

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 3RD JUNE 2015

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0140/FUL**

Location: Primrose Hilltop Day Centre, Primrose Street

Target Date: 4th May 2015

To Note:

Additional comments to 12th May 2015 amendments

Environmental Health

The comments and recommendations within my colleague Adam Finchs memo dated 20th February 2015 are still relevant and recommended.

Ministry of Defence

MOD has no safeguarding objections

Nature Conservation

Additional internal and external surveys of the building are recommended to establish if protected species are present or if additional surveys are required. I would request this inspection being carried out prior to determination. I would request that the landscaping scheme and built form include ecological enhancements in the form of bird and bat boxes, native and non-native nectar rich plant species. These could be conditioned and specified and mapped on the landscape plan.

Highways

The applicant has provided clarification on the traffic generation. The applicant has provided clarification on the traffic generation of the former use, but I am still unable to find the Tripos Court data and so cannot comment further.

Please require the developer to provide this data and reassess the overall transportation impact of the proposal.

In the interim the Highway Authority maintains its holding objection to the proposal.

Additional Comments

Subject to any comment from our Transport planners this verifies that the use of 4 trips per room is justified.

Landscape

The landscape team have no objections to the proposed amendments.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

The changes proposed are acceptable in design terms. However, the window to the common room should be replaced with a door to improve access and relationship to the patio.

Architectural Liaison Officer

The footpath between Greens Road and Primrose Street has been designed out and therefore I am able to fully support the application from a crime reduction and/or community safety perspective.

Third Party Comments

Additional comments to 12th May 2015 amendments

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in relation to the application as submitted:

- 47 Greens Road

The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Object to the comments from Urban Design and Conservation comments relating to having a door serving the re-located common room as this will lead to noise and disturbance to for neighbouring occupiers

Amendments To Text:

Amendments to paragraphs 8.12 to 8.15 changed to the following:

In light of the changes to CIL regulations public art contributions can no longer be sought off site. There is, however, still a requirement for public art contributions on site, which means this application may be required to provide for contributions on site.

The public art officer and supporting colleagues are working on the interim approach to advise whether public art could be provided on this site and what public art criteria may be met.

Public art is interlinked with planning obligations and this should be read in connection with the planning obligations sections further in this committee report.

This is provided without prejudice to any other applications.

Condition 29 – Cycle Storage

No development shall commence until full details of large scale plans for parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The agreed facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

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

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **14/1995/FUL**

Location: Land And Buildings To Rear Of 1 - 5 Napier Street And Adjacent
To 1A Napier Street

Target Date: 6th April 2015

To Note:

Amendments To Text:

Amendments to paragraphs 8.27 to 8.30 changed to the following:

In light of the changes to CIL regulations public art contributions can no longer be sought off site. There is, however, still a requirement for public art contributions on site, which means this application may be required to provide for contributions on site.

The public art officer and supporting colleagues are working on the interim approach to advise whether public art could be provided on this site and what public art criteria may be met.

Public art is interlinked with planning obligations and this should be read in connection with the planning obligations sections further in this committee report. This is provided without prejudice to any other applications.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **14/2070/FUL**

Location: Perse Upper School, Hills Road

Target Date: 8th April 2015

To Note:

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **14/1878/FUL**

Location: Land Between 60 - 68 Victoria Road

Target Date:

To Note:

Amendments To Text:

Amendments to paragraphs 8.10 to 8.12 changed to the following:

In light of the changes to CIL regulations public art contributions can no longer be sought off site. There is, however, still a requirement for public art contributions on site, which means this application may be required to provide for contributions on site.

The public art officer and supporting colleagues are working on the interim approach to advise whether public art could be provided on this site and what public art criteria may be met.

Public art is interlinked with planning obligations and this should be read in connection with the planning obligations sections further in this committee report. This is provided without prejudice to any other applications.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 3RD JUNE 2015

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0191/CLUED**

Location: Leys School, Trumpington Road

Target Date: 06.04.2015

To Note: Since the Committee report was drafted a further Statutory Declaration from a Mr Robert Stewart of Vicarsbrook, Chaucer Road has been received. This declaration sets out the following:

Paragraphs 1 & 2 deal with matters relating to Mr Stewart's address, knowledge of the site and references the location plan attached to the Declaration.

Paragraphs 3 – 6 the character and tranquillity of Chaucer Road and confirms the year that Mr Stewart acquired the property.

Paragraph 7 outlines that Mr Stewart was aware of the proximity of the all-weather pitch at the Leys School to the new property. Paragraph 7 sets out that Mr Stewart considered that the pitches did not cause a disturbance at that time and proceeded with the purchase of the land.

Paragraph 8 confirms that Mr Stewart was not disturbed by the use of the all-weather pitches at the Leys when residing at the property from February 2004 through to April 2006 and that when the demolition of the old property and the construction of the current property was underway between the summer of 2006 and Christmas 2010, Mr Stewart was on site daily.

Paragraph 9 states that the residents enjoyed the breaks in use of the pitches with three weeks at Christmas holiday, three weeks or so Easter holiday, an 8 week summer break and three 1-week half term breaks.

Paragraph 10 States that during the holiday breaks Mr Stewart was not aware of any significant use of the all-weather pitches. Any claim by the school must be for an ad-hoc and extremely infrequent basis without such continuity of use with a total of 20 or so weeks per year up until the summer of 2014 when the hockey pitch was not used.

