

**PLANNING**

2 November 2016  
9.30 am - 5.15 pm

**Present:**

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

**Officers:**

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer  
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
Principal Planner: Tony Collins  
Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby  
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton  
Planner: Rob Brereton  
Planner: Michael Hammond  
Planner: Sav Patel  
Planning Assistant: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Legal Advisor: Richard Pitt  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed  
Democratic Services Officer: Dawn Cave

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**16/160/PlanApologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Nethsingha for item 16/163/Plan and Councillor Holt attended as alternate member for item 16/163/Plan. Councillor Hipkin left the meeting after the decision on 16/167/Plan and Holland attended as alternate member from 16/168/Plan.

**16/161/PlanDeclarations of Interest**

Item	Councillor	Interest
16/165/Plan	Smart	Knew the individual who chose to use CORTEN on Long Road school building
16/167/Plan	Smart	Hosts English as foreign language students.

**16/162/PlanMinutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the amendment within minute 16/159/Plan which was amended from 'The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident in Mill Street' to 'A resident of Mill Street addressed the Committee in objection to the application'.

**16/163/Plan15/1759/FUL - Murdoch House, 40-44 Station Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of Murdoch House and the remains of the former Silo and the construction of two new mixed use buildings comprising 767sqm office floorspace (Class B1), 419sqm retail/cafe/restaurant floorspace (Class A1/A3) and 65 residential units for Block I1 and 473sqm retail/cafe/restaurant floorspace (Class A1/A3) and 24 residential units for Block K1, including ancillary accommodation/facilities with a single basement and 71 car parking spaces, with associated plant, 218 internal and external cycle parking spaces, and hard and soft landscaping.

The City Development Manager referred to late representations and the amended conditions contained within the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Raised issues with cycle parking provision and access to the cycle parking.
- ii. Fly cycle parking occurred because of insufficient cycle parking provision. Fly cycle parking would increase if the development went ahead as planned.
- iii. There was little cycle parking provision for out of gauge bicycles, not everyone used a carbon fibre bicycle.
- iv. Appreciated that there was Sheffield cycle parking provision but there needed to be a wider diversity of cycle parking provision.

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

**Resolved** not to accept the officer recommendation of approval, as the committee were minded to refuse the application, a decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred under the Adjourned Decision Protocol

Under the Council's agreed Adjourned Decisions Protocol this application will be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee to allow further discussion of reasons for refusal. The following matters may form the basis for detailed reasons for refusal.

1. Design – Block I1 is acceptable. Block K1 is not acceptable because it breaks the coherence of the square and fails to achieve a quality of design that the square deserves. The building does not surprise or delight and fails to do justice to its setting. It fails to enhance the setting of the Mill and would not enhance the appearance of Station Square
2. Community facilities – the development fails to make appropriate provision for community facilities for use by new residents. There should be on site facilities for residents
3. Cycle parking – the development fails to provide appropriate facilities for cycle parking. The use of double stacker cycle storage is unacceptable, there is no provision for off-gauge cycles and the access ramp/stair is too steep. The failure to provide adequate cycle parking will increase fly cycle parking in the area.

### **16/164/Plan16/1078/OUT - Plot 9 Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The outline application sought approval for all matters reserved for up to 14,193 sqm (excluding plant areas) of biomedical and biotech research and development (Use Class B1(b)); landscaping; car and cycle parking areas and all other associated infrastructure.

The Principal Planner (City) advised the Committee that amendments would be required to conditions 17 and 18:

- Condition 17(i): third line – '0730' amended to '0800'
- Condition 18(i): text of condition deleted, requested authority was delegated to Officers to compose appropriate suitable wording for condition 18(i).
- Condition 18(iv): paragraph 2 – 'prior to commencement of development' amended to 'prior to installation'

**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 subject to the amendments made to conditions 17 and 18(iv), authority was delegated to officers to compose appropriate substitute wording for condition 18(i).

### **16/165/Plan14/1691/COND12 - Plot 8 Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

The Committee received a discharge of conditions application.

