

**PLANNING**

2 September 2015  
10.00 am - 5.55 pm

**Present:**

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

Councillor Dryden left after the vote on item 15/181/Plan

Councillor Tunnacliffe left after the vote on item 15/185/Plan

**Officers:**

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer

Principal Planner: Tony Collins

Principal Planner: Lisa Lamb

Principal Planner: Toby Williams

Principal Conservation and Design Officer: Christian Brady

Senior Planner: John Evans

Senior Planner: Catherine Linford

Planner: Amit Patel

Planner: Elizabeth Thomas

Legal Advisor: Penny Jewkes

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****15/160/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.

**15/161/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Pippas.

**15/162/Plan Declarations of Interest**

Item	Member	Interest
15/1141/REM and 15/1171/FUL	Dryden	Personal and Prejudicial: Member of Addenbrookes Board. Left the room and took no part in these decisions.
15/0787/FUL	Hipkin	Personal: His daughter attends St Marys Junior School. (The application was for the senior school).

### **15/163/Plan Minutes**

The minutes from 5 August 2015 Planning Committee will be reviewed in October.

### **15/164/Plan 15/0906/FUL - 32-38 Station Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of a new office building comprising 16,937sqm (GIA) of office floorspace (Class B1) and 614 sqm (GIA) of retail/ cafe and restaurant (Class A1/A3), including ancillary accommodation/facilities with an additional double level basement and up to 124 car parking spaces, with associated plant, up to 626 internal and external cycle parking spaces, and hard and soft landscaping.

The Committee noted amendments to conditions 16 and 20 on the amendment sheet.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Penny Heath
- Frank Gawthrop (on behalf of the Friends of Wilton Terrace)

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Loss of daylight/sunlight to the public realm.
- ii. Void spaces between buildings needed to add to the street scene.
- iii. Green balconies would not mitigate impact of buildings.
- iv. Proposed buildings would be bland and would not enhance area.
- v. Area in need of improving.

- vi. Proposed office space would be much larger than that proposed in the outline application.
- vii. Massive office building is not wanted in the area.
- viii. Original plan proposed two separate buildings.
- ix. Would be out of scale with the area.
- x. Loss of Wilton Terrace regrettable.

Mike Derbyshire, Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Meftah (Ward Councillor for Trumpington) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. Area around the station has changed considerably in recent months.
- ii. Proposed buildings larger than that envisaged in the master plan.
- iii. Would bring considerably more traffic into a congested area.
- iv. S106 money would not mitigate the impact of a large development.
- v. Was out of scale with the area.

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 (as amended) recommended by the officers and subject to referral to Secretary of State.

### **15/165/Plan 15/0893/FUL - Land West of ARM 1, Peterhouse Technology Park**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for detailed planning application consisting of: the demolition of ARM2; the construction of new buildings for B1 use; two multistory car parking structures; additional temporary car parking spaces; new cycle parking spaces; hard and soft landscaping works; new internal roads, foot and cycle paths; ancillary and associated facilities and site infrastructure.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet and the additional conditions that had been circulated.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Mrs Dove.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Concerned about the impact of increased traffic on a small, quiet residential street.
- ii. Appreciated effort to minimise the visual impact.
- iii. Limedale Close would become an access route for cyclists which would have an impact on residents.
- iv. Speeding cyclists would present a hazard to locals.
- v. Would encourage motorists to park in Limedale Close.
- vi. Residents are restricted from parking in the street due to a covenant on properties.
- vii. Requested that the access route be changed.

Mike Muller of ARM addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Legal Advisor reminded the Committee of the correct test to be applied to applications which would cause harm to the Green Belt. The special circumstances to be considered were detailed in the amendment sheet.

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 (as amended) recommended by the officers and subject to referral to Secretary of State.

### **15/166/Plan 15/0777/FUL - New Museums Site, North Range**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the creation of a new student services centre, including demolition of existing examinations hall, north end of the Austin Building, Mond Building annexe and creation of a cut through the Old Cavendish Laboratory. Refurbishment of Old Cavendish, Rayleigh wing Arts School and Lecture Theatre creation of the landscape areas and associated works.

