

**PLANNING**

3 April 2019  
12.30 - 5.25 pm

**Present:**

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

**Officers:**

Interim Planning Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson  
Urban Extensions Project Manager: Julian Sykes  
Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby  
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
Principal Planner: Patricia Coyle  
Senior Planner: Lorna Gilbert  
Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson  
Senior Planning Policy Officer: Nancy Kimberley  
Senior Technical Officer: Adam Finch  
Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

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

**19/44/Plan Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**19/45/Plan Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillors Green and Thornburrow	18/1353/FUL	Personal: Application made by Cambridge Investment Partnership. Councillors Green and Thornburrow wanted to

		make this clear as councillors sitting on the committee.  (Established in January 2017, CIP is a joint venture between Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnerships.)
--	--	--

### **19/46/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019 were currently with officers for comment.

### **19/47/Plan 17/1748/FUL - 45 Cavendish Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey 2 bedroom dwelling house to the rear of 45 Cavendish Avenue.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The Objector was speaking on behalf of various residents. There were many objections from residents in the area.
- ii. The application would have an adverse effect on the character of the area.
  - a. Concern about design, scale and massing.
  - b. Other properties in the area had extensions, but no subdivision of land. This would be the first in the area.
- iii. Concern over loss of green corridor.
  - a. High risk of flooding in the area.
  - b. Mitigation measures were not sustainable. Referred to comments by the Drainage Officer. There was insufficient space available to provide compensatory flood storage. A pumped drainage system was not a sustainable form of drainage and would increase residual flood risk.

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

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Expressed concern about the application.
- ii. The new Local Plan was recently adopted. The Planning Committee should be confident in applying its policies.
- iii. The application was an overdevelopment of the site when compared to existing properties in the area.
- iv. It was a nice design in an inappropriate location as it was out of character with the area.
- v. Two bedrooms were listed in the application but the design could accommodate three. The house was designed for the needs of the current proposed occupant, but occupants and their needs may change in future. The design should clearly label the number of occupants, not just the number of bedrooms. The 'snug' had the potential to be another bedroom.
- vi. Queried if appropriate amenity space was provided. The garden could be overlooked by neighbours so there was no private amenity space.
- vii. Policy 6.40 (subdivision of land) was a material consideration for this application.
- viii. There were no other back garden developments in Cavendish Avenue. The application would have a negative impact on the green corridor and 'green lung' function of the area.

#### The Committee:

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

Councillors McQueen and Page-Croft left due to personal commitments after the vote to reject the Officer's recommendation.

**Unanimously resolved (by 7 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The north side of Cavendish Avenue is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached houses with established large rear gardens. The proposed dwelling would occupy a sizeable footprint within the rear garden of 45 Cavendish Avenue, and both the existing and proposed properties would have relatively small and constrained garden areas compared to surrounding houses in Cavendish Avenue. The proposed

development, by virtue of the design, scale and footprint of the dwelling, therefore fails to respond positively to its context and detracts from the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies 52, 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

- ii. By virtue of the location of the dwelling relative to surrounding properties, the amenity spaces to the front and rear of the dwelling would be poorly lit and overlooked by houses in Cavendish Avenue and Magnolia Close respectively. The development therefore fails to provide an acceptable quality living environment and standard of amenity and privacy for future occupiers, contrary to Policies 50, 52, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

**Resolved (3 votes to 3 with 1 abstention – and on the Chair’s casting vote)** to discount the following reason for refusal: Drainage (reference Policies 31 and 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and NPPF paragraph 163).

### **19/48/Plan 17/0705/FUL - The Bell Educational Trust Ltd, Red Cross Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for installation of a replacement Multi Use Games Area (MUGA).

The Principal Planner corrected two errors in the Officer’s report:

- i. A Landscape Strategy compliance condition needed to be included.
- ii. A majority of the boundary fence was 4m high (not 3m).

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There were no other MUGAs close to developments ie flats/houses where people lived.
- ii. It was too close to residents and the public highway. This led to safety concerns. Sport England guidance said the MUGA should be located further away.
- iii. Implementing the MUGA would lead to a loss of light and view for residents.
- iv. The streetscene would be destroyed as trees were replaced with a very high fence.
- v. Noise from football games would impact on neighbouring properties.

- vi. Suggested there were errors and estimates in the noise report. The apartment block was incorrectly identified within the original documentation as 2 storey rather than 3 storey properties.

Ms Sutton (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Thanked the Bell School for engaging with councillors and officers.
- ii. The MUGA was large. Referred to P7 & 8 of the drawing pack. Queried if the diagram showed how close the MUGA would be to local flats. The site context had changed since the tennis courts (MUGA site) were put in.
- iii. Suggested the flats would not have been built if it were clear they would have less amenity space (due to the MUGA).
- iv. S106 funding criteria required sports amenity space to be available to the Bell school and residents. The current segmented games area was acceptable. Queried why the segments needed to be combined into one large MUGA. This could cause more noise than the segmented games areas.

