

PLANNING

27 April 2016
10.00 am - 5.00 pm

Present:

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

Officers:

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Lisa Lamb
Principal Planner: Toby Williams
Senior Conservation & Design Officer: Susan Smith
Planner: Rob Brereton
Planner: Lorna Gilbert
Planner: Michael Hammond
Planner: Sav Patel
Planning Assistant: Mairead O'Sullivan
Legal Advisor: Cara De La Mare
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/64/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Gawthrope.

16/65/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Tunnacliffe	16/72/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial knew both the Applicant and Objector on Beaulands Close. Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.

16/66/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2016 would be reviewed in future.

16/67/Plan 15/2316/FUL - Wests Garage, Newmarket Road

The Committee were advised that the application for the redevelopment of the Wests Garage site had been withdrawn by the applicants.

16/68/Plan 15/2321/FUL - Eastfield Phases 1 and 2

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 50 new affordable houses, following demolition of 26 existing dwellings (Nos 46-60 and 66-75 Eastfield), and associated highway works, landscaping and public open space provision.

The Senior Planning Officer updated her report with the following details:

- i. Referred to an amended layout plan.
- ii. Referred to additional conditions:
 - a. Number 26 as listed on the amendment sheet.
 - b. Nature Conservation Officer report details.
 - c. Delegated powers regarding heavy vehicle tracking.
- iii. Planning permission was subject to s106 being completed.

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

- 53 Chesterfield Road.
- 8 Shirley Grove.
- 320 Milton Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed specific concerns regarding:
 - a. Overlooking of amenity space.
 - b. The design appearance was a continuous structure with car ports in between.

- c. The impact of the design on the existing cycle route in the area.
This may impede traffic, cycle flow and pedestrian flow and so impact on safety.
- ii. Requested the Council follow its car and cycle policies. Referred to Cycling and Walking Officer comments on the cycle route.
- iii. Asked if 6 Shirley Grove could have the same mitigation measures as 7 Shirley Grove.
- iv. A lot of concerns had been addressed by Officer comments, but requested details on the wall and fencing around 53 Chesterfield Road.

Mr Sutton (Applicant's Agent) 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 plus additional condition and delegated powers:

Condition 26

Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and Local Planning Authority Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and 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)

DELEGATED POWERS to resolve discussions the Nature Conservation Officer and Waste Officer and add necessary additional conditions.

Change of Chair

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

16/69/Plan 16/0202/FUL - 96 Cavendish Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective planning permission for the conversion of the approved single storey side extension into a habitable annexe and attached outbuilding to the rear of the annexe which would lead into the garden space.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) 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.

16/70/Plan 15/1940/FUL - 48 New Square

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the application to provide six flats in total on the site. The proposal consisted of the conversion of the existing house to

form three flats (1 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed units); the demolition of the garage on the west side of the house and its replacement with a 1 1/2 storey building containing a single 1-bed dwelling; and the erection of a detached two-storey building with 2 x 1- bed flats in Willow Walk in place of the existing car park.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet.

The City Development Manager confirmed to the Committee that a representation letter had been ruled out of time in accordance with the information contained within the Committee agenda. The Legal Officer confirmed that the letter could not be read out but public speakers could talk about the issues raised in the letter.

The Committee received representations in objection to this application and application reference 15/1941/LBC from two local residents.

The representations covered the following concerns:

- i. Referred to paragraph 3.10 of the 2006 Local Plan, residential development would not be permitted in the garden or curtilage if adversely affected the setting of a listed building.
- ii. 11 trees would be affected as well as the listed building.
- iii. Certain issues had not been given adequate weight.
- iv. Expressed disappointment that the letter from Richard Buxton was not read out.
- v. Under the NPPF there was a duty to safeguard the character of the area.
- vi. Residents urged to refuse application.
- vii. Incredulous of comments from the Conservation Officer.
- viii. The small unknown building had been grandiosed into a two-storey building.
- ix. The drawings were inaccurate and misleading.
- x. The development would not enhance the Conservation Area.

Peter McKeown (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Bick (Market Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Expressed concern with the impact that this application would have on the historical environment in Willow Walk.

- ii. By listing buildings and designating Kite as a Conservation Area this was an interesting area.
- iii. Referred to mature trees and important views.
- iv. Needed to reconcile new development with the features contained within the Conservation Area Appraisals.
- v. Expressed disappointment that nothing had come out of the Development Control Forum.
- vi. The development would be built on higher ground, therefore the property would not be subservient to other buildings.
- vii. A sharply pitched roof may have been more in keeping with the New Square properties but was not in keeping with Willow Walk.
- viii. This was a sensitive location in the City, New Square and Willow Walk needed separate and equal consideration.
- ix. More information should have been contained within the Conservation Area Appraisal.

Councillor Gillespie (Market Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. The application drawings contained inaccuracies.
- ii. Referred to the light study which whilst complied with Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines did not satisfy residents' concerns.
- iii. Had requested that Member's undertake a site visit.
- iv. Commented that the Officer's PowerPoint presentation contained some photographs that were not of a good quality.
- v. There was a focus on the open space from New Square which was irrelevant to the objections.
- vi. If the Committee approved the application it would go against guidelines previously set in the Local Plan.
- vii. Suggested that an additional condition was included that Willow Walk was not used by construction traffic as there were risks to properties, vehicles and street furniture.
- viii. The significance of the Conservation Area was important and should be taken into consideration.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey building on the Willow Walk frontage, by virtue of its height, fenestration design, roof shape and the materials of its construction, would have a harmful visual effect on this part of the Kite Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings in Willow Walk. In so doing the development fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

2. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on views within the Kite Conservation Area including views from the open space on New Square and from the east and west along Willow Walk. In so doing the development fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

3. The proposed development would involve the removal of trees which have a positive effect on the visual amenities of the Kite Conservation Area. In so doing the development would have a harmful effect on the visual amenities of the Conservation Area contrary to policies 3/10, 4/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

16/71/Plan 15/1941/LBC - 48 New Square

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for listed building consent to convert existing end terrace known as No.48 New Square, three self-contained flats, demolition of existing garage and erection of one self-contained studio-flat and removal of 4No. parking bays accessed via Willow Walk and erection of two self-contained flats. All with associated landscaping and access arrangements.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from two local residents detailed in minute 16/70/Plan (Planning reference 15/1940/FUL)

Peter McKeown (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Bick and Councillor Gillespie (Market Ward Councillors) addressed the Committee about the application detailed in minute 16/70/Plan (Planning reference 15/1940/FUL).

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reason:

1. The proposed two storey building on the Willow Walk frontage which includes modifications to the boundary wall on Willow Walk would harm the special interests of the listed building on site and its setting. The development is therefore contrary to policy 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

16/72/Plan 16/0117/FUL - Beaulands Close

Councillor Tunnacliffe withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective planning permission for an access control barrier to a private road. The case officer introduced the planning item and made reference to the amendment sheet and her response to subsequent concerns raised regarding the committee report, which was noted by the Committee. An additional condition was recommended on the amendment sheet.

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

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Sought to amend the hours of operation of the barrier not to include night-time hours.
- ii. No reference was made to the Independent Noise Survey. The application was retrospective and could not have surveyed pre-existing noise levels. The Environmental Health Officer should have taken the noise report into account
- iii. The case officer had not considered photographic/video evidence provided

- iv. Objectors had held back submitting complaints pending the submission of the noise assessment which was the reason for more noise issues highlighted more recently.
- v. The new barrier's default position is closed, the old barrier's default position was that it was open, which results in different impacts and traffic behaviours.
- vi. There was no key pad access so cars and vans had to linger at the barrier which created noise and traffic problems.
- vii. Accepted the barrier should operate during commuter time periods but requested that the Committee applied suitable mitigation to the hours of operation outside of commuter time periods when the barrier would not be required.

Janet Grimwood (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1 abstention) to grant the application for retrospective planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation and the additional condition recommended on the amendment sheet, for the reasons set out in the officer report and amendment sheet, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

16/73/Plan 15/1855/FUL 1 Fitzwilliam Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing building and construction of six new dwellings and associated access and landscaping.

The Committee noted the amendments detailed in the amendment sheet.

Peter Stocking (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Supported the views of the Planning Officer and the Conservation Officer.
- ii. Development had been resisted on this large plot.
- iii. Trees were protected by Tree Preservation Orders.
- iv. The mass and scale of the development was too large for the size of the plot.
- v. The development would dwarf the properties in Claredon Road.
- vi. Trees would be replaced by the County Council.
- vii. Expressed concerns regarding drainage.
- viii. The development would not be in keeping with the area.

