

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

14 February 2018
10.00 - 11.00 am

Present

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe, Hipkin, Holt, Smart

Other Councillors present: Cantrill and Sinnott

Officers:

Principal Planner Nigel Blazeby

Principal Planner: Sav Patel

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

For Applicant:

David Digby (CIP, Applicant)

Andy Thompson (Beacon, Agent)

Max Kettenacker (Allies and Morrison, Architect)

Oliver Unwin (Allies and Morrison, Architect)

For Petitioners:

3 Petitioners were in attendance

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/5/DCF Introduction by Chair to the Forum

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. He stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

18/6/DCF Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr Hipkin	18/7/DCF	Member of co-sponsor of Applicant.

18/7/DCF 17/2245/FUL- Mill Road Depot

Application No: 17/2245/FUL

Site Address: Mill Road Depot, Mill Road, Cambridge, CB1 2AZ

Description: The erection of 184 dwellings (including 50% affordable

housing), 72sqm of floor-space consisting of Use Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Food and Drinks) or D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) - in the alternative, basement car park (101 spaces), surface water pumping station, open space (including play area), alterations to the junction with Mill Road, together with associated external works including cycle parking and landscaping.

Applicant: Cambridge Investment Partnership

Agent: Mr Andy Thompson

Address: Beacon Planning, 8 Quay Court Colliers Lane Stow-cum-Quay
Cambridgeshire CB25 9AU

Lead Petitioner: Resident of Kingston Street

Case Officer: Sav Patel

Text of Petition:

We object to building B_09, a tall 3 storey apartment building with ground floor retail space because of:

- Loss of amenity (loss of privacy from 1st and 2nd floor windows: noise, disturbance and nuisance from retail use within 5 meters of the existing houses) to a number of houses not limited to 12-26 Kingston Street.
- Inappropriate design (red brick in a conservation area).
- The tall 3 storey design is out of scale with the rest of Kingston Mews which is 2 storey and directly contradicted by the applicant's own design and access statement which describes the development as 'gently stepping up from 2 storey on Kingston Mews to a 3 storey in the central portion of the site...' and specifically states 'the mews houses are sited 3 metres away from the boundary with Kingston Street to improve the relationship to the Kingston Street boundaries'.
- We consider that all the proposed buildings which will directly neighbour Kingston Street, must maintain this design principle and therefore that the proposed apartment building is inappropriate for this location.

Do you think there are changes that could be made to overcome your concerns?

Yes. We consider that replacing the proposed apartment building B_09 with a 2 storey mews house of the same design and positioning as the rest of Kingston Mews, i.e. 3 metres from the boundary wall, constructed with Cambridge brick, would be an appropriate compromise and would address our concerns.

Case by Applicant

David Digby and Max Kettenacker made the following points:

- 1) The application was for 184 dwellings with 50% affordable housing at social rent which would be at 50-60% of market rents.
- 2) Public exhibitions had been undertaken and the application was tested against planning guidance.
- 3) Building B09 marked the entrance to the site and was the first building on arrival from Mill Road. The building was proposed to be a marker, this was why a 3-storey building was proposed however the applicant was willing to make changes and consider other ways to mark the entrance to the site.
- 4) Concerns had been expressed regarding: noise, disturbance from the proposed use classes on the application form, proximity of buildings to the boundary, the scale of the building, overlooking from upper floors and the brick colour.
- 5) Proposed changes to move the building back by 2.2m to create a passage way to give access to upper buildings.
- 6) Proposed changes to the scale of the building so that it would be 2 storey on Kingston Street and 2 and a half storeys on other side with a pitched roof.
- 7) Pictures had been provided by a resident of Kingston Street which helped to understand the impact on the property of the proposed development.
- 8) Proposed a reduction in the number of windows and that there would be no windows on the North side. These previously may have been oblique to mitigate overlooking but in the revised proposal the building itself would be moved and the windows would be as far away as possible and a privacy screen was proposed.
- 9) Summarised the proposed changes to the application: a reduction of the height of the building to 2 and a half storeys, the introduction of bedrooms into the roof space. Retention of the two residential units but these would be smaller. The space on the ground floor would be smaller and away from the boundary and to internalise the bin store and introduce a residential buffer.

Case by Petitioners

Petitioner A spoke on behalf of 66 local residents. She made the following objections regarding building B09:

- 10) The loss of amenity was not limited to 14-26 Kingston Street

- 11) Referred to the loss of privacy from 1st and 2nd floor side windows
- 12) The noise of the use of the new building
- 13) Inappropriate brick materials were proposed
- 14) Refuted the need for a statement building based on the Applicant's own Design and Access Statement.
- 15) Pictures were out of scale, design and massing with the Mews houses and with the development brief.
- 16) An external bin store would create noise disturbance, attract vermin and would be a security risk.
- 17) The images showed the dominance of the proposed building to existing houses but were not accurate in scale on the pictures. The building to be no higher than 2 storeys and set 3m back.
- 18) Drew Councillors attention to specific paragraphs within the development brief where the proposed development did not meet the brief which included:
 - No need for a retail use as there was adequate provision on Mill Road.
 - Community provision on site would be too small to be of use to community groups.
 - There should be a tight 2 storey edge, the applicant's current application included a 3 storey, a reduction to 2.5m did not meet the brief.
 - Development would not meet BRE sunlight requirements.
 - The positioning of Kingston Street houses not shown accurately as they are too far from the boundary
 - Kingston Mews should be extended by 1 mews unit to replace B09 and provide opportunity for public art
 - The current proposal for B09 was not in scale.