The Committee noted the revised conditions on the amendment sheet; and the addendum to the amendment sheet.

Peter Fisher, the Applicant's Architect, 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 (as amended) recommended by the officers.

### **15/167/Plan 15/0779/LBC - New Museums Site, North Range**

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent

The application sought approval for internal and external alterations to the Grade II listed Old Cavendish Laboratory and Arts School Buildings, including the creation of a new ground floor cut-through, removal of the non-original walls and links to the proposed new building for the new student services centre.

The Committee noted the revised conditions on the amendment sheet; and the addendum to the amendment sheet.

Peter Fisher, the Applicant's Architect, 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 (as amended) recommended by the officers.

### **15/168/Plan 15/1970/FUL - Land at Former Rosemary Branch**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 8 dwellings and 2 flats, car and cycle parking and landscaping, together with associated infrastructure.

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.

### **Councillor Blencowe Chaired items 15/169/Plan and 15/170/Plan**

#### **15/169/Plan 15/1141/REM - Circus, Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The Committee received a reserved matters application.

The application sought approval for public realm (known as circus/piazza) totaling 1.57ha in area, pursuant to outline application 06/0796/OUT.

The Committee noted new conditions on the amendment sheet.

Andrew Blevins, 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 (as amended) recommended by the officers.

#### **15/170/Plan 15/1171/FUL - High Street, Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for resurfacing of land at Keith Day Road to provide new public realm with 0.22ha associated landscaping.

Andrew Blevins, 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.

#### **15/171/Plan Expression of Thanks**

The Committee expressed their thanks to Mrs Jewkes as Legal Advisor as it was her last meeting.

### **15/172/Plan 15/0225/FUL - 2 Barrow Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of new dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling on the site.

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

The representation set out the following specific concerns:

- i. Development out of scale with neighbours.
- ii. Application's ridge height should be the same height as neighbour's.
- iii. Sense of enclosure.
- iv. Visually dominant design.
- v. Design out of character with the area.
- vi. Loss of amenity.
- vii. Overshadowing.
- viii. Loss of light.

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

Councillor Avery (Trumpington Ward Councillor) submitted a written representation to the Committee about the application as he was unable to attend in person.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 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.

### **15/173/Plan 15/1123/S73 - Perse School**

The Committee received a Section 73 application.

The application sought approval to vary condition 16 (Long Road Access) of 14/2070/FUL to also allow (ie include) vehicles providing a delivery, collection or maintenance function for the Perse School.

Ms Wood (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application. She suggested replacing conditions 3, 4 and 8 with two new conditions regarding traffic access.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that condition 3 refer to the 'site' not 'school'. Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that refuse and vehicular access be specifically referenced in conditions (for clarification, although they were legally the same thing).

The amendments were **carried unanimously**. The Senior Planning Officer suggested clarifying details in condition 3, deleting (report pack) conditions 4 and 8, then renumbering remaining conditions.

#### 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 amendments:

Amendment to condition 3 to read:

The service road granted planning permission under reference 06/0175/FUL shall only be used by the following vehicles: construction vehicles, vehicles delivering construction materials, or vehicles delivering tom or providing maintenance to the school. The service road shall only be used by the vehicles specified above between the following hours: 08.00 – 18.00 Mondays to Fridays, 0.800 -13.00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Deletion of conditions 4 and 8 and re-numbering of remaining conditions.

#### **15/174/Plan 15/0787/FUL - St Marys School, Bateman Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for:



- Creation of a new extended entrance to the school (Bateman Street).
- Construction of a new boundary wall and signage, enclosing the bicycle store. A small extension to the classroom accommodation and signage. Provision of through colour render to the existing brickwork of two buildings (the Cortile and the Science block).
- Provision of new gates/screens/ fencing on to Bateman Street. Provision of screen to obscure extract ductwork from the science classrooms (Bateman Street).