Paragraph 11 states that during the summer of 2014 Mr Stewart became conscious of the increasing intensification of the use of the all-weather pitch during the months of July and August 2014 and were disturbed by the use of the hockey pitches for

summer camps and the floodlights were used in the evenings and weekends on an almost daily basis. This had not been the situation between 2011 and then, and was a complete contrast to the situation before the change occurred.

I consider that this evidence can be afforded weight, however the report clearly covers the issues of the continuity of the evidence relating to the all-weather sports pitches and the holiday periods. Issues relating to the perceived intensification of the use of the pitches and the impacts that this has in terms of noise and light disturbance cannot be considered as part of the CLUED application, which is restricted to a consideration of whether there is evidence to demonstrate that the use would be lawful.

Having reviewed the evidence contained in the Declaration, I do not consider that any of the evidence contained in Mr Stewart's statement would alter the recommendation made in the committee report and does not raise any new issues that need further discussion.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0132/S73**

Location: 70 King Street

Target Date: 21.04.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0417/FUL**

Location: 86 Mill Road

Target Date: 04.05.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0176/FUL**

Location: 52 Suez Road

Target Date: 05.06.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None.

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0486/FUL**

Location: 16 Bowers Croft

Target Date: 08.05.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0433/FUL**

Location: 30 Newton Road

Target Date: 01.05.2015

To Note:

Amendments To Text:

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The proposed development is of high quality and would respect the architectural character of the local area;- The scale and form of the proposed dwelling would not harm the character the area;- The proposed would not have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours;- The existing trees adjacent to the northern boundary would not be significant affected by the proposed dwelling.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

Daylight

Following further representations from the occupiers of no. 32 Newton Road, officers have revisited this property to specifically consider whether the proposed dwelling would result in reduced light levels to their existing kitchen area. No. 32's kitchen is on the north side of the house and directly faces the side wall of the neighbouring application site garage which is located directly on the boundary and which would be demolished as a result of the proposal. The proposed scheme would be set off 1m from the boundary (i.e. not as close as the existing garage) but would be 2 storeys high and include a rendered gable facing the kitchen area.

Having stood within the existing kitchen area of no. 32, it is clear that this room is already enclosed and it is difficult (unless one crouches down) to appreciate open sky from its main window (see attached photo). Light entering the kitchen is mainly daylight rather than sunlight because no. 32 largely overshadows its northern side

(where the kitchen window is located) during the course of the day. Daylight coming into the kitchen is therefore reflected off the south (white painted) brick wall of the existing garage of no 30. I note the proposed gable facing no. 32's kitchen is to be rendered in an off-white colour and I consider it likely that this would reflect light back into the kitchen. Whilst the exact form of boundary treatment between the properties is not detailed, I see no reason why a close boarded fence or wall here could not also be finished in a lighter colour to maintain the same degree of reflectiveness that exists presently. A fence line would be likely to be lower than the existing eaves line of the existing garage and I am mindful that there may also be less immediate enclosure of the kitchen area if looking directly out from its window than at present.

In conclusion and despite the representations, I do not consider that sunlight or daylight entering the kitchen area of the adjacent property no. 32 would be significantly altered as a result of the proposal.

Overlooking

I have also further considered representations with regard to overlooking from the proposed external balcony area of the proposed house at 2nd floor level into no. 32's garden. Having revisited the site and considered plan 1408.03.4, I consider it reasonable to impose a further condition to ensure a screen is erected around the terrace to further limit the angle of view into the garden of no. 32 as external terraces can be more imposing than views from internal windows, particularly at greater heights because they are from external vantage points. The plans presently show a line of view from the corner of the terrace showing a worst case scenario of someone looking down into the garden space 6m from the rear of no. 32. This could easily be mitigated, and I would suggest a viewing angle to limit views to no less than 20m from the rear original wall of no. 32's house i.e. a similar arc of view as shown on plan 1408.03. for no. 28 adjacent.

Photograph looking out of no. 32's kitchen window onto the neighbour garage on the application site.



Paragraph 2.3 – amend the last sentence to read: The propose dwelling would be set off the southern boundary by 1 metres and between 1.7 metres and 2.6 metres off the northern boundary.

Paragraph 8.6 – Amend sentence to read:

The eaves line of the proposed projecting gable on the front elevation would match the eaves line of the no.32 and sit below the main ridge line by 400mm. Whilst the ridgeline of the propose dwelling would 667mm higher than the existing dwelling and 759mm higher than no.32, I do not consider the increase in height would cause any significant adverse visual impact from the street scene or appear unduly dominant in this context.

Paragraph 8.25 –Third party representations – impact on tree:

Include the work “not” and delete “be” so the officer response should read:

The tree officer has assessed the information submitted and is satisfied that the development would not harm the trees subject to conditions.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Additional condition:

Prior to the occupation of the house, plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority showing a screening arrangement which would limit the angle of view from the proposed 2nd floor terrace area into the rear garden of no. 32 Newton Road. The angle of view shall be restricted from the screened terrace so that a depth of garden no less than 20m from the original rear wall of no. 32 shall be screened from overlooking. The screening shall be erected prior to the occupation of the house and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to protect the privacy of the adjacent residents (Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/12).

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0238/FUL**

Location: Fosters Mill, Station Area Development

Target Date: 05.05.2015

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/0304/FUL**

Location: 131 Gwydir Street

Target Date: 17.04.2015

To Note:

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Amendment to Condition 4:

The lower panel of the proposed window in the eastern (rear) elevation at first floor level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent and fixed in position prior to occupation of the extensions.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14).

DECISION:
