

**PLANNING**

1 February 2017  
10.00 am - 5.55 pm

**Present:**

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

Councillor Pippas left the meeting after the decision on 16/1764/S73 - Gonville Hotel, Gonville Place

Councillor Holt joined the meeting prior to the decision on 16/1760/FUL - 2 Sturton Street

Councillor Hipkin left the meeting after the decision on 16/1943/LBC - 48 New Square

Councillor Holland joined the meeting prior to the decision on 16/1674/S73 - 28 Maids Causeway

**Officers:**

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer

Principal Planner Nigel Blazeby

Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey

Principal Planner: Toby Williams

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton

Senior Planner: Lorna Gilbert

Senior Planner: Sav Patel

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

Planning Enforcement Officer: Ben Walther

Planner: Rob Brereton

Planner: Michael Hammond

Legal Advisor: Richard Pitt

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Committee Manager: James Goddard

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

**17/20/Plan Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**17/21/Plan Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**17/22/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and 4th January 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**17/23/Plan 16/1389/FUL - Mount Pleasant House, Mount Pleasant**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission and noted the additional information included in the amendment sheet and the late representation from Cambridge, Past, Present and Future.

The application sought approval for demolition of the existing office building and removal of the 145 associated car parking spaces (use class B1a) and construction of College accommodation (comprising 243 en-suite rooms and 24 studios), landscaping and access arrangements (use class sui generis).

The Principal Planner addressed the Committee to clarify Committee comments regarding cycling provision, design concerns and summer occupation.

Following discussion by the Committee, the Chair sought advice from the Legal Representative and from Planning Officers, regarding the merits of deferring the application on the basis of further consultation being undertaken with the County Council regarding highways mitigation and detailed design elements of the proposal being made more apparent. Planning Officers advised that there were no grounds for deferral.

The Committee resolved to move to the vote in agreement that the colour of the bricks and treatment of the mortar was to be delegated to Officers and controlled through condition, that there was no policy to restrict out-of-term time occupation of the building and that the highways mitigation/consultation had been undertaken satisfactorily.

The Committee requested that officers provide Committee Members with the opportunity to view and comment on the brick sample panel before condition 16 was discharged.

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.

**17/24/Plan 16/1764/S73 - Gonville Hotel, Gonville Place**

The Committee received an application for Section 73 permission.

The application sought approval to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission 15/1200/FUL to remodel and set back the glazed façade link, preserve the existing rear French doors on rear elevation, reduce footprint of glazed link of northwest elevation, amend the roofline above glazed link and internal layout alterations.

The Committee noted that the drawings had not been included in the agenda pack but were available via the planning portal.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for Section 73 permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**17/25/Plan 16/1760/FUL - 2 Sturton Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for replacement of existing roof plant.

The Planning Office referred to amendments to conditions as set out on the Amendment Sheet.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Raised the following concerns about the impact of the application:
  - a. Neighbour's amenities.
  - b. Out of character of the area.
  - c. Over development of site.
- ii. Took issue with the licence application for 2 Sturton Street and its impact on the planning application.
- iii. Asked for the following conditions to be imposed if planning permission was granted:
  - a. Obscure glass.
  - b. Keep windows/doors shut 24/7.
  - c. Keep refuse on-site.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to a list of required conditions/informatives tabled at the meeting. These were listed on the public file as recommended by the Senior Technical Officer as part of a licensing application the site.
- ii. Residents' had concerns about the application:
  - a. Loss of amenity.
  - b. Noise and disturbance.
- iii. Adding the proposed roof plant would upscale the development leading to higher visitor numbers to the site. Current seating capacity was 40 people, this could increase to 114.
- iv. Extra conditions were needed to control site usage if planning permission were granted, as listed in the Senior Technical Officer's recommendations. The Planning Officer's report did not appear to reference these.
- v. Asked that the following conditions (as listed on P2 of the tabled notes) be imposed if the application were approved:
  - a. Close the alfresco terrace and covered areas by 22:00 7 days a week.
  - b. Contain refuse on-site, with collection during set hours.
  - c. Keep windows/doors shut 24/7.

- d. Obscure glazing and fix shut first floor kitchen and toilet windows.
- e. Filter kitchen exhaust at DEFRA's highest level of abatement.
- f. Provide off-pavement cycle parking.

