

# Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 3 February 2016

## PLANNING

3 February 2016  
10.00 am - 4.31 pm

### Present:

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

### Officers:

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer  
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
Principal Planner: Tony Collins  
Principal Planner: Lisa Lamb  
Principal Planner: Toby Williams  
Planner: Michael Hammond  
Planner: Sav Patel  
Planning Assistant: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Legal Advisor: Victoria Watts  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 16/18/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Gawthrope.

Councillor Hipkin gave his apologies for the afternoon session and Councillor Holland was present as the alternate.

### 16/19/Plan Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

### 16/20/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

The minutes of the meeting of the 6 January 2016 would be reviewed at a future meeting.

### **16/21/Plan 15/1683/FUL - Department of Chemistry Lensfield Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for an extension to the Department of Chemistry, to provide for additional academic research space, associated landscaping, infrastructure and other works (Chemistry of Health Building).

Professor Jeremy Sanders 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.

**Only Members who were present for the original consideration of application 14/1905/FUL (below) were eligible to take part in take part in the deferred decision making process.**

Councillor Dryden left the meeting to attend to Mayoral duties and Councillor Blencowe took the Chair.

### **16/22/Plan 14/1905/FUL - 64 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission. The application had been reported to the 6 January 2016 Planning Committee with an officer recommendation of approval. During the consideration of the application, Members of the Committee raised a number of concerns about the proposal. The Committee voted not to accept the officer recommendation of approval and a decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred because the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP) was triggered.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed used development comprising 84 dwellings, circa 152m2

A1-A3 commercial space, and associated access, car and cycle parking, and public realm enhancement.

The Committee received the additional information regarding viability as requested at the previous meeting. The additional documentation was noted.

Andrew Jones outlined the position regarding viability.

- i. The Islington Case demonstrated that land values should reflect the tone of values in the area under discussion.
- ii. There were questions around the extent to which planning obligations reflected land values.
- iii. Guidance was not straight forward.
- iv. Applicants must ensure that land values were not over bid as an argument for reducing social housing numbers.
- v. The hierarchy of policies on affordability puts profits before affordable housing requirements.

The Committee discussion is summarised as follows:

- i. Expressed satisfaction that the concerns regarding the finish to the block containing social housing had been addressed. The alternative finish proposed and corresponding planning conditions were considered acceptable.
- ii. Accepted that the proposed balconies were generous and noted that there was no policy in place offering guidance on this matter.
- iii. Accepted that the proposed road would improve connectivity for cyclists. However, it was regrettable that no funding was available to improve the junctions at either end. Officers confirmed that this was a County Council responsibility.
- iv. Accepted that a challenge on viability grounds was unlikely to succeed.
- v. Suggested that a refusal on height grounds of Block G could be supported.
- vi. Discussed the concerns around the height of this block as it would be:
  - Out of keeping with the area;
  - Would not deliver the bookend buildings envisaged by the Eastern Gate SPD.
  - Would dominate the area in both mass and height.
  - Would not enhance an already dreary streetscape.
- vii. Discussed the parking and highway issues as follows:

- Sought clarification regarding the bollarded entrance points to a road that would be adopted as public highway.
  - Suggested that parking would be difficult to control.
  - Accepted that this was not grounds for refusal of the application.
- viii. Discussed the possibility of using emerging policy regarding amenity and usable space.

The Committee considered recommendation 2

2: To **REFUSE** the application for any or all of the issues as set out above and highlighted in the table below. In considering refusal reasons, members should be mindful of the officer advice and the potential for a costs award against the Council should the decision be subject to a planning appeal. If minded to pursue issues 1, 2, 4, 5 or 6 as refusal reasons, members should be clear exactly which policies the proposed development would be contrary to and the harm that would arise.

On a show of hands (**3 votes to 3 – and on the Chair’s casting vote**) this recommendation was lost.

The Committee:

**Resolved (3 votes to 3 – and on the Chair’s casting vote to approve** the application in light of the further advice and the additional/amended conditions recommended plus those set out in the original officer report and amendment sheet, together with a S106 agreement (including a claw-back clause) as below:

Those conditions as recommended as part of the 6 January 2016 Planning Committee Report.

- revised conditions 32 and 34 as set out on the amendment sheet to the 6 January 2016 Planning Committee.
- an additional condition (18) as set out at paragraph 0.8 of the 3 February 2016 Committee report regarding the treatment of Block H.
- revised condition 14 as set out at paragraph 0.51 of the 3 February 2016 Committee report regarding renewable energy technologies.
- An S106 agreement, including a claw-back clause, for terms as set out in the 6 January 2016 Planning Committee Report.