The application sought approval to discharge Condition 12 of the amended outline permission 14/1691/S73 with respect to the building approved on Plot 8 under reserved matters permission 16/0653/REM.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for discharge of conditions in accordance with the officer report.

### **16/166/Plan16/1299/FUL - 1-4 Water Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 13 flats (following the demolition of existing buildings 1-4 Water Lane), together with the provision of one disabled space, cycle parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

The Planning Officer updated the Committee on cycle parking access.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application which covered the following issues:

- i. Building the flats would create significant parking issues.
- ii. Access for cycle parking was outside the scope of the planning application.
- iii. The cycle parking did not meet disability requirements.
- iv. There was an issue with people parking and blocking access to properties on Water Street. If the application was approved the problem would be exacerbated.
- v. Expressed concern about contractors, there was a lot of rubbish and items which had been discarded.
- vi. The developer had no right of access from the rear of the property.

- vii. Expressed concern regarding overlooking from the first floor balconies onto Water Street and Water House properties.
- viii. The quality of life of the existing residents would suffer as a result of the proposed development.

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

**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.

### **16/167/Plan16/6001/S106A - Brunswick House**

The Committee received an application under S106A for the modification or discharge of Planning Obligations pursuant to Section 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Restrictions on occupation by students).

The application sought approval for the proposed variation to the S106 Agreement to allow the occupation of the student accommodation block (Brunswick House) by a broader range of students/delegates during the summer vacation period.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of the Cambridge Riverside Development.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There had been noise and anti-social behavioural issues over the past 3 years, Environmental Health and the Police had been involved.
- ii. It was not uncommon to have to close windows to make his television audible.
- iii. Referred to the objections contained within paragraph 7.2 of the Officer's report.
- iv. Commented that the summary section within the Officer's report was not correct.
- v. The application sought to introduce a population of people who would have no investment in the community and which Anglia Ruskin University would not be able to exercise discipline over.
- vi. The limited security presence on the site had made some improvement but this was only when the security officers were present.
- vii. The application represented a material change to the planning permission and asked that the Committee refused the application.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to defer the application to seek advice on whether a management plan could be put in place and secured through a s106 agreement.

### **Change of Chair**

Councillor Hipkin left the meeting and Councillor Blencowe took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

### **16/168/Plan16/0837/FUL - 95 Barton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a new single family dwelling together with garage and ancillary studio, bin and cycle storage, access and landscaping.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. potential damage to protected species, specially bats
- ii. lack of data on bats, and no basis for claims of mitigation measures
- iii. Application conflicted with policies 4/3 and 4/6
- iv. Overshadowing

Cllr Cantrell (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. the context of the development on a key approach to the city;
- ii. the environmental and conservation issues that arise as a result of the application
- iii. expressed concern that the proposal was not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12
- iv. whilst the existing property not was of significant architectural merit, it contributed towards the townscape, which the proposed building failed to do
- v. scale and mass of proposed building, which would have a negative impact on adjacent properties
- vi. ecology and protected species concerns

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 4, with the Chairman using his casting vote)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers in the main report.

### **16/169/Plan16/0720/FUL - 73 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a proposed residential development of six studio apartments, kitchen extension to existing restaurant, and associated Works including demolition of existing single storey structures.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers in the main report, subject to a condition on the green roof.

Green Roofs: Full details of the green roof system to be implemented including drainage details, moisture matting, waterproofing details, etc as needed to ensure the longevity of the sedum and to protect the roof. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12).

### **16/170/Plan16/1495/FUL - 6 Blanford Walk**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for alterations and change of use of dwelling house to large HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) (sui generis).

The Planning Officer confirmed that landlords were encouraged to support the City Council's training days on landlord responsibilities, and this was included in the informatives.

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 in the main report.

### **16/171/Plan16/1344/FUL - 89 Histon Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 1.5 storey dwelling with access from North Street following demolition of existing shed at the rear of 89 Histon Road.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. how the description of the proposed property was misleading, in terms of height, size, aspect and location
- ii. the objector had requested a Tree Preservation Order for the tree that was proposed to be removed
- iii. the traffic and parking issues at the location, specifically the narrowness of the road, existing congestion and difficulty in manoeuvring.

