

## PLANNING

1 August 2018  
12.30 - 4.15 pm

### Present:

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

### Officers:

Interim Planning Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson  
Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby  
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton  
Planner: Rob Brereton  
Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Legal Advisor: Richard Pitt  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### Changes to National Planning Policy Framework

The **National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)** – sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social policies for England. These policies articulate the Government's vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations.

The Planning Delivery Manager informed the Committee that on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2018 some changes had implemented to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with immediate effect. The report contained in this agenda had been written before the changes were implemented.

All reports had since been reviewed against the new NPPF and any relevant changes would be highlighted during the consideration of those applications.

### **18/117/PlanApologies**

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

**18/118/PlanDeclarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**18/119/PlanMinutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting would be agreed at the next meeting.

**18/120/Plan18/0560/FUL - 1 Redfern Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 1 x 3bed detached dwelling, with associated access and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing garage of No.1 Redfern.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The application contravenes regulation regarding sub division of plots.
- ii. Additional noise would disturb neighbours.
- iii. Neighbours open space amenity would be damaged.
- iv. Impact of additional access on busy junction.
- v. Residents already have problems getting in and out of their own on-plot parking.
- vi. Plans offered limited cycle storage.
- vii. Area prone to flooding.
- viii. Strong feeling in the community against this application.

Ellie Davies (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Todd-Jones (Arbury Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee regarding the application and made the following points:

- i. Application does not reflect the key location or context of the area.
- ii. Corner plot needs special consideration.
- iii. Would impact on an already busy junction that was well used by cyclists and pedestrians.
- iv. Design out of keeping with the area.
- v. Does not satisfy planning policy 3.12 a. and b. requirements for applications to have a positive impact on the area.

- vi. Adverse impact of sub division of plots.
- vii. NPPF Annex 2 protects gardens from development.

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.

**18/121/Plan18/0509/FUL - 15A Vinery Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing commercial unit and the provision of 6 residential units along with access and associated landscaping and works.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from residents of Vinery Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Speaking on behalf of residents of Belgrave Road and Vinery Road.
- ii. There were a number of concerns such as, noise, privacy, security and parking.
- iii. Noise levels were currently low as the industrial building was rarely used.
- iv. Number 15 and 17 would be overlooked.
- v. Parking pressure would increase.
- vi. Would result in gross overdevelopment.
- vii. Change of use should not be approved.
- viii. Impact on a quiet neighbourhood.
- ix. Design out of keeping with others in the area.

Matt Hare (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee regarding the application as follows:

- i. Consultation with local residents had been poor.
- ii. Work had already started on site.
- iii. Boundary disputes had already begun.
- iv. A protected tree had been lost.
- v. Scale and massing of proposal was out of keeping with the area.

- vi. Density of development was too great.
- vii. Rents likely to be high and this would lead to over occupation.
- viii. High occupancy rates would result in a lot of noise.
- ix. Would result in considerable harm to local residents.
- x. Unsafe overdevelopment.
- xi. Proposal lacks windows.
- xii. Single staircase design would be unsafe if there was a fire.

The Committee had some concerns about the application as follows:

- i. The relationship between the proposed site and the currently unused industrial unit.
- ii. The lack of ventilation to the internal space of the proposed development.
- iii. Refuse arrangements.
- iv. Quality of the design for a development in a conservation area.
- v. Cramped living space caused by the desire to maximise the footprint of the proposed building.

The Committee were concerned that the visuals available to them made it difficult to make a decision on the application.

Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed and Councillor Hipkin seconded a motion to defer application until improved visuals and plans were available.

The motion was **lost by 4 votes to 3 and 2 abstentions**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 and 1 abstention)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1 and 1 abstention)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of: the overly cramped internal living spaces within the dwellings; the need to ensure windows to upper floor rooms in the front and rear elevations are high level or obscure glazed; the high degree of enclosure of external amenity spaces; the need to provide tall screens to the balconies/terraces on the front elevation; and the lack of natural ventilation to apartment 1 would constitute poor design that would fail to provide a satisfactory quality of living environment and standard of amenity for future occupiers.

Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of Policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)

2. Due to the scale, footprint and massing of the proposed building, the development would fail to have a positive and enhanced impact on the character and appearance of the locality within the Conservation Area, and therefore is contrary to Policies 3/4, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

### **18/122/Plan18/0778/S73 - 77 Shelford Road**

The Committee received a S73 application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission 16/1371/FUL.

