

PLANNING

7 February 2018
10.00 am - 4.15 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Hipkin (Chair), Smart (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Hart, Holt, Nethsingha, Sarris and Tunnacliffe

Councillors Sarris left after the vote on item 18/40/Plan.

Officers:

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer
New Neighbourhoods Development Manager: Sharon Brown
Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: John Evans
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Toby Williams
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton
Senior Planner: Mary Collins
Senior Planner: Michael Hammond
Planning Enforcement Officer: John Shuttlewood
Planner: Rob Brereton
Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
Legal Advisor: Rebecca Williams
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/26/Plan Apologies

All expected Members were present.

18/27/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Sarris	18/29/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Employee of Cambridge University

Councillor Sarris	18/35/Plan 18/36/Plan	Personal: Fellow of Trinity College and Trustee of Trinity Charity. Trinity College is a punt operator. Withdrew from the meeting for these items and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.
Councillors Sarris & Tunnacliffe	18/35/Plan 18/36/Plan	Personal: Conservator of the River Cam.

18/28/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 10th January 2018 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

18/29/Plan 17/1799/FUL - Proposed Cavendish III laboratory

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Development of 37,160 sqm for D1 academic floor space to accommodate the relocation of the Cavendish Laboratory, namely; all associated infrastructure including drainage, utilities, landscape and cycle parking; strategic open space to the south and west of the new Cavendish; modifications to JJ Thomson Avenue to provide disabled parking and changes to road surface materials; alterations to the existing access to Madingley Road to the north west to enable servicing; and demolition of Merton Hall Farmhouse and removal of existing Vet School access road from JJ Thomson Avenue.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

Professor Richard Phillips addressed the Committee on behalf on the applicant in support of the application.

Matthew Danish addressed the Committee on behalf of West Cambridge Active Travel in support of the application and stated the following:

- i. Welcomed the plan.
- ii. Thanked the applicant for the consultation and engagement.
- iii. Hoped to have further opportunities to engage as the project progressed.

The committee expressed concerns about the order that applications for the wider West Cambridge site were being considered. Officers confirmed that although the outline application for the wider site had not yet come before the Planning Committee for determination, this application could be considered as a stand-alone application as, in the officer's view, it was not prejudicial to the determination of the wider outline application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 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, subject to the completion of a s.106 agreement and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers, as amended by pre-committee amendments set out on the amendment sheet.

18/30/Plan 16/1904/OUT - Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The application sought outline permission for the erection of up to 245 dwellings, including affordable housing, a nursery and/or community facility, open space, car parking, cycle parking and associated works following the demolition of all existing buildings on the site.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a late request for a statement to be read out in objection to the application from a local resident. The Chair disallowed the statement due to the late submission. However, the Officer was asked to cover the issue of existing properties in close proximity to the boundary of the proposed site in her presentation, which was the substance of the late submission.

Paul Belton (Applicant's Agent) 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 as amended by pre-committee amendments set out on the amendment sheet.

Also subject to completion of S106 Agreement, and delegated authority to confirm either contributions or no contributions towards healthcare facilities following consultation with consultees.

18/31/Plan 17/1886/FUL - 13 Brookside

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for alterations and extensions including the addition of 2no. dormers to the front elevation; 1no. dormer to the rear elevation; an upwards extension to the rear closet wing; a new access from the ground floor level to the rear garden via an external staircase; a double height rear infill extension including lowering of the basement floor; internal alterations to the building layout; and the demolition and erection of a new garage.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Residents had no great concerns about the original scheme; but did about the current one as the proposed structure was larger, deeper and blocked people's views.
- ii. Would be happy to keep the void in the proposed plan.
- iii. Expressed the following specific concerns:
 - a. Sash window and the mass of brickwork around it was out of character with the area.
 - b. Loss of privacy and amenity.
 - c. Overlooking, which would not be mitigated by the privacy screen.
 - d. Loss of light.
 - e. Designs had been submitted and withdrawn various times, now residents were confused what proposals were going forward.
 - f. Suggested the proposed plans contained errors and what had been built did not match approved plans.

