

## **PLANNING**

5 August 2015  
10.00 am - 4.25 pm

### **Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Dryden (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Gawthrope, Hart, Hipkin, Holland, Holt, Pippas and Tunnacliffe

Councillor Hipkin left after the vote on item 15/141/Plan

Councillor Dryden left after the vote on item 15/147/Plan

### **Officers:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell  
City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer  
Principal Planner Officer: Tony Collins  
Principal Planning Officer: Lisa Lamb  
Environmental Quality & Growth Manager: Jo Dicks  
Senior Planning Officer: Catherine Linford  
Senior Planning Enforcement Officer: Alison Twyford  
Senior Technical Officer: Adam Finch  
Arboricultural Officer: Kenneth McGregor  
Planning Enforcement Officer: Debs Jeakins  
Planning Officer: Michael Hammond  
Planning Officer: Amit Patel  
Planning Officer: Sav Patel  
Legal Advisor: Cara De La Mare  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

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

### **15/134/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart, and Councillor Holt was present as the alternate.

Councillor Hipkin was present for the morning session only and the alternate, Councillor Holland, attended the afternoon session.

**15/135/Plan Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

**15/136/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 were approved and signed as a correct record.

**15/137/Plan 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.

**15/138/Plan 15/0398/FUL - 8, 10, 10A Cheddars Lane and 351-355 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of student accommodation with 321 student rooms (following demolition of existing buildings), together with ancillary accommodation comprising common/study rooms, porters lodge, laundry room, plant room, bin and bike enclosures, landscaping and associated infrastructure including a sub-station.

The Principal Planning Officer drew Members attention to the lengthy appendices to the amendment sheet regarding this application. He explained the elevations of the site and tabled additional images.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Similar plans to develop on industrial sites had been rejected.
- ii. Alternative mixed use of the site had not been considered.
- iii. Eleven building, currently used as industrial units, would be lost.
- iv. Proposal was not responding to an identified need in the area.
- v. Application was premature as it was submitted in advance of the emerging Local Plan.
- vi. Student rooms in this area were not wanted by either of the Universities.

- vii. Large blocks would be situated very close to existing residential accommodation.
- viii. Mitigation measure did not go far enough to make the scheme acceptable.
- ix. Noise levels would be unacceptable.
- x. Surface water drainage was insufficient.
- xi. Parking and in particular, disabled parking, was inadequate.
- xii. It would be impossible to police a no car policy.

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

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

- i. Questioned the accuracy of the images supplied by the applicant and suggested they had used a wide angle lens rather than the 50mm used normally used for such images.
- ii. Local residents had commissioned an independent study.
- iii. Buildings would be visually dominant.
- iv. Revisions had been made to the plan but these were not sufficient to make it acceptable to local residents.
- v. Properties adjacent to the site already suffered from poor light levels and additional buildings would exacerbate the situation.
- vi. Building D would be tall and would have a significant impact on neighbours.
- vii. Buildings E and F would damage existing trees which currently screened the area.
- viii. Noise levels would create conflict and result in loss of amenity value for the area.
- ix. Proposed communal areas would abut sensitive boundaries.
- x. Proposed management of the site was insufficient and no evening or overnight cover was to be provided.

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

- i. Site not suitable for student housing.
- ii. Surrounding area described as 'hostile' to development.
- iii. Proposed buildings would be very close to existing homes.
- iv. Noise would be an issue. Student units would disturb existing residents and industrial units would disturb future student residents.

- v. Lack of parking, lack of disabled parking and lack of drop off spaces will inconvenience local residents and result in a resident parking scheme being required.
- vi. A no car scheme would be unenforceable.
- vii. Visitor parking had not been addressed.
- viii. Proposals were not supported by the target market.
- ix. Would be unaffordable to Anglia Ruskin students.
- x. Contractual arrangements make the upfront cost too great for many students.
- xi. Bidwell's assessment of the need for additional student housing was questionable and lacked evidence to support the level of need.
- xii. Site had poor transport links to the City Centre or the Universities.
- xiii. Would be an unsustainable site.
- xiv. Would be a gated community with no links to neighbours.

Councillor Robertson (Ward Councillor for Petersfield) addressed the Committee regarding the application.

