

PLANNING

3 October 2018
10.00 am - 4.10 pm

Present:

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

Councillor Hipkin left after the vote on item 18/146/Plan

Officers:

Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson
Planner: Mary Collins
Principal Planner (City): Tony Collins
Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies
Legal Advisor: Richard Pitt
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/135/PlanApologies

There were no apologies.

18/136/PlanDeclarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

18/137/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the previous meeting would be brought to the next meeting for sign-off.

18/138/PlanNew Local Plan

The Senior Planner updated Planning Committee on progress on the Local Plan:

- i. The Planning and Transport Committee resolved 2 October 2018 to recommend to Council (18 October 2018) to adopt the new Local Plan.
- ii. The Council was in a period of transition between the 2006 and 2014 Local Plans. However, Councillors should now give significant weight to the new Local Plan.
- iii. The Council received the Planning Inspector's comments on 2014 Local Plan noon 29 August 2018, ie the same day as the last Planning Committee.
- iv. The Council reviewed 29 August committee decisions in light of the Planning Inspector's comments and found the vast majority were unaffected. However, decision letters were not sent out for two applications: 18/0806/FUL - 291 Hills Road and 18/0765/FUL - Garage Block, Markham Close, the latter of which has been returned to committee today.
- v. The Romsey Labour Club application (from earlier in 2018) will also return to committee for further consideration in future.

18/139/Plan18/0090/FUL - 63 New Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the erection of a building comprising of three 2 bed units, six 1 bed units and one studio flat. The proposal would provide one visitor/disabled parking space and 13 cycle parking spaces.

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

Councillors sought advice from the Legal Advisor on reasons that could be considered for refusal of the application if they were minded to do so. The Legal Advisor said that amenity was a low risk reason for refusal, parking was a higher risk one. He suggested not including it due to cost implications to the Council if Officers tried to contest a decision that was hard to defend. Several Committee Members were minded to support parking as a possible reason for refusal as the application would exacerbate existing parking pressure in the area. The Chair said that Highways Authority comments in the report reflected advice to consider for housing estates in rural areas. The comments had been made in January 2018, so were no longer relevant. They had to be included in the Officer's report as the comments had been made. The Highways Authority

were asked not to include generic comments more appropriate to rural developments in future consultation responses. The Chair said National Planning Policy Framework guidance on parking standards was a material consideration for Planning Committee Members.

Councillor Hipkin volunteered to give evidence at an appeal if parking was proposed as a reason for refusal.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 8 votes to 2) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

The Chair decided that the possible reasons for refusal should be voted on and recorded separately:

Resolved (unanimously) that Members were minded to refuse the application for the following reason:

There was no direct access to private external amenity space.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 3) that Members were minded to refuse the application for the following reason:

Lack of on-site parking for future occupiers.

Councillor Smart proposed, and Councillor Nethsingha seconded, implementing the major decision protocol. The Committee would give a minded to refuse decision which would be brought back for review at a future committee.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to implement the major decision protocol and were minded to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The proposal has no direct access to a private external amenity area for units 3,4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10. The application has therefore failed to demonstrate that 10 units can be accommodated on the site in a form that secures an acceptable level of amenity space for future occupants. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/12 and Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed

submission, July 2013 (submitted March 2014) as amended by the Inspectors' Main Modification policy 50.

- ii. The proposal has no car parking for future occupiers, apart from the disabled/visitor car parking space. This will increase parking pressures on nearby streets and therefore be detrimental to amenity of nearby residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 & 3/12 and Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed submission, July 2013 (submitted March 2014) as amended by the Inspectors' Main Modification policies 55 & 57.

The case officer will produce a follow up report concerning the potential reasons for refusal for the members' consideration at the next committee.

18/140/Plan18/1108/FUL - 560 Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a 1x Bed Bungalow along with car parking and associated landscaping.

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

Councillor Johnson (Abbey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Speaking on behalf of local residents who were unable to attend.
- ii. The current proposal was an improvement on the previous application but did not address all concerns.
- iii. Access for vehicles and pedestrians was still poor.
- iv. Would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy for neighbours.
- v. Would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours.
- vi. Appeared to contravene the Local Plan (3.4, 3.10 and 3.7).

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 2 and 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.