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

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

The representation covered the following issues:

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern about the application as work on the house did not conform to the approved submitted plan.
- ii. Residents had not objected to the previous application as they did not think the (now approved) plans would lead to loss of privacy/amenity.
- iii. The (setback) basement door and privacy screen would exacerbate the loss of light and sense of enclosure for neighbours. Tabled a document to illustrate this point. The Planning Officer confirmed information shown was already in the public domain.
- iv. The proposed planting between the staircase and wall would exacerbate the light loss issue unless it was continuously pruned.
- v. Neighbours had concerns about overlooking. They would have strongly objected if the current application had been submitted in 2015.
- vi. The Applicant appeared to have been badly advised on building design by his builder, but this should not affect neighbours by Planning Committee's acceptance of the Officer's recommendation to approve this application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Members voted on reasons for refusal:

- **Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to accept: Impact on neighbour of loss of light and sense of enclosure due to the privacy screen, basement extension and staircase.
- **Resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to accept: Impact of design of rear projection.
- **Resolved (by 4 votes to 3)** not to accept: Block like rear dormer window.
- **Resolved (by 5 votes to 2)** not to accept: Front dormer window not built in accordance with approved plan.

Unanimously resolved to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

The proposed single storey basement extension, external staircase and its screen would overshadow the basement kitchen door and windows of No. 14 Brookside and its rear patio area. It would also appear

overbearing and enclosing when viewed from within this kitchen and from the patio. As such the proposal would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the amenity of the occupiers of No. 14 and is contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed extensions by virtue of the heavy design and form of the rear brick ground floor element would appear discordant and incongruous in relation to adjoining properties. It would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would harm the quality and character of this Building of Local Interest. As such the proposal is contrary to policies 3/4, 3/14, 4/11 and 4/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

18/32/Plan 17/1848/FUL - 87 Histon Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a 1.5 storey 2 bed dwelling to the rear of 87 Histon Road with access from North Street, with integrated store for bins and bikes.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Canterbury Close.

The representation covered the following concerns:

- i. Dominating design that would be out of context/character with the area.
- ii. Loss of privacy and light.
- iii. Overlooking.
- iv. Lack of scale drawings. Inaccuracies in submitted documents.
- v. Exacerbation of existing access and parking issues.
- vi. Sewerage and refuse collection arrangements.

Councillor O'Reilly (Abbey Ward Councillor, speaking on behalf of Councillor Todd-Jones) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The property would be 2 storeys not 1.5 as listed.
- ii. The development would be in a Conservation Area, on an unadopted (highway) track.

- iii. The application had no parking space, this would exacerbate existing parking issues and displace others in an already constrained area.
- iv. Suggested the design would:
 - a. Dominate the streetscene.
 - b. Lead to a loss of light and overlooking.
 - c. Not meet Local Plan criteria 3/10 (subdivision of existing plot, access and parking) or 3/12 (design of new buildings).

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.

18/33/Plan 17/1453/FUL - 29 Fernlea Road

The Committee received an application for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey front extension, part single storey, part two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and change of use to 8-person HMO (House in Multiple Occupation).

Mr Khan (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 issues:

- i. Referred to #2.2 in the Officer's report. Residents had concerns about how the City Council handled planning applications concerning this address since 2011.
- ii. Parking/access.
- iii. Noise and overlooking concerns.
- iv. The house would be in multiple occupation.
- v. Intermittent building works occurred over several years. Residents were unclear what the design would look like when completed.
- vi. The design was out of context with the area.
- vii. Builders working on 29 Fernlea Road trespassed on neighbour's property.
- viii. The 29 Fernlea Road property encroached on neighbour's land.

- ix. The Applicant was not building to approved plans (#2.2 in the Officer's report).
- x. Officers had been on-site and found unreported building work (referred to enforcement investigation #2.4 in the Officer's report). Residents were concerned this work was not included in the current application.
- xi. Referred to #6.1 in the Officer's report: "The development may therefore impose additional parking demands upon the on-street parking on the surrounding streets and, whilst this is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact upon highway safety, there is potentially an impact upon residential amenity which the Planning Authority may wish to consider".

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) 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 reason:

The scale of the extension has an overbearing and enclosing impact on the occupant of the adjoining property No. 27 and therefore adversely impacts on their amenity. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

18/34/Plan 17/1793/FUL - 159 Vinery Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing buildings and construction of two new buildings containing 6 x 1 bedroom apartments and 3 x 2 bedroom apartments. Provision of on-site parking and bin & bike storage

Mr Jackson (Applicant's Agent) 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.

18/35/Plan 17/1864/FUL - Scudamores Mill Lane

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for replacement of ticket office and pontoons.

The Planner updated her report to amend text in the table (#8.21) on P321: "The addition of the ramp will significantly improve access to the river for less able people **with mobility issues.**"

Mr Wood (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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.