- i. Represented Petersfield Ward which contained Anglia Ruskin University.
- ii. Liaison meetings with the University suggest that they did not support this application.
- iii. Students were unable to afford studio flats.
- iv. This was a speculative student development and would not be used for this purpose long term.
- v. Would end up being accommodation for language school students.
- vi. Would not ease pressure on family housing.
- vii. If approved please add conditions requiring:
  - that it may only be used by students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge;
  - that any proposal to vary this requirement be brought to Planning Committee (not delegated to officers; and
  - if a variation was approved, 40% of the accommodation must become affordable housing.

Councillor Whitehead (Abbey Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee regarding the application.

- i. Density of the site was a cause for concern.
- ii. Development would be overcrowded.
- iii. This application, in common with similar application for the West of the City, was motivated by profit.
- iv. Impact on area would be detrimental to the local community.

- v. Application does not address an identified housing need.

Councillor Baigent (Ward Councillor for Romsey) addressed the Committee regarding the application.

- i. The City required more housing and not more student accommodation.
- ii. Site under consideration would be a key part of wider development of the area.
- iii. Would result in a lack of light for neighbouring properties.
- iv. Would be unaffordable for many students.
- v. Would be costly for the City Council as no Council Tax contributions would be collected towards waste collection or other services to the site.
- vi. Parking issues would have a detrimental impact on neighbours.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that any variation of conditions would be brought back to the Planning Committee suggested that any additional conditions regarding this were unnecessary. He stated that the site had not been identified for Housing in the Local Plan and that this was not, therefore, a grounds for refusal.

Councillor Blencowe proposed that condition 28 be amended to require that approval of the management plan be brought to Committee and not delegated to officers.

Committee resolved (*Nem Con*) that Condition 28 (management plan) must be discharged only by Planning Committee and not under delegated powers, this fact to be communicated to the applicant by an informative on the decision notice.

#### 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 and including the amended condition.

#### **15/139/Plan 15/0864/FUL- 20 Station Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of Leda House and construction of a new 6 storey office building comprising 7421sq.m (GEA) of office floorspace (Class B1); 254 cycle parking spaces; associated plant; hard and soft landscaping; a basement with 40 car parking spaces and 5 motorcycle bays; infrastructure works including basement car park ramp (Scheme B).

Simon Miles, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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 and with delegated authority granted to negotiate and complete s106 Agreement by 31 January 2016.

**15/140/Plan 15/0865/FUL - 20 Station Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of Leda House and construction of a new 6 storey office building comprising 7421sq.m (GEA) of office floorspace (Class B1); 254 cycle spaces; associated plant; hard and soft landscaping; a basement with 40 car parking spaces and 3 motorcycle bays; infrastructure works (Scheme A).

Simon Miles, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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 and with delegated authority granted to negotiate and complete s106 Agreement by 31 January 2016.

**15/141/Plan 15/0120/FUL - 186-188 Histon Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of two existing dwelling houses and construction of 13 residential units (comprising 8x 1 bed flats and 5x 2 bed flats), including land for the storage of vehicles associated with the adjacent commercial units at 184 Histon Road, along with 2x car parking spaces, cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping.

The Planning officer drew members attention to the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1 with 1 abstentions)** 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.

**15/142/Plan 15/1045/FUL - Marque House, 143 Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective installation of 1 condenser unit over the basement car park entrance, situated on the side of the parapet wall within the area leading down to the basement parking.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern regarding the:
  - Planning process.
  - Applicant started work without planning permission.
  - Loss of amenities for residents from installing the condenser.
- ii. Took issue with the:
  - Noise assessment data supplied by the Applicant. Referred to own assessment data, which appeared to have been ignored by Officers.
  - Location of the condenser.
- iii. Queried why resident's objections appeared to have been dismissed.

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

Councillor Herbert (Ward Councillor for Coleridge) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The nature of the development meant that it included a combination of shop and residential units.
- ii. Suggested the photo in the Officer's report did not accurately reflect the actual layout of buildings on the site. The condenser would be located near amenity space, but away from the shop it served. This was not clearly shown in the report.
- iii. Outlined the history of the application. The location of the condenser was more suited to the (original) larger building than the (current) smaller one.
- iv. The location of the condenser was inappropriate being near amenity space. It was put in without planning permission due to an unfortunate breakdown in communication between the Council and Applicant.
- v. Insufficient noise attenuation information had been provided despite assurances from the Applicant that it would be submitted.
- vi. Took issue with noise mitigation measures conditioned in the Officer's report, they needed to be more specific to be enforceable.