18/141/Plan18/0758/FUL - 57 Hartington Grove

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Conversion of existing first floor and ground floor HMO (7 occupants) into 5 self-contained bedsits, a two storey rear extension and a side dormer.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident who made the following comments:

- i. Speaking on behalf of herself and an owner occupier and neighbours who were unable to attend.
- ii. Application was overdevelopment.
- iii. Would have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity.
- iv. Lack outdoor space.
- v. Single person units could be occupied by 2 people.
- vi. Had limited cycle and bin storage.
- vii. Would be unpleasant for occupiers due to the amount of obscure glazing.
- viii. Scale and mass on build on the boundary line was unacceptable.
- ix. Would result in noise nuisance.

Ben Pridgon (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions and on the Chair's casting vote) 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.

18/142/Plan18/1050/FUL - 107 Hazelwood Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Part two storey, part single storey rear extension. Single storey front extension with alterations to convert existing garage to habitable space and incorporate into main dwelling.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident who made the following comments:

- i. Loss of sunlight to rear windows and patio area.
- ii. Would be overbearing.
- iii. Feared the property would become a HMO and make life unbearable for neighbours.
- iv. Parking issues would be exasperated.

Parvez Khan (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. A previous application had been refused due to size, scale, massing and the impact on neighbours.
- ii. Previous reasons still apply.
- iii. Scale of proposal out of keeping with the area.

Councillor requested that in in future report regarding application that had been to committee before in the past include the reasons for previous refusal.

The Committee discussed the application and suggested that the application was out of keeping with the character of the street. The size, massing and sense of dominance was considered inappropriate.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0 and 1 abstention) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

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

Due to the size and scale of the proposed first floor rear extension and its proximity to the side boundaries, it would negatively impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties 106 and 108 Hazelwood Close. The proposed first floor rear extension would dominate these properties and cause a sense of enclosure, particularly when viewed from the ground floor rear windows, which would be unacceptable. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed

Submission, July 2013 (submitted March 2014), as amended by the Inspectors' Main Modifications).

18/143/Plan18/0745/FUL - Cantabrigian RUFC

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the installation of four 15 metre tall floodlight masts each with no.3 2kw floodlights on top. The floodlights would be pointed down towards the pitch. The masts are proposed to be located in each corner of the pitch and provide 100lux over the pitch.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident who made the following comments:

- i. Speaking on behalf of a local resident group.
- ii. The amenities of local people were not being protected.
- iii. Residents of Sedley Taylor Avenue would be impacted by the proposed lighting.
- iv. Existing lighting was already problematic.
- v. Additional conditioning was required regarding the angle and shading of the lights.
- vi. Permitted hours should not exceed the current usage.

Nigel Faben, Treasurer of Cantabrigian RUFC addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Pippas (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee regarding the application and made the following comments:

- i. Local residents had concerns.
- ii. Light pollutions would impact a number of properties.
- iii. Concerns had been raised about the drainage of the sports field.
- iv. Environmental information was missing.
- v. Applications lacked considerations for neighbours.
- vi. Neighbour fear increased use and extended hours of lighting.
- vii. A travel plan was needed as access was problematic.

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.

18/144/Plan18/0765/FUL - Garage Block, Markham Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing garages and erection of 5 no. affordable apartments with associated car parking.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

Stephen Logstaf (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.

18/145/Plan18/1104/FUL - Gunhild Way Garages

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of garages and erection of 2no. affordable dwellings, widening of access and associated works.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

Stephen Longstaf (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee suggested that the site had offered the potential for greater density and a more imaginative design.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 9 votes to 1 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

18/146/Plan18/0768/FUL - 21-25 Fitzwilliam Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Fourth storey extension to create 1no 3bedroom flat, and 4no 1no bedroom flats and 1no 1bed mews style flat to incorporate bin and bike store.

The Committee noted the textual corrections contained in the amendment sheet and the late representations received.

Clive Barnes (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1 and 1 absetention) 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.

18/147/PlanTPO 21/2018 - 5A and 7 Herschel Road

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order 21/2018 that relates to 5A and 7 Herschel Road.

The Committee:

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

18/148/PlanTPO 10/2018 - 2 Southacre Drive

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order 10/2018 that relates to a 2 Southacre Drive.

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 4.10 pm

CHAIR