Councillor Hipkin proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include one of the Senior Technical Officer recommendations affecting the site's licensing application:

- i. All doors/windows accessing the ground floor covered/terrace area and those that serve the first floor terrace shall be kept closed between 22:00 – 11:00 or at any time during the provision of entertainment or the playing of music.

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

#### 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 plus additional conditions set out on the amendment sheet and additional condition:

8. The new doors hereby approved from the main building serving the ground floor terrace must be kept closed after 22:00 hrs until 11:00 hrs the following morning or at any time during entertainment of the playing of music.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

#### **17/26/Plan 16/1002/FUL - 19-21 Godesdone Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a residential development containing seven units (one 2xbed flat and six 1xbed flats) including bin and cycle storage, following the demolition of the existing buildings on the site.

The Planning Office referred to amendments to conditions as set out on the Amendment Sheet.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 2)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

**(By 6 votes to 2)**

1. The proposed building, by reason of its contrived design, height and bulk would appear incongruous within the street scene and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal is contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**(By 6 votes to 2)**

2. The proposal fails to provide a high quality living environment for future residents by reason of an insufficient provision of external amenity space. As such the proposal is contrary to policies 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**(By 6 votes to 1)**

3. The proposal fails to make appropriate provision for cycle parking. As such the proposal is contrary to policy 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**17/27/Plan 16/1942/FUL - 48 New Square**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the provision of 5 no. self-contained flats comprised of:

- i. The conversion of No. 48 to form 3 no. self-contained flats including internal and external works to the Listed Building.
- ii. The erection of a single storey building to provide 1 no. self-contained flat fronting Willow Walk, following removal of the car parking bays.
- iii. Demolition of the existing garage and the erection of 1 no self-contained studio-flat.
- iv. Associated landscaping and access arrangements.

Public speakers spoke about 16/1942/FUL and 16/1943/LBC at the same time.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to a previous iteration of the planning application currently being considered by the Planning Inspector. The current application may be replaced by the previous iteration if the refusal decision was overturned.
- ii. Referred to previous residents' comments on 48 New Square applications. Queried if the new application was an improvement on the last.
- iii. Expressed the following concerns:
  - a. Unattractive design.
  - b. Sense of enclosure.
- iv. The application needed to be unobtrusive if approved eg hidden by a wall. The character of Willow Walk needed to be preserved.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Willow Walk is a Conservation Area.
- ii. This application was an improvement on the last design but there were still some concerns:
  - a. Location of the boundary wall.
  - b. The 'rejected' previous application may be built if the Planning Inspector overturned the refusal decision.
  - c. Light pollution from roof windows.
  - d. Construction vehicles may access New Square through Willow Walk if the application were granted. Willow Walk is not suitable for heavy traffic.
  - e. The site was difficult to access/travel to by car/bike.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Willow Walk residents preferred no development on site.
- ii. This scheme was an improvement on the unacceptable previous one, but there were still some concerns eg the unattractive design.
- iii. Queried the Applicant's intention about which planning application would be implemented if approved (this or the last one being considered by the Planning Inspector).
- iv. Made the following requests:
  - a. The boundary wall should be solid not permeated with vents etc.
  - b. Light sensitive blinds to prevent light pollution.
  - c. Willow Walk is a private road. Construction traffic access to New Square should be controlled by condition as the road was not adopted by the Highways Authority.
  - d. New planting to replace trees removed from the site. This should match the number of trees removed and improve on the quality of site trees.
  - e. Condition approval of the site releases family accommodation elsewhere, to take advantage of the Applicant's offer.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that no ventilation and extraction equipment shall be installed on the northern elevation of the building fronting Willow Walk, unless full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

#### 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 with the following additional condition:

No vents, pipes, flues, exhausts, and other ventilation and extraction equipment shall be installed on the northern elevation of the building fronting Willow Walk, unless full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall thereafter be installed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area and the setting of Listed Buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/10 and 4/11).



