

## **PLANNING**

4 July 2018  
12.30 - 5.15 pm

### **Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Hart, Hipkin, Page-Croft, Sinnott, Thornburrow, Tunnacliffe and Holt

Councillor Hipkin left after the vote on item 18/112/PC.

### **Officers:**

Interim Planning Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson

Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby

Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey

Principal Planner: Sav Patel

Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton

Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson

Planner: Rob Brereton

Planner: Eloise Limmer

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

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

### **18/107/PlanApologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors McQueen and Nethsingha. Councillor Holt was present as the alternate.

### **18/108/PlanDeclarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

### **18/109/PlanMinutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **18/110/Plan17/2157/FUL - 54-58 Chesterton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of former HSBC bank building and redevelopment of site to provide 2no. ground floor commercial units comprising Use Class A1 (shop), A2 (financial and professional) - in the alternative, with 8no. apartments, cycle parking, and associated infrastructure.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

Nick Green (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Sargeant (West Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Frontage to Chesterton Road was acceptable and sympathetic to character of area.
- ii. Rear of property was problematic.
- iii. In-fill of entire plot was overdevelopment.
- iv. Densification of the area was problematic.
- v. Similar applications in the area had been rejected.
- vi. Rear access was very limited.

The Committee discussed the application and were unclear on the status of the existing basement. The access to the basement was visible on the plan but no details were included in the application.

With the Chair's permission, the applicant's agent confirmed that basement area would be divided in line with the proposed retail units. Full details were included with the application but were not included in committee report.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 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.

**18/111/Plan18/0164/FUL - Land to the North of Cherry Hinton Caravan and Motorhome Club**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for relocation of agricultural access onto Limekiln Road.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Site on edge of the city and part of green boundary.
- ii. Questioned the agricultural use of the land.
- iii. Land was not used and had been the subject of a previous planning application.
- iv. As planned usage was unknown it was not possible to assess vehicle numbers using the new gates.
- v. Applications lacked detail.
- vi. Conditions were unenforceable.

Councillor Ashton (Cherry Hinton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Applicant had previously applied to build on the site.
- ii. Applicant had access point that was never used.
- iii. Over year site had been used for various agricultural uses.
- iv. Site forms a safeguard to the city boundary.
- v. Application was the first step towards a housing application.
- vi. Council was ignoring the Landscape Officer's advice.
- vii. This small green area needed to be protected.

The Committee suggested that a stronger condition was needed regarding lighting to the site. This was agreed *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, subject to the conditions recommended by the officers and subject to amended wording to condition 11 as below:

11. Prior to the installation of any external lighting, a detailed scheme for low level lighting to the access only shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent detriment to foraging bats (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/15). To protect the character of the area and residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4, 3/7, 4/13 and 4/15).

### **18/112/Plan18/0597/FUL - 107 Argyle Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective planning permission for raised ground levels in rear garden and rear boundary fence in excess of permitted development parameters.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Owner of 107 had misled the planning committee.
- ii. Local resident had objections.
- iii. High fencing to a narrow passageway was overbearing.
- iv. Unfinished look was unsightly.
- v. Elderly, less mobile neighbours were presented with an ugly fence outside their windows.
- vi. Raised level of the internal garden had forced the fence to be raised for privacy.

Officers clarified the status of the garden canopy. This would be dealt with by a separate retrospective application.

The Committee discussed the application and stated that the fence was overbearing, of poor design and caused harm to the amenity of neighbours.

The Committee:

**Resolved (Unanimously)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

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

The fence, by virtue of its height and design would appear incongruous in the street scene and result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7.

The fence by virtue of its height and design will result in an unacceptable degree of enclosure on and overbearing impact to neighbouring residents. The fence is necessary to prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties due to the raising of the ground level within the site and this aspect of the development is therefore also unacceptable. As such the proposal is contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/7.

### **18/113/Plan18/0169/S73 - Westcott House**

The Committee received an S73 application to vary conditions as below.