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to refuse the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendations subject to 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. Prior to their individual use, samples of following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) colour finish for the use of all render
- b) metal cladding and metal screening

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the character and appearance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/11)

4. Prior to the commencement of development of the individual items listed below, large scale plans of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
  - a) Projecting fin
  - b) Perforated screen
  - c) Signage

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the character and appearance of the conservation area (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/11)

5. 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)

6. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.
  - i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,
  - ii) contractors site storage area/compound,
  - iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
  - iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

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

### **15/175/Plan 15/0567/FUL - 63 Thoday Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey one bed room unit (residential studio) on land to the rear.

The Planning Officer circulated colour photos of the site showing various building elevations.

The Principal Planning Officer revised the recommendation for refusal to include a specific reference that the design did not respond to the character of the area.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation for the following reason:

The proposed studio flat, due to the infilling of the gap, erosion of view of the rear of the terraces and its scale, form, design and fenestration - which would be highly visible in the street - would result in a form of development that would be visually and cumulatively detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, the development would lead to pressure to prune or fell the Birch tree at the front of the site, which would erode and be of detriment to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, given that the tree plays an important role within the street. For these reasons, the development would be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4 and 4/11 of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

### **15/176/Plan 15/0400/FUL - 23 Garden Walk**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a 1.5 storey rear extension to provide three additional one bedroom flats

The Senior Planning Officer stated the images in the drawing pack had been superseded by those on the amendment sheet.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 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.

### **15/177/Plan 15/0999/FUL - 161 Gwydir Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a rear roof extension to create two linked dormers which would cover the majority of the rear roof space.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3)** to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.
- 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.

### **15/178/Plan 15/0134/FUL - 44 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for retrospective and full planning permission.

The application was part-retrospective and sought approval for part two storey, part single storey, front, side and rear extensions including conversion of the garage to living space.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a member of the public.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. A retrospective application was being made in addition to planning permission originally sought in 2012 ie various work has been done outside of the permission granted. Conditions had been knowingly and persistency breached.
- ii. Work should be undertaken in-line with permission granted in 2012, which it had not.
- iii. The application design was visually dominating and out of scale with neighbouring properties.
- iv. Roof space usage should be controlled.
- v. If planning permission were granted, people working on scaffolding at 44 Queen Edith's Way could overlook neighbours.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The house had a large footprint in comparison to neighbouring properties.
- ii. There were 7 bedrooms and no garden.
- iii. Environmental Health Officers had visited 44 Queen Edith's Way due to safety concerns.
- iv. If the application were approved, conditions should be imposed to manage permitted development.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a considerate contractor informative.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 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, with an additional considerate contractor 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).

**15/179/Plan 15/0287/FUL - Cantabrigian Rugby Club, Sedley Taylor Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 1No. dwelling, formation of a new access on to Long Road and associated operational development. This application was brought back to committee 2 September 2015 in response to comments raised by the owner/ occupier of no.23 Sedley Taylor Road after the Planning Committee meeting of 5 August 2015, where the application was approved by committee.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Took issue with details in the Officer's report and suggested this created a false impression of the site.
- ii. The development did not fit into the site set out in the previous iteration of the report (5 August 2015).
- iii. Referred to her objections raised 5 August 2015 and said the application should not be approved for these reasons.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The principle of developing the site was acceptable, but he took issue with this application.
- ii. Raised the following specific concerns:
  - A massive house was proposed for the space available. It had a large footprint in comparison to neighbours.
  - Overdevelopment of site.
  - There was no garden. Queried where alternative open space would be available.
  - Removing parking spaces to implement the application would exacerbate existing issues. The proposed new access was acceptable.
  - A lack of transparency on the reasons for approval originally given 5 August 2015.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 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.

### **15/180/Plan 15/1038/FUL - 92 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey dwelling to the rear of 92 Queen Edith's Way.

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.

### **15/181/Plan 15/1085/FUL - 253 Chesterton Road**

The Committee received an application for change of use.