The applicant, Mr Thornley, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Holt (Castle Ward Councillor), addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following areas:

- i. access and safety: specifically the narrowness of the road and parking issues
- ii. granting permission for this application could set a precedent for many other similar applications in this area, causing further parking and safety issues, and degrading the appearance of the area.

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 in the main report.

### **16/172/Plan16/0504/S73 - Land R/o 8 Montreal Road**

The Committee received an S73 application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) of permission 14/1649/FUL to permit a minor material amendment to the approved dwellings including fenestration and rear dormer alterations, increasing the eaves height to plots 3 & 4 by 450mm and changes to the single storey rear projections to introduce a parapet roof design. It was noted that the original application (14/1649/FUL) was for four dwellings to rear of Montreal Road. The variation focused on the external appearance of the properties.

The Chairman highlighted an email from an objector who could not attend the committee meeting. Committee Members confirmed that they had all had opportunity to read the representation. The Planning Officer addressed a number of the issues raised by the objector.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers in the main report.

### **16/173/Plan16/1157/FUL - 8 Kings Hedges Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing building and the erection of a new building to provide one studio flat four one-bedroom flats, together with bin and cycle storage, and landscaping.

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 in the main report.

**16/174/Plan16/0822/FUL - 27 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a two storey dwelling containing two one-bedroom flats on the land behind 27-29 Mill Road. The proposed works would involve the demolition of an existing outhouse.

Mr Owers (Applicant's Architect) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Robertson (Petersfield Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following areas:

- i. parking issues, specifically how the loss of one parking space would be an issue, as parking was at a premium
- ii. the effect on the Conservation area, and the danger of setting a precedent, given the historic pattern of development in the area;
- iii. expressed concern that the proposal was not compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/10.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 0 with 2 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 in the main report.

**16/175/Plan16/1201/FUL - 140 Perne Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought retrospective approval for change of use to Guesthouse and erection of outbuilding. It was confirmed that the property was already operating as a Guesthouse, and the outbuilding was under construction.

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 in the main report.

**16/176/Plan16/1300/FUL - Cantabrigian Rugby Club**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of one dwelling, formation of a new access on to Long Road and associated operational development (Amendments Pursuant to Approved Scheme 15/0287/FUL). With the Chairman's permission, Ward Councillor Moore had circulated background information to this item.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. the Rugby Club did not own most of the land, and some of it was subject to probate.
- ii. the issue of loss of open space in return for building a new road, and lack of clarity about when the road would be built
- iii. build over arrangements with Anglia Water
- iv. Conditions were required regarding fencing, closing off the road and piling
- v. the direction of the windows

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

Councillor Moore (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee. He explained that he was not speaking against the application, but recommending a deferral, due to the complexity of the ownership issues of the access path needed to be resolved.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1 with 1 abstention)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers in the main report.

**16/177/Plan16/1442/FUL - 56 Sturton Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use to ten bed HMO with up to ten persons, and the construction of single storey rear extensions and a roof extension incorporating additional rear dormer window.

On a show of hand the recommendation to approve the application was lost by 2 votes in favour to 5 against.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to refuse the application for the following reason:

The proposed additions to the dwelling, in particular the addition of the roof dormer, by virtue of their poor design, would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policies 3/14d and 4/11.

### **16/178/Plan16/1240/FUL - 186 Gwydir Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use for the house from residential to Class D1 (non-residential institutions) and the construction of a new building in the garden.

The Committee received a representation in support to the application from a Trustee of Charity.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. the historical importance of the property
- ii. the nature of the visiting arrangements
- iii. the sustainable transport methods promoted to visitors.

Councillor Robertson (Petersfield Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The representation covered the following areas:

- i. the historical importance of the property
- ii. the funding secured by the Applicants to address the damp problems.

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 in the main report.

The meeting ended at 5.15 pm

**CHAIR**