The application sought approval to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission 16/1371/FUL (proposed demolition of existing dwelling and workshops and erection of 9 dwellings) to include alterations to the footprints of Plots 4-9 and the garage of Plot 1, alterations to the site levels of Plots 4-9, amendments to the arrangement of windows, roof lights and garage openings, changes to the materials, and alterations to the parking layout and landscaping scheme.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Loss of privacy.
- ii. Overlooking as building would be close to boundary.
- iii. Please condition to require screening by evergreen trees.
- iv. Rear window had increased in size in this application and this was unacceptable.
- v. Roof lights would result in light pollution.
- vi. Flood risks would be increased.
- vii. Neighbours would be overlooked.

The Senior Planner added clarity to the drawings as members had suggested they were inaccurate.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 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.

**18/123/Plan17/2050/FUL - 64 Coleridge Road and Land r/o 62 and 60 Coleridge Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 2no. houses to the rear of site. First floor side and rear extension to main house. Conversion of house to 1no. 3-bed and 1no. 1-bed flat.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from residents of Coleridge Road

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The site comprises of a large garden area with very narrow access via a passage way.
- ii. Properties would have no vehicle access.
- iii. Would be an unacceptable overdevelopment.
- iv. Would dominate neighbours.
- v. Would overshadow neighbours.
- vi. Bin storage and collection arrangements were unacceptable and would clutter street scape.
- vii. Contravenes 3.10 of the Local Plan.
- viii. Would result in significant loss of amenity and would have an adverse impact on neighbours.
- ix. Building line too close to existing properties.

Emily Ceraudo (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Moore (Coleridge Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and raised the following points:

- i. Family housing would be overlooked.
- ii. No vehicle access would compromise safety in an emergency.
- iii. Properties could contain as many as twelve residents and the associated noise would be problematic.
- iv. Impact on already limited parking in the area.
- v. Obscure glazing to bedrooms would be unpleasant for occupants.
- vi. Light loss to residents of number 62.

- vii. Impact on the amenity of neighbours unacceptable.
- viii. Out of keeping with the area.
- ix. Concerned that officers appear to be unusually motivated to approve this application.

The Principal Planner strongly refuted the suggestion that officers had any unusual motivation to seek approval of the application.

Councillor Hipkin stated that he felt the many references in the report to the amendments of the scheme put Members under pressure to approve the application.

The Principal Planner confirmed that this detail was included to demonstrate the journey of the application and the thought processes of the case officer.

Councillor Thornburrow stated that there was no access to this site and it was not possible to properly consider this application due to inaccuracies in the drawings.

Councillor Smart proposed a motion to defer the application until any inaccuracy of the plans could be corrected. Councillor Thornburrow seconded the motion.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 8 votes to 1) to defer the application.**

#### **18/124/Plan18/0618/FUL - Land adj to 22 Mill End Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the proposed development of a pair of semi-detached dwellings: 1no. one bed and 1no. two bed, with associated landscaping, parking, bin and cycle storage.

The design and access statement was circulated.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Contravenes policy 3.10 of the Local Plan as it would have an impact on the amenity of neighbours.
- ii. Would be overbearing for neighbours.
- iii. Scale and mass out of keeping with the area.
- iv. Would cause overshadowing.
- v. Loss of evening light to garden.
- vi. Not opposed to any development. A single dwelling would be more appropriate.

Sam Hicks (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Ashton (Cherry Hinton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

- i. Matters covered by policy 3.10 were subjective and matters of opinion.
- ii. A site visit would be helpful.
- iii. Would result in significant loss of light to neighbours gardens.
- iv. Would result in significant adverse impact and feeling of enclosure.
- v. Would be overbearing and overdevelopment.
- vi. A single dwelling would be more appropriate for the site.

#### 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.

#### **18/125/Plan18/0221/FUL - 48 Chesterton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Change of use from A1 (Shop) to A3/A5 (Restaurant/hot food takeaway) and installation of an extraction fan exhaust unit to rear elevation following demolition of existing rear lean-to.

The Committee noted that the revised NPPF was pertinent to this application.

The Committee expressed a desire to see the clock on the front of the building retained as a link to the history of the area. An informative would be added to this affect.



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 including the informative above.

Informative to be added to the decision notice to seek to require the retention of the existing clock on the frontage of the building.

The meeting ended at 4.15 pm

**CHAIR**