### **16/23/Plan 15/1652/FUL - Trumpington Park and Ride**

The Committee received an application for Change of use (sui generis).

The application sought approval for a 150 vehicle car boot fair (second hand goods only) on Sundays on existing car park between 7.00am - 1.00pm.

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.

**16/24/Plan 15/1499/FUL - Brethern Meeting Room, Radegund Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a front extension to create access porch, and a detached annexe to rear of site for additional floor space/storage.

Councillor Kavanagh (Coleridge Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Points were being made on behalf of residents in streets surrounding the application.
- ii. The application would exacerbate existing traffic flow and parking issues in the area, mainly associated with commuter traffic.
- iii. Residents were supportive of the hall being used, but had concerns regarding traffic.
- iv. A banksman was in place to control traffic outside the hall, but there was a high volume of traffic and associated anti-social behaviour.
- v. There was more demand for parking spaces than the hall could provide all ready, which impacts on surrounding streets. The application would increase the existing pressure from commuter traffic.
- vi. Referred to paragraphs 8.12 and 8.13 of the Officer's report and asked for a full time banksman to be in place to control traffic outside the hall, not just when the annex was in use (if the application was approved). The banksman could also advise hall visitors of parking issues in the area, plus control vehicles going in/out of the hall.
- vii. People should be encouraged to travel to the hall using other modes of transport apart from cars eg public transport.

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.

### **16/25/Plan 15/1879/FUL - 3 Barton Road**

Councillor Dryden rejoined the Committee and took the Chair.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing building and replacement with one 3 and one 2 storey building consisting of 26 post graduate student rooms plus support facilities for Darwin College.

The Planning Officer updated his report:

- i. Referred to conditions and informatives listed on amendment sheet.
- ii. In paragraph 8.36 of the Outlook section, the penultimate sentence should be replaced with:

*“I do not consider the proposed development would result in a form of development that is uncharacteristic of this area.”*

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from 3 local residents.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Barton Road had a rural identity and was the gateway to the area.
- ii. The application proposed a higher on-site density to other areas of Newnham.
- iii. Reducing the height of the application and amending the proposed materials would better suit the area.
- iv. Took issue with the Officer’s report stating the (existing) building to be demolished was “of poor design”, it was simply ‘not good’.
- v. Newnham had no bus service, so the application would increase car numbers in an all ready congested area. On-site car parking provision was inadequate.
- vi. Concerns over loss of light and outlook. Expressed safety concerns as the application was located on a school travel route.
- vii. The application provided insufficient amenity space.

The Applicant's representative addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The large number of representations reflected resident's concerns.
- ii. This was an important site in the area, located on an arterial city route.
- iii. The character of the area was rural on the outskirts and more sub-urban nearer the city.
- iv. The application was located near to the Newnham Conservation Area.
- v. The building proposed for demolition did not fit into the character of the area. This showed the need to have an appropriate design for any replacement.
- vi. There had been design discussions between the Applicant, residents and officers.
- vii. Proposed over-development of the site had affected the design quality.
- viii. Block A was too high at 3 storeys, 2 would have been more appropriate and addressed resident's overlooking concerns.
- ix. Block B's design and massing was out of character with the area.
- x. There was a lack of car parking and amenity space on-site.
- xi. The University were only responsible for controlling undergraduate car parking. Mature students were the expected target audience for this application, they would be the responsibility of the college.

The City Development Manager proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to remove the date reference:

**APPROVE** subject to completion of the s106 Agreement by ~~30<sup>th</sup> May 2016~~ and the following conditions

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

Councillor Hart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative to raise the issue of amenity space access.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

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 as amended above.

### **16/26/Plan 15/2063/FUL - Land rear of 268 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 3.No four bed houses, internal access road, car and cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping.

The Planning Officer updated his report by referring to conditions listed on amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Queen Edith's Way.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Loss of trees. The application would be visible through gaps in the trees.
- ii. Loss of view and light for neighbours due to visually dominating design.
- iii. Street lighting would be placed on Lime Kiln Road (for the first time).
- iv. The application would be located near nature reserves and the green corridor that linked them. It could have a negative on these and the green belt.
- v. Referred to paragraph 8.5 of the Officer's report: "Therefore, my professional opinion remains that the proposed development would have a significant detrimental impact on the character of this unique edge of city site".