Petitioner B made the following objections:

- 19) He had a loft conversion and a single storey extension which would be impacted by the revised proposal.
- 20) If the boundary wall was moved, better access could be provided to residents of Kingston Street with a safe and secure communal gate at the end.

- 21) He did not want any development built on the land greater than 2 storeys in height.
- 22) It was not appropriate to have a commercial element within the development as Mill Road was so close.
- 23) He was not against housing but asked that any development was no higher than 2 storeys in height.

Case by Ward Councillors

Councillor Sinnott spoke as a Ward Councillor on behalf of local residents. She made the following points:

- 24) Questioned the rationale for a 2.2m distance and not a 3m distance.
- 25) Questioned why building B09 was only 2.2m
- 26) Questioned the rationale behind the use of materials and whether the materials for building B09 was the same as other tall buildings on the site.

Case Officer's Comments:

- 27) Details regarding the application were sent to 650 neighbours on 8 January 2018, 20 site notices were displayed and a notice was put in the press.
- 28) Received 38 representations and 36 objections. Whilst many were supportive of redevelopment of the site the following issues/concerns were raised:
 - There was either too much or not enough car parking provision
 - Increased traffic generation
 - Pressure on existing services including schools and doctor surgeries
 - Questioned the commercial use given the close proximity to Mill Road
 - Red brick was out of character in the area
 - Lack of community provision
 - Would like more affordable housing on site
 - Access to Chisholm Trail
- 29) Policy consultations had been undertaken with statutory consultees.

- The County Council had objected in relation to visibility and links to the Chisholm Trail from within the site.
- Environmental Services raised concerns about contamination.
- The Drainage Engineer objected to the drainage strategy on basis of it being the least sustainable and raised ground water displacement concerns.
- Anglian Water raised concerns regarding the surface water strategy which could be dealt with by conditions.
- Conservation raised concerns as the scale of the apartment blocks and impact on the Conservation Area.
- The Landscape Officer commented that insufficient information had been provided.
- Housing Officers were satisfied with the mix and tenure of the development.
- The Environment Agency had yet to respond.
- The Access Officer requested changes.

Members' Questions and Comments:

Members raised the following questions:

- 30) Queried the status of the amendments the Applicant had made during the Forum
- 31) Asked where the concept of a retail unit on the ground floor had come from as there was retail on Mill Road.
- 32) Asked why a large use class had been applied for.
- 33) Queried why there was a large building at the end.
- 34) Asked if public art or landscaping had been considered in place of a marker building.
- 35) Understood the need for a marker and asked if brick had been considered.

The Case Officer answered as follows in response to Members' questions and comments:

- 36) The revisions provided by the Applicant were a direct response to the concerns raised through the Development Control Forum, the Planning Department had not received formal amendments to consider but if submitted would be subject to a formal consultation.

The Applicant's Agent answered as follows in response to Members questions:

- 37) The concept of retail on the ground floor came from a public consultation; there was no firm user agreed.
- 38) Accepted that there could be a larger impact with certain uses and would take this issue way to look at.
- 39) The large building at the end was encouraged by the Design and Conservation Panel to introduce a marker building. Accepted that the marker building did not necessarily need to be in a greater scale and could be achieved in a different way.
- 40) Signage or public art had been raised by the Petitioner and the Petitioner's comments regarding a tree would be taken into account.
- 41) Would take the issue of the marker building away to look at further.
- 42) Commented that there were numerous red brick buildings around the site.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

- 43) They would review the proposed uses on the ground floor of B.09 building with the Case Officer and the Urban Design Officer and would look at the marker building in light of the concerns from residents.
- 44) In relation to public art they could consider whether a mural could be added.
- 45) Commented that the design was a work in progress and would try to work with the Petitioners concerns

Summing up by the Petitioners

Petitioner A reiterated:

- 46) Her concerns regarding the statement building and commented that retail use was not required as this was adequately provided for on Mill Road.
- 47) That the size of the community use proposed would be too small for community groups to use.
- 48) That red bricks reduced light and the overall architecture in the area was gold brick.
- 49) Expressed concern regarding passages.
- 50) Commented that the development was meant to be an opportunity to improve the area and that the opportunity to reduce the boundary wall should be taken.

- 51) The revised proposal from the Applicants did not meet the concerns raised by the Petitioners.

Petitioner B commented as follows:

- 52) He would still object to the revised proposals from the Applicants as the height of the proposals would still significantly impact on him more than his neighbours due to his loft conversion and extension.
- 53) He had had to remove red brick.
- 54) Commented on the parking issue for Kingston Street residents from users of Mill Road.
- 55) He was not happy with any commercial building on the site.
- 56) Commented that the boundary wall needed to be removed as it would not be structurally sound. A passageway would be better to provide access to gardens.

Final Comments of the Chair

57) The Chair observed the following:

- The application was a work in progress and the points raised during the Forum would be taken away and looked at.
- Any amended plans would go out for a 14 day consultation period.
- Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties and published on the Council's website.
- The application would be considered by the Planning Committee and the Case Officer was working towards taking the application to the 28th March Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 11.00 am

CHAIR