Councillor Pippas (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The Bell School sold its football pitch and flats were then subsequently built. The flats would now be 4m away from the proposed wooden fence around the MUGA.
- ii. People bought the flats expecting one thing and could get another.
- iii. Suggested the MUGA was being developed to allow more flats to be put on the (former) football pitch land. Queried why other alternatives such as planting flowers could not be implemented.
- iv. The MUGA would create noise for flat occupiers.
- v. Residents were concerned that balls flying over the fence surrounding the MUGA would go into peoples' dwellings or onto the public highway.

Councillor Baigent left the committee as he felt unwell.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 6 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, with an additional condition requiring compliance with the landscape plan and accompanying management strategy.

### **19/49/Plan 18/0907/FUL - 50 St Stephens Place and 51 Canterbury Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of an office building and the erection of a development of nine flats.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a St Stephen's Place resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to speaking notes and attached diagram that were tabled at committee.
- ii. The scale and massing of the development constituted an over-development of site.
- iii. Requested the proposal be deferred until a daylight / sunlight study could be undertaken.
- iv. The application did not answer objections from the last iteration, which had been refused. There were unresolved concerns about car parking, access and the party wall.
- v. The application would affect the character of the area.

The Committee noted points in the written statement from Castle Ward Councillors Holt and Payne. The statement was tabled at committee. It referred to:

1. Significant reduction of light to St Stephen's Place and 51 Canterbury Street.
2. The proposed development would be out of character with the surrounding area.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 6 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.

**19/50/Plan 19/0051/PIP - Cambridge and Huntingdon Health Authority, 18 Vinery Road**

The Committee received an application for planning permission in principle.

The application sought approval for a residential development of 9 dwellings.

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

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 6 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.

**19/51/Plan 18/1945/FUL - Unit 2, 61 Ditton Walk**

The Committee received an application for change of use from B1 to flexible B1/D1 use.

The Senior Planner corrected a typographical error in her report:

**REFUSE** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed flexible B1/D1 use does not guarantee the return of the B1(c) floorspace at the end of the 10 year period for the flexible permission. As a result the proposal has the potential to result in the loss of the B1(c) floor space contrary to policy 41 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

Ms Joslyn (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (3 votes to 3 – and on the Chair's casting vote)** to refuse the application for change of use in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report (amended above), and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**19/52/Plan 18/1353/FUL - Kingsway Clinic, Carlton Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the conversion of former NHS Clinic into 4no. flats.

Councillor Green proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to improve the boundary wall visual impact through a landscape condition. The Senior Planner suggested amending the boundary condition to include planting.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 6 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 and additional boundary treatment condition.

7. Prior to the occupation of the units, details of a boundary treatment for the flat adjacent to Carlton Way shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment should provide some defensible space for this occupier. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59).

**19/53/Plan 18/0217/FUL - 82 Regent Street**

The Committee received an application for change of use from Class A2 to Nail Treatment/Beauty Treatment Salon, sui generis.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to grant the application for change of use in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out

in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **19/54/Plan 18/1974/S73 - The Jenny Wren, 80 Campkin Road**

The Committee received an application for Section 73 application.

The application sought approval for to vary condition 2 of permission 17/0927/FUL (New building comprising of a Public House at ground floor with nine residential units on the upper floors(two 1xbed units & seven studio units) along with car and cycle parking and associated landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings) as follows:- 1) omission of the basement; relocation of bin and bike store to external structure and relocation of cellar from basement to former bin/bike store and2) increase in building height by 300mm.

Councillor Price (King's Hedges Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The application was considered/approved under the previous Local Plan.
- ii. If the application came before committee now it would not meet Local Plan standards.
- iii. There was no reference to Policy 76 in the Officer's report, specifically 'cellerage'. Requested Policy 76 be applied to protect the pub.
- iv. Residents were concerned that the pub was incrementally being changed into housing. They were concerned over the loss of pubs in the city.
- v. Requested the application be deferred.
- vi. If the application were approved, a condition would be needed to require the pub to be open before residences were occupied.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 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.

### **19/55/Plan Odour Study**

#### Matter for discussion

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned consultants Odournet to undertake an Odour Impact Assessment, in order to assess the level and risk of odour impact posed by Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (CWRC) to both inform the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and aid consideration of development proposals. That assessment had been completed.

To accompany the study, a technical note had been prepared jointly with Environmental Health to set out how officers intend to interpret the results of the Odournet Assessment.

Members of the three Committees (Joint Development Control Committee – Cambridge Fringes, Cambridge City Planning Committee and South Cambridgeshire DC Planning Committee) were asked to note both reports.

### Discussions

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer and the Urban Extensions Project Manager.

Councillor Blencowe said the report had been presented to the Joint Development Control Committee. If land owners wanted to develop their sites before the Area Action Plan was approved, or the Water Recycling Centre moved, the Officer's report set out assessment criteria for applications to be measured against.

The Urban Extensions Project Manager said an agent representing (affected) land owners had submitted a letter objecting to the report on the morning of committee. Officers would respond to this.

### The Committee:

The Committee **unanimously** resolved to note the findings of the 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (2018) (appendix A), and the Technical Note on interpretation of 'Odour Impact Assessment for Cambridge Water Recycling Centre' (October 2018) (Appendix B), for the purposes of considering planning applications in the vicinity.

The meeting ended at 5.25 pm

**CHAIR**