Amendments were requested to the Officer's recommendations. Councillor Blencowe proposed that an additional condition should specify that the condenser be screened on all four sides.

This amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 2)** 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 an additional condition to read:

The mitigation measures, including the enclosure around all four sides of the condenser, specified in the application and its associated acoustic Assessment prepared by Belair Research Ltd dated 3/6/2015 (ref B3269/CB3174), as amended by the letter prepared by Acoustical Control Consultants Ltd dated 2/7/2015 (ref13879/RAC/hr), shall be fully

installed and implemented before the condenser unit hereby permitted are brought into operation and shall be maintained permanently thereafter.

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

### **15/143/Plan 15/0842/S73 - 6 Hardwick Street**

The Committee received an application for a Section 73 application to vary condition 2 of application (Approved Drawings) 14/0946/FUL.

The application sought approval to vary condition 2 of application (Approved Drawings) 14/0946/FUL to allow amendments to be made to the design of the extension and ground levels (retrospective).

Ms Richardson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for a Section 73 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.

### **15/144/Plan 15/0962/FUL - 218A-220 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought approval for rendering external wall and painting in soft stone colour (retrospective).

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

The representation covered the following concerns regarding render on the side of the building:

- i. It was detrimental to the building.
- ii. It goes against the character of the area, which was generally naked brickwork.

- iii. The planning appeal decision said that all render should be removed, not just some.

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

Councillor Baigent (Ward Councillor for Romsey) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Conservation Area status had only recently been given.
- ii. Historic work was unaffected by the Conservation Area status.
- iii. Render was applied without planning permission, it should be removed.
- iv. Referred to the Planning Inspector's comments stating the render was visually obtrusive.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

#### **15/145/Plan 15/0602/FUL - 564 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use from a family home to a HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) (Sui Generis).

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to grant the application for retrospective 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.

#### **15/146/Plan 15/0603/FUL - 31 Gisborne Road**

The Committee received an application for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use of the property from C3 domestic dwelling house, which can be occupied by up to 6 people, to a HMO (sui generis) use, for occupation by 9 people.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for retrospective 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.

**15/147/Plan 15/0287/FUL - Cantabrigian Rugby Club, Sedley Taylor Road**

Councillor Dryden left the meeting due to Mayoral commitments. Councillor Blencowe assumed the role of Vice-Chair in the Chair for the rest of the meeting.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a four-bedroom, one and a half-storey detached dwelling, and for the creation of a 5.5m wide vehicular access and 1.8m wide pedestrian access from Long Road to service the existing parking area.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Professor Muthesius.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Residents supported the new Sports entrance. However they expressed the following concerns:
  - Felt the proposed dwelling represented an over-development of site. Height is over one storey.
  - Sense of enclosure.
  - Loss of amenity.
  - Loss of privacy.
  - Overshadowing.
  - Overlooking.
- ii. The new use of the access was welcomed, but existing protective covenants needed to be preserved. Emergency service access to the site appeared difficult. Requested that a two-way mirror be conditioned at the head of the access.

- iii. Suggested the development should be moved off the eastern and northern boundaries to allow for the original wooded setting to be restored.

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

Councillor Holland proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a two-way mirror be conditioned at the head of the access

This amendment was **lost by 2 votes to 1**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 2)** 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.

### **15/148/Plan 15/0793/FUL - 2 Bulstrode Gardens**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of single storey brick built garage. The division of the site to create a new site and build a new two-storey dwelling including the removal of 3 silver birch trees.

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

Councillor Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor) was unable to attend the committee so his comments had been added to the amendment sheet.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendation with the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.'

2. 'The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.'

3. 'No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

4. 'There should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

5. 'No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces 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 and to avoid harm to the character of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12, 3/14 and 4/11)'

6. '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 development (including demolition). 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: 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, 3/12 and 4/4)'

7. 'Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed at and above first floor level in the side and rear elevations of the extensions, hereby permitted, unless fitted with fixed, obscure glass up to a minimum height of 1.7 metres above the internal finished floor level

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4.

### **15/149/Plan 15/0787/FUL - St Marys School, Bateman Street (Deferred)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting with the agreement of the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.

### **15/150/Plan 15/0924/FUL - 3 Fendon Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a part two-storey, part single-storey, rear and side extensions. The works incorporate the demolition of an existing garage and part demolition of the existing house. A roof extension including rear dormers and a balcony is included in the scheme, which also involves an increase to the ridge height of 0.2m.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Supported the principle of extending the property.

