

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM**

8 March 2018  
10.00 - 11.00 am

**Present**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Blencowe, Holt and Smart

**Officers:**

Principal Planner Nigel Blazeby  
Senior Planner: Michael Hammond  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

**For Applicant:**

Nick Green (Architect)  
Anthony Dean (Agent for Charity Owner)

**For Petitioners:**

1 Petitioner

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**18/8/DCF Introduction by Chair to the Forum**

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. He stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

**18/9/DCF Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Hipkin.

**18/10/DCF Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr Holt	18/10/DCF	Has known the Petitioner for a long time.

**18/11/DCF 17/2157/FUL - 54-58 Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 1EW**

**Application No:** 17/2157/FUL

**Site Address:** 54-58 Chesterton Road Cambridge CB4 1EW

**Description:** 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

**Applicant:** M Rickard Cats & Animal Charity

**Agent:** Saunders Boston Architects

**Address:** 119 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8HA

**Lead Petitioner:** Resident of Trafalgar Road

**Case Officer:** Michael Hammond

**Text of Petition:**

**The grounds for asking for a Forum on this application are as follows:**

1. That the scale and massing of the proposed new building is disproportionate to the two storey residential Victorian neighbourhood, especially within the De Freville Conservation Area.
2. It will dominate its immediate neighbours.
3. That the development will have a negative impact on transport, both pedestrian and vehicular in the road, increasing the likelihood of pedestrian accidents.
4. Residents are already fearful of using the road as cars regularly drive down the pavement.

**Do you think there are changes that could be made to overcome your concerns?**

Yes

1. It is recognised that the site might benefit from development not least to remove the existing higgledy-piggledy building and turn it into something more in keeping with the Conservation Area and to provide additional family-orientated accommodation.
2. That the plan should keep the new building within the existing footprint of the bank building, allowing the car park to be either left as a car park or developed as an amenity.
3. That the roof line of the new building should not extend beyond the existing roof line of the bank.

**Case by Applicant**

Mr Green made the following points:

- 1) The site was on Chesterton Road and was the former HSBC bank.

- 2) The site had been in the ownership of the Owner since the 1950s and understood it had been a bank since that time.
- 3) The application had taken a long time, the applicants had used the pre-application process and a lot of consultation had been undertaken with Planning Officers, the public, the Police, Highways and Archaeologists.
- 4) The scheme proposed the demolition of the existing building and a new building in its place. The basement would be retained, there would be retail on the ground floor and 1 bed and 2 bed flats upstairs in accordance with the emerging local plan.
- 5) No private space would be provided but the development was in a location with amenity space close by ie: Midsummer Common.
- 6) The context of the area was that there were large buildings at the front.
- 7) The principles of development needed to address the significant corner and provide frontages from Chesterton Road. The building diminished in scale to the rear but provided active frontages onto Trafalgar Road with retail units at the front.
- 8) Consultations had been undertaken with highways who had said the development was acceptable. The Planning Policy Team had said that the development was acceptable subject to minor revisions on the application.
- 9) Further work had been undertaken in relation to 2 and 2a Trafalgar Road. Daylight and sunlight assessments had been carried out and it was considered that the BRE guidance was met.
- 10) A further shadow assessment had been carried out which showed a slight increase in shadow at the equinox and summer solstice but considered this was not a significant impact.
- 11) Proposed a revision to overcome the overlooking issue by the provision of a Juliet balcony and the removal of a window for flat 4.
- 12) This was a contextually appropriate scheme generally supported by consultees. Further works had been undertaken including sunlight and daylight assessments.

### **Case by the Petitioner**

The Petitioner spoke on behalf of residents and made the following points:

- 13) Had concerns regarding traffic cutting through from Chesterton Road to Trafalgar Road to Victoria Road.