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to refuse 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 Officer.

16/74/Plan 15/2044/FUL 29-31 Harding Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for planning permission of two semi-detached dwellings, and one detached dwelling, following demolition of two semidetached bungalows and garages.

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

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Approval of this application would set an unacceptable precedent of two storey buildings amongst individually designed bungalows.
- ii. The proposed development would more than double the number of bedrooms on site.
- iii. Would bring an increase in noise and traffic.
- iv. The proposed development was well below the emerging plan guidelines.
- v. Would describe the proposed design as ugly and harmful and detracted from the overall appearance of its surrounding.
- vi. The unnamed side street would produce a sharp boundary creating a change in character to the enclave of where the bungalows were situated.

- vii. Could damage the bio diversity of the area.
- viii. National Planning Policy Framework stated that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment but this application did not meet these standards.

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

Councillor Todd-Jones (Arbury Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Accepted that the proposed design was an improvement on the original application which had previously been refused (as referenced in 8.8 of the Officer's report).
- ii. Disagreed with the Office's conclusion of the application as referenced in 8.5 of their report.
- iii. The Inspectorate's comments concerning the appeal to the refused application regarding the design of the building would appear as an 'incongruous element in the street scene' applied to this application.
- iv. Did not comply with Local Plan Policies 3/4 and 3/12 as the design did not respond positively to the existing features of the local character and did not have a positive impact on its settings of the surrounding character.
- v. Believed the proposed side access road was the main reason that this application should be refused.

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.

16/75/Plan 15/2378/FUL - Langham House, Histon Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for planning permission of the erection of a one bed unit and store.

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

Councillor Smart proposed an additional landscaping condition to the Officer's recommendation.

The additional condition was carried unanimously.

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 and additional landscaping condition recommended by the officers.

16/76/Plan 15/2171/FUL - Ditchburn Place, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the creation of larger Extracare flats, construction of an extension to provide six new Extracare flats and demolition of Burmaside House. The proposal would replace Burmaside House with a three storey extension with eaves and ridge height level with that of the existing three-storey buildings on-site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from the Mill Road History Society.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. The Society fully supported the Council's aims to provide more and better quality care in Ditchburn Place. This could be done whilst retaining the exterior of Burmaside House as this had an importance place in the history of Mill Road.
- ii. It was also significant as the architect of Burmaside House, S.E. Urwin, was the County Architect in Cambridgeshire during the 1930s. He was part of the European 'International' architectural movement which sought to change society through design, with very distinctive buildings in health and education.
- iii. For the reasons stated The Society had submitted an application to English Heritage for the Burmaside House to become a designated a Building of Local Interest and also for the entire Ditchburn Place site to be considered for Grade II listing.
- iv. Believed the Design and Access Statement to be inadequate.

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.

16/77/Plan 16/0025/FUL - 24 Grantchester Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey ground floor rear extension; a first floor side extension; and a roof extension. General internal and external refurbishment, complete replacement of existing sash windows with timber framed double glazed units.

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

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. The proposed development was overbearing, overdeveloped, overlooked into neighbouring properties and also created overshadowing to those properties.
- ii. Six of those individuals expressing support of the application as a referenced in the officer's report lived in Edinburgh and one from the architect. Only one signature was from an individual who lived in the area.
- iii. Believed the design did not comply with the Council's roof design guide.
- iv. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the neighbouring properties and surrounding area.

Mr Fiddian-Green (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee noted a written statement of objection from Councillor Cantrill (Ward Councillor for Newnham).

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.

16/78/Plan 15/2276/FUL - 338 Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a pair of semi-detached one bedroom chalet style dwellings. Access would be from a shared private drive of approximately 30m length via Mowbray Road. Each would have a rear garden of 4-5m depth x 4m width and one car parking space to the front. On the ground floor, an open plan kitchen would connect to a lounge which would lead onto each garden space. On the first floor, each unit would have a south facing bedroom window set within a dormer and a north facing ensuite window facing up the garden towards the host dwelling.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 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.

16/79/Plan 15/1858/FUL - Land at 3 Victoria Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval the erection of a new dwelling, incorporating amendments to application 14/1754/FUL.

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.

The meeting ended at 5.00 pm

CHAIR