**17/28/Plan 16/1943/LBC - 48 New Square**

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for the provision of 5 no. self-contained flats comprised of:

- i. The conversion of No. 48 to form 3 no. self-contained flats including internal and external works to the Listed Building.
- ii. The erection of a single storey building to provide 1 no. self-contained flat fronting Willow Walk, following removal of the car parking bays.
- iii. Demolition of the existing garage and the erection of 1 no self-contained studio-flat.
- iv. Associated landscaping and access arrangements.

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.

**17/29/Plan 16/1674/S73 - 28 Maids Causeway**

Councillor Hipkin withdrew from the meeting and Councillor Blencowe took the Chair.

The Committee received an application for Section 73 permission.

The application sought approval to vary condition 1 drawings of 15/1109/FUL to increase the height of the new garage to 2.97m at the front parapet, replace window and door facing 28 Maids Causeway with bi-fold glazed door, with integral single door.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from residents of Maids Causeway.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The objectors said that neighbours had accepted the garage on the grounds that it would not exceed 2.8m. The objectors queried why the additional height could be applied for in the current application.
- ii. The objectors expressed the following concerns about the current application:

- a. Was double the current volume of the last.
  - b. Loss of light.
  - c. Dominated neighbours' house and garden.
  - d. Overbearing.
  - e. Overlooking.
  - f. Sense of enclosure.
  - g. Out of character with the area.
- iii. The objectors alleged that the owners of 28 Maids Causeway had deliberately and repeatedly ignored conditions imposed on previous planning permission.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Objectors had supported the initial garage application, but the objectors thought the height on the current one was too high.
- ii. The objectors alleged the situation had been exacerbated as work was undertaken without planning permission.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Asked for strong and clear enforcement action.
- ii. Requested that the case be judged as fresh application even if some work needed to be dismantled.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. By reason of the height and massing of the building, it is an overly dominant feature in the street that is harmful to the character of the area

and fails to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. As a result, the development is contrary to Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

2. By reason of the height of the building and its proximity to the boundary with No.26 Maid's Causeway, the development has an unacceptable enclosing and overbearing impact on this neighbouring property, to the detriment of the amenity of its occupiers. As a result, the development is contrary to Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.
3. The rear windows serving the garden room result in an unacceptable level of overlooking of the first floor bedroom window in the rear elevation of No.26 Maids Causeway. As a result, the development is contrary to Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

### **17/30/Plan 16/1916/FUL - 61 Norfolk Street**

The Committee received an application for change of use permission.

The application sought approval for change of use of takeaway (A5 use) and Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMO) to 3no. residential units, including alterations to the front elevation, rear extension and rear roof extensions. Erection of one-and-a-half storey building to provide a further 2no. residential units. Associated landscaping, bin and bike storage.

Mr Aguilar-Agon (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to refuse the application for change of use permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

### **17/31/Plan 16/1919/FUL - Land r/o 268 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 3x4 bed houses, internal access road, car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping.

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.

### **17/32/Plan 16/1617/FUL - 59 St Barnabas Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for refurbishment and extensions to the existing St Barnabas House, Stable Blocks and Kirby Building to provide 42 student bedrooms, manager accommodation and breakout space along with cycle parking following the demolition of existing single storey rear projection to St Barnabas House and kitchen store.

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

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Did not object to the application per se, but wanted it managed through conditions.
- ii. Requested that conditions imposed on the main building be imposed on the extension.
- iii. Requested the Management Plan be made publically available and the area covered by the smoking ban be extended due to the impact on neighbours.
- iv. Specific concerns:
  - a. Litter.
  - b. The number of students gathering in front of neighbour's properties.
  - c. No confidence in the existing Management Plan. The situation was expected to be exacerbated by increased student numbers in future.
- v. Asked for conditions to:
  - a. Mitigate doorbell noise.
  - b. Mitigate light pollution at night.
  - c. Stop smoking on the street.
  - d. Move the pedestrian access so it is next to the vehicle entrance.
  - e. Impose a curfew on break out room usage between 23:00 – 08:00.

- vi. Queried who were the students that visited the Kirby Building (eg were they limited to a particular organisation?) as the sheer volume of numbers affected the area due to throughput.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The area was affected by various issues as the current Management Plan was not implemented effectively, leading to concerns from residents:
  - a. Litter.
  - b. Smoking.
  - c. Site Manager (as referenced in Management Plan) not contactable.
- ii. Mitigation is needed for:
  - a. Doorbell noise.
  - b. Light pollution.
- iii. Queried if a new Management Plan could be implemented if the old one had not been.
- iv. Referred to conditions in the application from 2000.