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

Councillor Ashton (Cherry Hinton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Had no objections to developing the site in principle, but this should be done through an appropriate design in a unique area of the city.



- ii. The Planning Committee had been invited to attend a site visit prior to considering the application.
- iii. Residents still had concerns regarding:
  - a. Overlooking.
  - b. Loss of light.
  - c. Impact on local neighbour reserves.
  - d. Travel safety as the application would be located on a school travel route.
- iv. The developer had not engaged with residents. Concerns could have been addressed if this had occurred.
- v. Trees had been cleared from the site without permission.
- vi. There were 35 conditions to be met in order for the application to be built. Queried why so many were needed if the development was considered acceptable.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to remove all permitted development rights from the site.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

#### The Committee:

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

The Chair adopted the adjourned decision making protocol, so the application would be brought back to the next committee.

**Unanimously resolved** to defer to the application to allow further discussion of a potential reason for refusal as follows:

'The proposed development would, by virtue of its unsympathetic scale, bulky design and loss of trees, have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and setting of this edge of city site and surrounding rural context. The proposed development would result in an alien form of development and unduly diminish the rural character of this green edge from Lime Kiln Road. The proposal therefore fails to sympathetically respond to the site context and setting of the city. For these reasons the proposed development conflicts with policies 3/2, 3/4, 3/12 and 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and government guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012'

The Committee also requested clarification of the relevance of the status of the 'East Green Corridor' referred to by the Ward Councillor, Councillor Ashton.

### **16/27/Plan 15/2235/FUL - 171 Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for single storey rear extension, single storey side infill extension, amended first floor rear window and extension of rear dormer window (following removal of chimney). A single storey studio in the rear garden is also proposed.

#### 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.

### **16/28/Plan 15/1673/FUL - 15 Whitehill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a new 2 Bedroom dwelling adjoining 15 Whitehill Road, following demolition of the existing side extension.

#### 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.

### **16/29/Plan 15/1686/FUL - 106 Wulfstan Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 1 x 3 bed dwelling house and single storey front extension to existing dwelling house.

#### 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.

### **16/30/Plan 15/1421/FUL - Land Adjacent to 4 Grantchester Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a new dwelling following demolition of the existing garage and shed, with associated access and landscaping.

The Planning Officer updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet and stating condition no.7 should be removed.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Grantchester Road.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Increased flood risk.
- ii. Structural and environmental damage.
  - a. Access to the site by construction and future residential traffic.
  - b. Impact on wildlife.
- iii. A local architect lived in a nearby property. Asked the Committee to be mindful of the impact of the application on this property.

Mr Petter (Applicant) 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.

### **16/31/Plan 15/1826/FUL - 56 Kimberley Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for an attic conversion, including a roof extension with a rear dormer and a front dormer.

The Planning Officer updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet and stated paragraph 2.4 should read "Councillor Austin" instead of Councillor Avery.

Councillor Austin (West Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There was a lot of local interest in the application due to the property location in a highly visible spot and Conservation Area.
- ii. The site was developed all ready. Queried how much more was reasonable.
- iii. Part of the justification for the recommendation for approval was that some properties had dormer windows all ready. There were only 3 dormer windows in the general area and none in close proximity to the site.
- iv. Dormer windows in the application would be visible in the public realm and bigger than other dormer windows in the area.
- v. Queried if the application met Design Guide criteria and if Conservation Officers had reviewed it.

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.

### **16/32/Plan 15/1848/FUL - 58 Arbury Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of two storey house following demolition of existing garage.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Emergency vehicle access to neighbouring Havenfield retirement home flats which share the road with the application.

- ii. Existing parking and traffic flow would be exacerbated.
- iii. Pedestrian safety.
- iv. Loss of light.
- v. Noise.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 3 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.

**16/33/Plan 15/1865/FUL - 317 Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 8 No. flats following demolition of existing dwelling at 317 Hills Road.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a car club informative.

This amendment was **carried nem con.**

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 as amended above.

Informatives to add:

Car Club

The applicant is encouraged to ensure all future tenants/occupiers of the flats are aware of the existing local car club service and location of the nearest space.

**16/34/Plan 15/2087/FUL - 3 St Margarets Square**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a new outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation to 3 St Margarets Square

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 plus additional condition and informative as set out on the amendment sheet.

**16/35/Plan Decision Sheet - Major Applications**

The meeting ended at 4.31 pm

**CHAIR**