The application sought S73 approval to vary conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29 of ref: 15/1217/FUL (Proposed extension to house additional library space and new teaching / tutorial accommodation to the south side of Westcott House. Proposal incorporates a basement, ground and first floor with a new college entrance off the refurbished Manor Street Car park access) to amend the timings of discharge of these conditions.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

Peter Howard-Jones (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.

### **18/114/Plan17/2183/FUL - Land Rear Of Queens Meadow**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 2 No affordable dwellings.

The Committee noted the Amendment Sheet and the following correction to the text of recommendation 18. Additional word in bold and underlined.

The window on the south-east **side** elevation at first floor of Plot 2 level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 3 or equivalent prior to commencement of use and shall have restrictors to ensure that the window cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall nearest to Coldhams Lane and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Councillor Thornburrow requested additional conditions to protect the health of trees in a neighbouring property. This was agreed *nem con.* with the wording delegated to officers.

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, subject to the conditions recommended by the officers and subject to the additional condition:

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

- i) contractors access arrangements for plant and personnel,
- ii) the location of contractors site storage area/compound and material storage,
- iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the adjacent trees and amenity of the adjoining properties during the construction period. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/4 and 4/13)

**18/115/Plan18/0454/FUL - 53 Kings Hedges Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Change of use of existing dwelling to 9 bedroom large scale HMO. Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer and front rooflights following demolition of existing garage.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. HMO would be out of keeping with the area.
- ii. Kings Hedges Road was an interesting road with sections of family accommodation and sections of non-residential.
- iii. Nine units in one property would be problematic.
- iv. Insufficient parking in the area.
- v. Property lacked communal areas.

Don Proctor (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Gawthroe (King's Hedges Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments.

- i. There were no other HMO's in the area.
- ii. Size of proposed extension was out of keeping with the area.
- iii. Neighbouring properties would be overshadowed.
- iv. Area was currently predominantly family housing.
- v. Proposal was overdevelopment.
- vi. Parking in the area was already problematic.

Councillors discussed the proposal and had the following concerns:

- i. Inadequate internal living space.
- ii. Out of keeping with the area.
- iii. Concerns regarding fire safety.
- iv. Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties.
- v. Overdevelopment.
- vi. Insufficient cycle parking.
- vii. Scale of the extension.
- viii. Poor quality design.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3 and 1 abstention)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3 and 1 abstention)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. By virtue of the scale of the development and the proposed number of occupiers, together with the poor quality of the internal communal space, the proposal would result in an increased reliance on the rear garden area and level of activity that would harm the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 4/13 and 5/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
2. Due to the scale and design of the proposed side and rear extensions, the development would unbalance the row of properties and appear dominant and incongruous in the streetscene, particularly when viewed in the context of the adjacent row of bungalows on Campkin Road. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

**18/116/Plan18/0446/FUL - 33 Redfern Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a two storey side extension following demolition of existing car port. New front and rear roof extension including raising ridge height. Replace existing conservatory with new single storey rear extension and convert existing out house to study/workshop.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Moved to the neighbouring property one year ago.
- ii. This was an attractive area to retire to.
- iii. Accepts that the property next door needed updating.
- iv. Scale of proposal contravenes emerging local plan.
- v. Would result in overlooking and shadowing.
- vi. Would present a long blank wall to neighbours.
- vii. Featureless and overbearing aspect.



- viii. Large dormer would overlook neighbours.
- ix. Sunlight would be lost in the kitchen and garden of her house.
- x. Has concerns about the possible future use of the outbuilding.

Jacqueline Jiang-Haines (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Mike Todd-Jones (Arbury Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Appreciates that the applicant had listened and amended plans.
- ii. There were no other dormers in the area.
- iii. Increased ridge height would be problematic.
- iv. Size of planned property would be overdevelopment.
- v. Shadowing of neighbours would be significant and unneighbourly.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0 and 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.

The meeting ended at 5.15 pm

**CHAIR**