Location: 86 Searle Street

Target Date: 18<sup>th</sup> July 2014

<u>To Note</u>: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

# DECISION:

This page is intentionally left blank