The application sought approval for:

- Change of use from an A1 (shop) to A3 (restaurant/cafe).
- Installation of new air conditioning / heating.
- Alterations to external façade and immediate forecourt. Installation of cycle racks and external seating onto private forecourt.

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.

### **15/182/Plan 15/1014/FUL - 74 St Catharine Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a rear roof extension.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3)** to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.
- 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.

### **15/183/Plan 15/0611/FUL - 3 Ascham Road**



Councillor Dryden left the meeting to undertake Mayoral duties. Councillor Blencowe took over as Vice Chair in the Chair.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of single storey two bedroom house.

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.

### **15/184/Plan 15/0729/FUL - Land Rear of 15 Coleridge Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of a two bedroom house.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Dr Virden.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The design was out of character with the area.
- ii. Referred to objections set out in paragraph 7.2 of the Officer's report. Also raised concern regarding loss of light and impact of the application on people's health.
- iii. Referred to construction hour information in the Officer's report and stated access problems would arise from these.
- iv. The plot of land was too narrow for this development.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an additional construction condition and a considerate contractor informative.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 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; subject to an additional condition and informative:

Condition:

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

- i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,
- ii) contractors site storage area/compound,
- iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
- iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

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).

### **15/185/Plan 15/1021/FUL - 15 Whitehill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of new 3 Bedroom dwelling to the land r/o 15 Whitehill Road, Cambridge and creation of new access off Elfleda Road.

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.

**15/186/Plan 15/0945/FUL - 23-25 Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of nos.23-25 Hills Road and the re-development of this plot with a four-storey building with a mansard roof form, containing a retail unit (A1) on the ground floor level and student accommodation (C2) on the upper floors.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. His residents' association had experience of 16 – 18 year old foreign students in Linwood Road. They congregated in the street and disturbed residents (this had been reported to Environmental Health Officers).
- ii. 2 Linwood Road did not have an on-site warden.
- iii. If no amenity space was provided at 23-25 Hills Road then it was likely students would congregate in the road.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There was no onsite external amenity space at 23-25 Hills Road, therefore students were likely to congregate in the road which could:
  - Block the narrow Cambridge Place entry point, particularly for service vehicles.
  - Lead to anti-social behaviour such as smoking and drinking.

- ii. Parking / drop-off spaces for service vehicles should be provided.
- iii. Policy 50 of the Local Plan should be considered.
- iv. Strict control of the building process was required, the current conditions were impossible to enforce.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 2)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reason:

The development fails to make proper provision for servicing of the proposed student accommodation units and in so doing fails to provide for the adequate management and maintenance of the development. The development is therefore contrary to policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

### **15/187/Plan General Item: 14/1740/FUL: Double Tree By Hilton, Granta Place**

On 4 March 2015 Planning Committee considered an application (14/1740/FUL) to allow the extension and alterations to the existing hotel to provide 16 additional bedrooms. The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions and completion of a S106 agreement for SCATP contributions (£23,616) and public art.

As no highway project was identified at the stage of the application, the Head of Planning sought Committee's approval to secure the contribution towards an identified project.

On the basis the Council can no longer pool contributions from developments without having identified a local project to secure it against, the Head of Planning sought members' approval for the following:

- (Officer report paragraph 1.4) The County Highways Authority (CHA) has identified the "Trumpington Road Mini-Roundabouts Safety Improvement

Scheme” as the project to secure the SCATP contribution (£23,616) through a S106 agreement.

- (Officer report paragraph 1.5) The Head of Planning also sought members’ approval to withdraw the public art contribution as no public art strategy has been prepared for this and no local project has been identified. Also as the public art officer did not make any request for this, the Head of Planning did not consider it necessary to seek public art contribution, in this instance.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Agree the project that the County Highway Authority has identified in para 1.4 for the SCATP contribution to be spend on.
- ii. Agree to withdraw the request for public art contribution as set out in para 1.5.
- iii. Agree an extension of time for completion of the Section 106 agreement until 31 October 2015.

The meeting ended at 5.55 pm

**CHAIR**