- ii. Took issue with the details of this specific application:
  - Impact on existing residents' amenities (overlooking, dominance, loss of light and privacy).
  - Impact on the character of the area due to the applications' unsuitable design.
- iii. Referred to residents' queries set out in the Officer's report. The number of these were disproportionate to the size of the application, it's unusual to receive this many representations for a minor application.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2)** 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.

**15/151/Plan 15/0629/FUL - 134 Coleridge Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a part two storey, part single storey, side and rear extension, loft extension with rear dormer and juliet balcony. Change of use of dwelling to house in multiple occupation (8 rooms).

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

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 7 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.

**15/152/Plan 15/0818/FUL - Land R/O 1 Fen Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a dwelling and associated works on land to the rear of 1 Fen Road, fronting Fallowfields, Cambridge.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to his written representation.
- ii. Suggested the application was not in accordance with Local Plan policy 3/1, 3/10 or 52.
- iii. Expressed the following concerns:
  - The design was poor and detrimental to the character of the area. Previous applications had been refused due to poor design.
  - The application added to the number of houses in the area by stealth.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **15/153/Plan 15/0068/FUL - 10 Coldhams Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use of the existing property from dwelling (C3 use) to an eight bed (8 person) house in multiple occupation (Sui-Generis use). The proposal also sought retrospective permission for the flat roof dormer window in the rear roofscape of the two storey side extension. The proposal also included bin and cycle storage provision.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mr Terry, speaking on behalf of Mrs Raymer.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The area has been over developed in terms of houses in multiple occupation. There were a lot in the area.
- ii. Existing parking issues would be exacerbated by the application.
- iii. Family houses were being replaced in the area by houses in multiple occupation. This was detrimental to the character of the area.

- iv. Requested obscured glazing and restrictions on the number of occupants to 8 if the application were approved.

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

Councillor Johnson (Abbey Ward Councillor) was unable to attend the committee so his comments were added to the amendment sheet.

The Committee:

**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.

#### **15/154/Plan 15/0757/FUL - 29 Cromwell Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use from A1 commercial unit to A3 restaurant. Change of use for A1 offices to residential and extension at 1st floor. 1 two bed unit to rear of site.

The Committee were advised the amendment sheet contained a typographical error. There was no amendment to the Officer's recommendation, this was to approve the application as set out on P405 of the agenda pack.

The Committee:

**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.

#### **15/155/Plan 15/0999/FUL - 161 Gwydir Street**

This item was deferred to the next meeting with the agreement of the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.

#### **15/156/Plan 15/0563/FUL - 45 Elizabeth Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to split the current curtilage of the plot to accommodate a one-bedroom bungalow at the rear of the site.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation.

### **15/157/Plan EN/337/14 - 213 Huntingdon Road**

On 1 July 2015 Planning Committee authorised the service of an enforcement notice for breach of condition 4 of 10/0691/FUL relating to the separate use of the annex at 213 Huntingdon Road.

Since Members authorised the notice, further legal advice was received indicating that the breach of a planning condition relating to the separate residential use of the annex is not subject to the usual ten year immunity rule for breach of conditions, but would become immune from enforcement action after four years in line with the immunity period for residential dwellings.

The Committee were recommended to:

- Note the four year immunity rule applies in relation to this breach of condition relating to separate residential occupation.
- Confirm their authorisation to draft and serve the enforcement notice (referred to in the report from 1 July 2015).
- Approve the alteration in the wording of the reasons for issue of the notice to refer to four years instead of ten years.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (7 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to confirm authorisation of the drafting and service of an enforcement notice (as set out in the Planning Committee Report of the 1 July 2015) and approve the alteration in the wording of the reasons for issue of the notice to refer to four years instead of ten years.

### **15/158/Plan Objection To City Of Cambridge Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 02/2015 2a Carisbrooke Road**

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order (NO. 02/2015) that relates to a (2a Carisbrooke Road).

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (7 votes to 0)** to accept the Officer's recommendation to confirm the tree preservation order without amendment.

**15/159/Plan Record of Officer Urgency Action****15/159/Plan To Withdraw the Enforcement Notice dated 2 October 2014 relating to 136 Perne Road**

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 4.25 pm

**CHAIR**