The Planning Officer proposed an amendment to the recommendation as requested by the Agent:

24. The Kirby Building and extension for the student common room/break out space hereby approved shall not be used between the hours of 2300 and 0730.

This amendment was **lost nem con**.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Planning Officer's recommendation regarding condition 21: No organised activities to take place within the external spaces around the buildings between 2300 and 0800 on any given day.

This amendment was **carried nem con**.

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 plus the amendments listed below:

Condition 21 – Wording amended as follows:

Prior to the occupation of the development, a student management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include provisions relating to travel advice; specific stipulations prohibiting the keeping of a car in Cambridge (excluding disabled students); check-in time slots in order to stage the impact of the check-in process; the organization of the move-in day; site security; the management of deliveries; responsibilities expected of students both inside and outside the site; the management of move-out times; maintenance cover; tenancy checks; waste management; and the external display of contact information for on-site management and emergencies. It shall include details of the resident warden. No organised activities shall take place within the external spaces around the buildings between 11pm and 8am on any given day. The scheme shall be managed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure the occupation of the site is well managed and does not give rise to significant amenity issues for nearby residents (Cambridge Local Plan, policies 4/13 and 7/10).

Condition 24 – No change from Committee Report (not to be used between 2300 and 0800).

### **17/33/Plan 16/1825/FUL - 63 Ditton Walk**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 4 self-contained units following demolition of the existing workshops with associated refuse, cycle, access and landscaping works.

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.

### **17/34/Plan 16/1362/FUL - Land adj to 99 Kendal Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of two 2-bed affordable houses, associated landscaping, parking spaces and rear gardens.

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

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Suggested the development did not comply with a number of Local Plan policies eg 8/4 as it did not meet the needs of people with disabilities.
- ii. Overlooking and loss of privacy.
- iii. Overbearing and sense of enclosure.
- iv. Loss of light.
- v. Accuracy of shadow studies.
- vi. Responding to context.
- vii. Sub-division of existing plots leads to small gardens.
- viii. Noise nuisance.
- ix. Ownership of land.

#### 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 plus and the alteration to condition 11 listed on the amendment sheet.

### **17/35/Plan 16/1358/FUL - Garages 1-48 Wiles Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of three 2-bed affordable houses, associated landscaping, parking spaces, rear gardens and an

alleyway for access following demolition of two garage blocks. Replacement of one site (Parking Court) with 21 space parking courtyard and landscaping.

The Planning Officer corrected a typographical error in condition 8.25 of the report. All 22 car parking spaces were on the hardstanding area.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of St Kilda Avenue.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Took issue with the accuracy of plans.
- ii. The application would exacerbate existing issues affecting:
  - a. Light loss.
  - b. Refuse collection.
- iii. Proximity of proposed housing on (existing) neighbours.
- iv. Parking provision.

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.

### **17/36/Plan 16/1087/FUL - 423-425 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of four 1 bed flat and 1 studio replacement flats.

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

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Work undertaken on the front of the application site and safety concerns arising from these.
- ii. Loss of light at the rear of the property and impact on neighbour's amenities.
- iii. Refuse collection issues.
- iv. Sense of enclosure.



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.

**17/37/Plan Tanglewood, Gazeley Lane**

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 182016 for Tanglewood, Gazeley Lane, Trumpington.

Members were asked to decide whether to confirm the TPO as is, confirm the TPO with modification or not confirm the TPO.

Members were recommended that the TPO be confirmed without modification.

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

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Trees provided amenity value but this did not mean they needed TPOs.
- ii. Reasons given for imposing the TPOs were not applicable so there was no need for the TPO.
- iii. Referred to assessment information in the Officer's report. Suggested the trees were not of sufficient amenity value to warrant protection from TPOs.

The Committee received a representation in support of the TPO from residents of Gazeley Road.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Took issue with details in the Objector's report.
- ii. Concern about multiple planning applications affecting the site and this could lead to loss of trees.
- iii. The trees were healthy and needed protection.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm the TPO that was the subject of the application.

The meeting ended at 5.55 pm

**CHAIR**