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

18/36/Plan 17/1865/FUL - Scudamores Quayside

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of the existing ticket offices and pontoons, erection of replacement ticket offices and pontoons

Mr Wood (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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.

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

18/37/Plan 17/1937/S73 - Carlyle House 20 Devonshire Road

The Committee received a S73 application to vary condition 2 of ref no: 16/1281/FUL (the redevelopment of three existing residential flats and demolition of commercial workshop to create 6 new residential units with associated cycle and bin storage and new landscaped amenity spaces) with new drawings to show retrospective and proposed alterations to roof design, increase in height, alteration to south elevation, reduction in height of the boundary wall and addition of windows and rooflights.

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

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the S73 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.

18/38/Plan 17/1909/FUL - 54A Mill Road

The Committee received an application for retrospective planning permission.

The application sought approval for a first floor rear extension to create four self-contained studio flats and proposed recessing of part of first floor rear wall and relocation of ducts.

The Senior Planner updated his report to amend condition 9.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Mill Street.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expected disturbance due to courtyard noise during the afternoon and evening.
- ii. High velocity extractor fans would be noisy. Welcomed monitoring of the impact on neighbours.
- iii. Queried if any mitigation factors were possible.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) 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 and subject to condition no.9 being re-worded as follows:

Prior to occupation of development, a layout plan showing the storage of facilities for waste including waste for recycling and composting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The layout plan shall identify the specific positions of where wheeled bins will be stationed. Details of the security/ access of the bin store shall also be provided. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained for their intended use thereafter.

Reason - To provide an acceptable living environment for future occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 5/2).

18/39/Plan 17/1838/FUL - 40 Grantchester Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey extension to the side and rear.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Due to the proximity of the proposal to the boundary, I consider that the following condition limiting construction hours should be attached.

No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern that the extra build extended almost up to the boundary.
- ii. Said the Case Officer confirmed in her report that the relationship between the two dwellings was very tight.
- iii. Expressed concern about:
 - a. Being in a tunnel effect and related sense of enclosure.
 - b. Siting.
 - c. Mass.
 - d. Unattractive design.
- iv. Suggested the development did not meet Local Plan policies 3/14 (visual dominance), 3/1 (sustainable development), 3/11 (design of external spaces) and 3/4 (responding to context).

The Chair read a statement submitted by the Applicant's Agent who was unable to attend the Committee. The Agent's statement supported the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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.

18/40/Plan 17/1926/FUL - 8 & 8A Oak Tree Avenue

This item was deferred as the Applicant's Agent registered to speak and then withdrew when informed by Officers there were no Objectors who also wished to speak. This was incorrect. Councillors agreed to defer the item to another committee date when all parties would have an opportunity to speak.

Councillor Sarris left the meeting to attend another commitment.

18/41/Plan 17/1955/FUL - 95 Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a roof extension including raising the ridge height, a rear dormer, an additional front roof light and a change of use of the property from a guesthouse to a large scale HMO which would accommodate 12 persons.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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.

18/42/Plan EN/0054/17 - 59 Hills Avenue

The Committee received a report requesting authorisation to take formal enforcement action.

This report detailed an alleged unauthorised change of use of a domestic residential dwelling into a commercial short-term visitor accommodation letting use at the premises.

The report recommended serving one change of use Enforcement Notice directed at remedying the harm caused as a result of the breach occurring. The recommendation looks to ensure compliance in the short term and onwards.

The Planning Enforcement Officer updated his report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Authority is sought to serve an enforcement notice as recommended in the committee report or to serve an amended notice removing any steps no longer required due to compliance.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to accept the officer recommendation to:

- i. Authorise an enforcement notice under S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) alleging that there has been a breach of planning control within the last ten years, namely without planning permission, the unauthorised change of use from C3 dwelling house to Aparthotel style serviced short-term visitor accommodation lets (sui generis) at the premises, specifying the steps to comply and the period for compliance set out in paragraphs 9.2 to 9.4 of the Officer's report, for the reasons contained in paragraph 9.5.

- ii. Authorise the Director of Planning and Economic Development (after consultation with the Head of Legal Practise) to draft and issue the enforcement notice.
- iii. Delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Economic Development (after consultation with the Head of Legal Practice) to exercise the Council's powers to take further action in the event of non-compliance with the enforcement notice.

The meeting ended at 4.15 pm

CHAIR