

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 6TH APRIL 2016

Amendment/De-brief Sheet

MINOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/2113/FUL**

Location: 116 Minerva Way

Target Date: 08.01.2016

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/1932/FUL**

Location: The Perse Upper School, Hills Road

Target Date: 31.12.2015

To Note: An objection was received from the occupier of no.31 Sedley Taylor Road. The objection covers the following matters:

- The approach to splitting up the pitch and floodlighting applications appears as an abuse of process and deceitful.
- The Perse School should add floodlighting to their Abington pitches.
- The floodlit sports pitch could harm wildlife including badgers, by way of additional noise, lighting and vibrations.

These issues have already been covered in the third party representations section of the Committee Report and so no amendments to the original text are deemed necessary.

Amendments To Text: none

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/2249/FUL**

Location: 41 Birdwood Road

Target Date: 29.01.2016

To Note: Nothing

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/2142/NMA**

Location: 1 Milton Road

Target Date: 14.12.2015

To Note:

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **15/2140/FUL**

Location: 97-99 Burnside

Target Date: 14.12.2015

To Note: A representation from 30 Park Road, Chesterfield has been received and is set out below:

“Dear Planning Cttee Member,

I understand that this case (15/2140/FUL | Construction of 2 semi-detached dwellings following the demolition of existing garages | 97 - 99 Burnside CB1 3PA) is to be determined on 6/04/16.

Please note that technically the necessary demolition requires Listed Building Consent. This application should have been contemporaneous. It is not. It would be better, and is a normal LPA requirement, that the two applications be considered contemporaneously.

However it is not possible to assess the LPA's reasoning as the case officer's report has been suppressed, or more precisely, was not available for scrutiny on 3/04/16, only a couple of days before the Planning Cttee meeting.

Neither was the LPA's Drainage Engineer's report available, although some correspondence which followed that report was made available. It is therefore puzzling as to why the Engineer appears not to have required the application of the Sequential Test to this site, when on an adjoining site this was demanded and, because none was made available, the application was refused on appeal.

Similarly, on the same adjoining site, the Conservation Officer objected that the proposed new build would be visible from the street Burnside, and this too was a ground for refusal. There were no other grounds for refusal on this site. So, I looked for an assessment of this issue in the LPA's Conservation Officer's Report, and found none such.

The owner of this adjacent plot is a financially well endowed elderly gentleman who can well afford to wait for planning permission, or, if he predeceases consent, his children will benefit. Indeed one could argue that a delayed planning consent might be a cunning loophole to minimize Inheritance Tax, although I am not suggesting a conspiracy!

However the residents of Cambridge cannot wait indefinitely for this land to the rear of Burnside, whether it be to the rear of 91-93 or to the rear of 97-101. The land is needed for housing now, not tomorrow or the day after, however much of a good speculation it would be for the owners of the land to hoard it. I do not need to remind Councillors that land in this City is scarce and over-priced.

The site is peculiarly well placed for both cycleways and bus routes. It would be hard to find better.

I have already, in my online submission, covered the alleged over-shadowing issue. Suffice it to remind Councillors that rear extensions in Burnside are routinely permitted on plots that are contiguous to neighbours. They routinely overshadow

rear gardens, and cut out sunlight. Quite right too. The houses are small and overshadowed. You accept that when you buy or rent one. The proposed new build is no worse than the ordinary everyday routine of living in Burnside.

Please therefore grant consent immediately for this development. The land is crying out to be used. I make this request despite the LPA's failure to submit two of its reports for public scrutiny. The Officers concerned have had more than enough time to do their homework."

The Planning Officer has set out his response below:

"Firstly, the demolition does not require listed building consent. The existing garages are not listed and are not within the curtilage of any listed buildings. The demolition of these buildings does require planning permission as they are within the Conservation Area. This element of the works was included in the application description proposal and assessed accordingly. Nevertheless, I have updated my report on the amendment sheet before committee to make it clear that the demolition has been assessed and that the demolition of these buildings is not considered detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area.

Secondly, the original report is available to view on the Cambridge City Council website at the following web address:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=181&Year=0>

It is my understanding that committee reports are usually uploaded to the website one week before the committee date. However, I am not responsible for uploading any documents to this website and so the democratic services team should be able to provide a reference as to the date this was uploaded.

Thirdly, with respect to the drainage matters, a sequential test was sought and submitted to the Local Planning Authority and this was deemed to be acceptable by the Council's Drainage Engineer. I appreciate that you would not have been made aware of this document until now as it was not immediately uploaded to public access. The reason why this was not uploaded as a priority is because this correspondence and information is of a technical nature and was provided to directly address the comments of the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer. My view is that the delay in uploading the drainage information does not preclude the application from being considered by the Planning Committee on 6th April 2016.

Fourthly, with respect to the point of the Conservation Officers comments, I accept that they have not made specific reference to the visibility of the site. The Conservation Team are a consultee and they provide guidance to planning officers relating to Conservation matters when making recommendations. I have specifically referenced the visibility of the site in paragraphs 8.14 and 8.17 of the Committee Report where I make it clear that the site is visible from Burnside.

Finally, given the supportive nature of the final paragraphs, I do not consider a response to any of these points necessary."

Relevance of Appeal Decision at 91 Burnside

There is a recent appeal decision for a new self-contained dwelling at 91 Burnside (north of the site) where an application was refused planning permission by the Local Planning Authority due to the harm it would cause on the character of the Conservation Area, by way of its scale, massing and siting, as well as due to the lack of a sequential test with respect to flooding. This appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on the grounds set out by the LPA.

The case officer for this application at 97-99 Burnside does not consider that this nearby appeal decision alters his recommendation as the nearby appeal decision is deemed to be dissimilar to that of this current application. This is because the current application is situated closer to the existing bungalow of no.58a Natal Road, appears far less cramped in the plot and is of a different scale and mass to that of the dismissed appeal scheme. Consequently, for the reasons set out in the relevant paragraphs of the committee report and in light of the aforementioned points, the recommendation remains that of approval.

Amendments To Text: Paragraph 8.19 has been amended as follows:

“The existing garage building and hard-standing/ gravel on-site is not considered to be a positive characteristic in the area. *The demolition of these buildings is considered acceptable by the Conservation Team and I do not deem the loss of these buildings to be harmful to the character of the Conservation Area.* The proposal would replace a reasonable proportion of this hardstanding/ gravel with turfed gardens which I consider would be an improvement in terms of increasing the levels of greenery in this area. The drainage officer has recommended a condition relating to surface water drainage and this has been attached accordingly.”

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **16/0010/FUL**

Location: 122 Foster Road

Target Date: 11.01.2016

To Note: A drawing showing the side (south) elevation has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This will be demonstrated in the case officer's presentation to Planning Committee.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:
