

**PLANNING**

1 April 2015  
10.00 am - 3.05 pm

**Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Dryden (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Gawthrop, Hart, Hipkin, Pippas, C. Smart and Tunnacliffe

**Officers:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell  
City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer  
Principal Planner (City): Tony Collins  
Senior Planning Officer: Catherine Linford  
Planning Officer: Michael Hammond  
Planning Officer: Amit Patel  
Planning Officer: Sav Patel  
Legal Advisor: Cara De La Mare  
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

Lead Highways Development Management Engineer, Cambridgeshire County Council: Ian Dyer

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**15/53/Plan Order of 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.

**15/54/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Hipkin and Councillor Holland who could not attend as the alternate.

**15/55/Plan Declarations of Interest**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>
15/60/PLAN	Councillor Dryden	Personal: Board of Governors for Addenbrookes Hospital. Did not take part in the discussion and vote and left the room.

15/66/Plan	Councillor Pippas	<p>Personal and Prejudicial: Lives near to application 15/0033/FUL.</p> <p>Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote after speaking as a member of the public.</p>
------------	-------------------	--

### **15/56/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 04 February 2015 & 4 March 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

### **15/57/Plan 14/1154/FUL - Wests Garage**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The proposal sought approval for the erection of new student housing (202 study bedrooms) and associated communal facilities, cycle parking, and external landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

The Committee received representation in objection to the application from Harry Goode.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. This application was the first test of the north side for Newmarket Road of the Eastern gate SPD which was adopted in 2011 and the Conservation Area created in 2012.
- ii. It was claimed that the application was SPD compliant but this is not the case, for example the proposal did not comply with the maximum heights stated in the SPD.
- iii. The developers had not responded to the historical character of the High Street as outlined in the SPD.
- iv. In accordance with the SPD, developers should avoid long flat horizontal rooflines but this proposal does not meet that requirement.
- v. The SPD aspires that Newmarket Road is to have green open spaces but there is none on this application.
- vi. The SPD references the social housing on River Lane and the impact on these properties has been ignored.
- vii. The application does not meet 4/11 of the Local Plan.

- viii. The development does not protect the views to and across the conservation area.
- ix. No images have been shown from Godeson Road as the development would have a negative impact on these residents.
- x. No 20 Godeson Road would be visually dominated by a 9 metre high and 15.4 in length structure running along the garden of the property.
- xi. Would have an adverse effect on the light into the gardens of nos 16 & 18 Godeson Road.
- xii. The proposal was an over development of the site.

Jenny Page (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

County Councillor Joan Whitehead (Ward Councillor for Abbey) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The site was on one of the busiest and congested road junctions in the City.
- ii. There was no safe cycling route on this side of the City to Anglia Ruskin University (ARU).
- iii. The safest route to ARU would be to walk along Newmarket Road to the roundabout and cycle the remainder of the way along the back roads.
- iv. If cyclists did not dismount along Newmarket Road this could be a danger to pedestrians.
- v. Crossing River Lane could be hazardous for pedestrians as this is the route to the nearest supermarket.
- vi. There was a large volume of cars entering and exiting River Lane at all times.
- vii. The suggestion that the residents parking scheme should be suspended on River Lane and Godeson Road for the start and end of term student drop off was unacceptable. These spaces were not available to the applicant for this purpose or taxis and delivery vehicles.
- viii. Both River Lane and Godeson Road were the main access routes to the surrounding houses.
- ix. The site was unsuitable for such a large development and the number of students it proposed to house.
- x. The proposal created a number of safety issues to both pedestrians and cyclists.

Councillor Richard Johnson (Ward Councillor for Abbey) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The development would have a negative impact on the Cambridge Housing Society tenants in River Lane.
- ii. The proposal was of significant overdevelopment creating a poor environment for students to live in.
- iii. An opportunity had been missed to ensure the development would integrate with the area and neighbours.
- iv. The proposal failed to correspond with the Eastern Gate SPD.
- v. There had been a lack of attention to the proposed development overlooking the River Lane frontage. The scale of the proposal was visually domineering to the residents.
- vi. There had been lack of images from the applicant taken from River Lane to show how the development would affect the properties on River Lane directly opposite despite requests from residents.
- vii. Requested that the Committee take note of these images supplied by the objectors.
- viii. The height of the corner block on River Lane ignored the SPD guidance for building heights and in some cases the development exceeds the guidance by up to 40%.
- ix. Had the proposed corner block on River Lane been within the SPD guidance the development would not be so over domineering to the Cambridge Housing Society tenants.
- x. The River Lane frontage of the proposal did not meet the standard set in 3.2.10 (gateways and entries) of the SPD.
- xi. There would be a 25-31% reduction in daylight to nos 6 – 10 River Lane and 22% to nos 12 -16% River Lane.
- xii. Meeting the minimum standard of daylight was not adequate and did correspond to 3.4.9 of the SPD.
- xiii. The loss of daylight should be considered as an unacceptable loss of amenity.
- xiv. Goes against 3/4 of the Local Plan.
- xv. The below ground court yard provides 18% of the Council's open spaces standard. This offered less outside space than the previous application which did meet 3/8 of the Local Plan.
- xvi. Did not meet 3/7 and 3/8 of the Local Plan.
- xvii. The proposal would change the character of Newmarket Road and is considered harmful to the conservation area.

Councillor Peter Roberts (Ward Councillor for Abbey) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The official representation of objection highlighted in the officer's report was not a true reflection of the number of residents who had expressed their objection directly expressed to Ward Councillors.
- ii. Residents were not opposed to development to the site but to what had been proposed.
- iii. Residents wanted an appropriate structure that fitted in with the surrounding area and offered quality of life to those living inside the proposed building.
- iv. Pragmatic suggestions had been offered by those opposing the scheme to improve the development, some of which had been addressed by the developer, but more changes were required.
- v. Further changes were required that offered financial benefits to the developer, enhanced the students' living conditions and did not have an adverse effect on local residents.
- vi. 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Local Plan needed to be considered.
- vii. North of Newmarket Road was a designated conservation area and should be protected.
- viii. The development should not emulate the hotel building opposite; long flat horizontal rooflines should be avoided and should not have a negative impact on buildings on the northern side of Newmarket Road.
- ix. Height guidelines referenced in the SPD had been ignored.
- x. The proposal offered no landscaping to soften the impact of the building on Newmarket Road.
- xi. Safety of the residents and students must be considered due the number of individuals on site.

After Members had debated the merits of the proposal. The Head of Planning Services advised the Chair to initiate the adjourned decision protocol as the Committee appeared to be minded to go against officer recommendation.

The item would then be deferred and the officer would prepare a further report providing relevant additional advice on the committee resolution. This report would be brought back to the next available meeting.

#### The Committee:

Councillor C Smart proposed and Councillor Blencowe seconded that the application was adjourned under the terms of the adjourned item protocol

based on the reasons that had been included in the report to committee in January 2015.

**Resolved unanimously** minded to refuse and therefore adjourn proceeding under the terms of the adjourned item protocol agreed in September 2014 for decision at the next planning available planning committee:

### **15/58/Plan 14/1797/FUL - Judge Business School, Trumpington Stret**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The proposal sought approval for demolition of unlisted former hostel buildings fronting onto Tennis Court Road (Bridget's and Nightingale) and construction of an extension to the former Addenbrooke's Hospital Building for the Cambridge Judge Business School including a link to Keynes House, a new substation and associated cycle parking and landscaping.

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

#### The Committee:

Resolved unanimously resolved 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 and additional condition recommended by the officer.

#### Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Additional Travel Plan condition (20) to read as follows:

Notwithstanding the submitted Travel Plan, prior to first occupation a revised Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable working arrangements, public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved in accordance with the details agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes of transport to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/3).

**15/59/Plan 14/1805/LBC - Judge Business School, Trumpington Street**

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

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

The proposal sought approval to facilitate planning application 14/1797/FUL for additional teaching, office, breakout and dining spaces for the Judge Business School. That proposal links to the existing Ark building and the back of the old Addenbrooke's hospital building. Various alterations to the historic fabric are required, including a link to Keynes House, links and knocking through to the Ark building, removal of windows in the Ark building, its over-cladding and alterations to existing glazing and doors.

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.

**15/60/Plan 14/1691/S73 - Addenbrookes CBC**

The Committee received an application for a variation of Condition 63.

The application sought approval for the variation of Condition 63 to agree an alternative pedestrian focused design for the Addenbrooke's roundabout and the provision of contributions to upgrade the Fendon Road roundabout.

The Committee received representation in objection to the application from Bev Nicolson.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The shared use of the paths between pedestrians and cyclists were a nuisance to everyone that used them.
- ii. From a pedestrian's perspective, cyclists can pose a danger and it is difficult to know what side of the path they should be walking on.
- iii. Equally pedestrians can be a danger to cyclists' particularly if they have not heard the cyclist's warning bell.
- iv. A group of pedestrians can break the flow of the cyclist's travel.
- v. Personal space is invaded.
- vi. Cyclists can be regarded as problem by pedestrians.
- vii. There is conflict between the two users.

- viii. Painting a line down the middle of the path does not elevate the issues identified.
- ix. Requested that the Committee rejected the proposal on the application for shared pathways.

Adam Hulford (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Moore (Ward Councillor for Queen Edith's) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Thanked the Planning Officer (John Evans) for the work that had been undertaken to improve the design of the application.
- ii. The roundabout was only one element of improved access; other elements of the routes to the site must be improved to reap the rewards of a continuing shift in the reduction of journeys away from private vehicles. Parking issues, congestion, air pollution and travel times also need to be addressed.
- iii. The routes to the site were full of hazards some of which would be addressed by the application.
- iv. Funding was being sought to further improve access to the site from all routes to ensure that they were functional and fit for purpose for all.
- v. Local people cannot walk to the site, particularly if they were elderly, immobile or visually impaired. Therefore pedestrian crossings must be timed to take these factors into consideration.
- vi. Local residents were isolated by fast roads with dangerous crossing points that have a high number of cycle-car collisions and therefore feel safer to take their car or taxi.
- vii. Improvement to the roundabout would bring benefits to a variety of individuals particularly cyclists who would be able to cross lanes before they enter the roundabout.
- viii. The City still needs to develop a clear focus on improving access for the high proportion of the City's residents, and its visitors, particularly those with impairments (especially mobility and sight), who account for 20% of the population currently.
- ix. The application was a welcome compromise.

The Committee:

**Resolved unanimously** to grant the application for the variation of Condition 63 in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in

the officer report, and subject to the additional and amended conditions recommended by the officers, and the additional informative.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Amended recommendation:

Approve subject to the completion of the associated S106 Agreement by 3 April and subject to the following conditions. *(All conditions listed in report).*

Amended Condition 63

No occupation of any floorspace for clinical research and treatment (D1 and/or clinical in-patient treatment), or biomedical and biotech research and development (B1b) or higher education building under use classes B1 and D1 or sui generis medical research institute uses shall take place until the offsite highways works at Hills Road/Fendon Road/Robinson Way shall have been fully laid out and implemented in accordance the approved schemes/plans in the Highway Design Report prepared by Lanmor Consulting dated March 2015, reference 140546/DS/KTP/01 Rev C.

Reason: In order to safeguard highway safety and network capacity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/2 and 8/11).

New condition 67

Details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of the Addenbrooke's roundabout upgrade development required under condition 63 of this permission. 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.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 4/4).

### Additional Informative

Notwithstanding this permission pursuant to section 73, any reserved matters which have been submitted and approved pursuant to the original outline permission 06/0796/OUT to date will continue to be regarded by the Council as approved reserved matters.

#### **15/61/Plan 14/1938/S73 - 1 Milton Road**

The Committee received an application for minor material amendments.

Permission was sought to vary condition 2 of the previous permission (14/0543/FUL) to permit minor material amendments to the approved scheme.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved unanimously** to grant the application for minor material amendments in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

#### **15/62/Plan 15/0009/FUL - Slipway, Garret Hostel Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to install a bollard and rail fence on the narrow quay running alongside Garret Hostel Lane slipway and the approach to Garret Hostel Bridge.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Tom Arnold and Natasha Dawn.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The proposal was an infringement on public access for both commercial and private boat users.
- ii. The erection of bollards would impede on the access to the boats.
- iii. The proposal would obstruct disabled access to the river.

- iv. The slipway was the only place where a wheel chair user could access the river without having to use a major boat company.
- v. There were no reported incidents of disabled users being harmed at this access point to the river.
- vi. Approving the application would leave no public access to the river for disabled users.
- vii. The effects of the proposal had not been thought through and the reason for refusal not justified.
- viii. The slipway was the only main public access point to the middle river which had been used for hundreds of years, dating back to the fourteenth century.
- ix. Goes against 3/9b of the Local Plan and the proposal could be deemed to be unlawful.
- x. The proposal ignored history and tradition.
- xi. The access statement made no reference to the access to the river which is the primary purpose of the jetty.
- xii. No evidence had been provided to support the officer's concerns over health and safety.
- xiii. Garrett Hostel Bridge was a superior view point for photos to be taken and questioned if the proposal area was frequently used as a photographic point.
- xiv. Queried why no health and safety concerns have been raised regarding the slipway at Jesus Green, Key Side, Silver Street or by the Anchor public house, all of which have a higher footfall and the river was deeper, yet there were no railings.
- xv. Unnecessary use of public money.

Natasha Dawn

- xvi. There were many private users who used this access point to launch their boats.
- xvii. The proposal would stop private users from accessing the river from this point.
- xviii. The access statement stated that the proposal would have no detrimental impact on the existing access, which was incorrect.
- xix. Questioned where would private users be able to access their boat on the middle river if the application was approved.

Caroline Gohler addressed the Committee in support of the application but suggested the following amendments.

- i. Should have conditions to control materials, add several lockable gates and improve paving to ensure that people can embark.

- ii. Railings should not be attached to wall the bridge
- iii. More work was needed to enable disabled access.
- iv. The design should be improved so that local people could benefit from the access point to the middle river.
- v. Decreases flexibility of the river and it's usage. For example there were organised tours that used this point to disembark and then continue to a tour of the Universitys' Gardens.

Councillor Owers addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1 vote)** 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.

**15/63/Plan 15/0010/LBC - Slipway, Garrett Hostel Lane**

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval to install a bollard and rail fence on the narrow quay running alongside Garret Hostel Lane slipway and the approach to Garret Hostel Bridge.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from Tom Arnold, Natasha Dawn and Caroline Gohler whose representation can be found under 15/62/Plan.

Councillor Owers 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 officers.

**15/64/Plan 14/1947/FUL - Land Rear of 2 Saxon Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of new 1.5 storey dwelling following demolition of the existing lock-up garage.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2 with 1 abstention)** 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.

### **15/65/Plan 15/0097/FUL - Land Adjacent to 1 Campbell Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a 2 bedroom end of terrace house.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ms Cordaro.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Spoke on behalf of various residents.
- ii. There were existing parking and access issues as demand outstripped supply.
- iii. The application would remove further parking spaces, thus exacerbating the parking problem.
- iv. People have already left the street due to parking concerns.
- v. Residents work from home, so need to be able to come and go without hindrance by construction traffic (if the application goes ahead). Asked for considerate contractor conditions to be imposed.
- vi. Taking out the drop kerb would cause issues.

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

Councillor C Smart proposed amendments to the officer's recommendation to include considerate contractor and car club informative. The planning officer also suggested including an informative to request a contact to whom parking concerns could be reported.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** 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 with the following informatives:

- **INFORMATIVE:** “Considerate Contractors: New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).The developer should also ensure that the contractors details are provided to residents of Campbell Street so that they have the means to contact contractors in the event of issues arising such as obstruction of the highway.”
- **INFORMATIVE:** Car Club: The applicant is encouraged to ensure all future tenants/occupiers of the dwelling are aware of the existing local car club service and location of the nearest space.

**15/66/Plan 15/0033/FUL - 4 Rustat Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear extension and new porch.

The Committee received a representation from Councillor Pippas. As he had a personal and prejudicial interest, Councillor Pippas would speak as a member of the public then withdraw from the discussion and room, and not vote.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Councillor Pippas owned a guesthouse at 2 Rustat Road. He was on good terms with his neighbour who put in the application.
- ii. Asked for restrictions to be imposed on construction times to minimise disruption to paying guests at 2 Rustat Road.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a considerate contractors informative.

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** 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 with the following Considerate Contractors informative:

New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).

Councillor Pippas withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.

### **15/67/Plan 15/2028/FUL - St Stephen Church and Church Hall, 24 Brookes Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for relocation of approved sub-station position and increase of approved height of external plant terrace.

The Planning Officer referred to additional representations set out on the amendment sheet in her introduction.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ms Gray.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The application threatened her home, business as a childminder and quality of life.

- ii. Suggested title and contents of the planning application documents were inaccurate.
- iii. Said that neighbours had not been correctly notified or consulted.
- iv. Queried if the impact of the application on pollution, people's health and people's amenities had been considered.
- v. Anticipated problems as a result of construction work.
- vi. Tree preservation order 18/2007 was in place, but the Council's Arboricultural Team don't seem to have been consulted on the application since 2007.
- vii. Raised specific concerns regarding:
  - Fire risk.
  - Vandalism/security.
  - Loss of trade/business.
  - Property value.
  - Flood risk.
- viii. The Council did not appear to follow its own guidelines when considering planning applications.

Mr Hodgson (Applicant's representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2 with 1 abstention)** 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.

### **15/68/Plan Review of changes to determination of applications by Planning Committee**

Item deferred until the meeting on 29 April 2015.

### **15/69/Plan Record of Officer Urgency Action**

Noted.

The meeting ended at 3.05 pm

**CHAIR**