- 14) A traffic review said that there was no significant impact on highways but he did not understand this.
- 15) Two shops were proposed as part of the development which would further impact on the demand in the area and he was not persuaded that deliveries for shops would use the lay by.
- 16) Expressed concerns with bins and the fact that these can get left in the middle of the road.
- 17) He recorded the street for a week between 5-8pm and this highlighted the number of times people parked vehicles on the pavement and on both sides of the street which forced pedestrians to walk in the middle of the road. Local feeling was that this issue was getting worse.
- 18) The overlooking issue would be resolved if the window from flat 4 was removed.
- 19) Had concerns about shadowing and expressed concerns about how accurate the diagrams were.
- 20) Had concerns about property 52 Chesterton Road and did not think that a sunlight assessment had been carried out. There was also an issue regarding overlooking from the west elevation and questioned the windows.
- 21) Height creep in the area was an issue.
- 22) Referred to the Nelson Court development which had received awards and looked good from the front but did not look so good from the back.

**Case Officer's Comments:**

- 23) The application was received on 22 December 2017, 45 people were consulted and a site notice was published on 19 January 2018.
- 24) Subsequent to this, 10 representations were received and objections were raised by Councillor Sargeant. Objections related to:
  - the character, design and appearance of the development,
  - the fact that the development was out of scale with the surrounding area,
  - the lack of green amenity space,
  - the overbearing impact on residential amenity,

- noise disturbance if the development was used for student accommodation,
  - concerns regarding access, fire access and bin collections from Trafalgar Road,
  - highway safety implications for pedestrians.
- 25) Policy consultations had been undertaken with statutory consultees.
- Highways raised no objections
  - Environmental Health raised no objections
  - Planning Policy had requested that the description of the development was revised and subject to this had no objections.
  - Urban Design was supportive subject to amendments of the application.
- 26) The Case Officer was waiting for amendments to be submitted by the Applicant. A daylight and sunlight assessment had been received and the case officer would be consulting with neighbours on this assessment and all other amendments.

### **Members' Questions and Comments:**

#### **Members raised the following questions:**

- 27) Expressed concerns about parking
- 28) Asked what the net loss of parking provision would be.
- 29) Asked if 1 retail unit had been considered as this would have less deliveries and less demand for parking.
- 30) Questioned the size of the units in the development.
- 31) Questioned where the deliveries for the retail units would park.
- 32) Expressed concerns regarding overlooking.
- 33) Questioned what amenity space the development provided.
- 34) Asked if the Petitioner was aware that the City Council had a maximum parking policy which included car free developments.
- 35) Questioned disabled access.
- 36) Questioned whether front box dormers were appropriate
- 37) Questioned where refuse for commercial units would be provided.

#### **The Applicant's Agent and the Owner answered as follows in response to Members questions:**

- 38) It was a car free development. As the development comprised 1 and 2 bed flats they did not anticipate that residents would have

- cars and bicycle parking provision was at the rear of the development.
- 39) There was a separate bicycle and bin service area for the retail units at the front.
  - 40) Currently there were 4 parking spaces and these would be lost under the proposed development.
  - 41) The retail element had been kept small to be attractive to a small business retailer.
  - 42) Wanted flexibility regarding the retail units these could be 1 or 2 units, the market would decide on the size of the unit but the current application was for 2 units..
  - 43) Confirmed that the size of the units within the development were in the spirit of the emerging local plans.
  - 44) Confirmed that the deliveries for the retail units should use the lay-by.
  - 45) Proposed to replace dormer windows with 3 pitched roof dormers but stated that Officers had not been provided with these proposals yet. The overlooking issue would be resolved with the removal of the window at flat 4.
  - 46) The 2 bed flats would have a terrace but the 1 bed flats would not have any individual amenity space as it was considered there was sufficient provision close by ie: at Midsummer Common and Jesus Green and this was in line with other applications in the City.
  - 47) Commented in relation to the overlooking issue that frosted glass could be an option to address this.

**The Petitioner answered as follows in response to Members questions:**

- 48) Had no problem with development but it needed to be in keeping with the area.
- 49) The development should stay within the existing footprint.
- 50) The development included 8 flats up, went up a level and extended to the rear this raised concerns.
- 51) The Nelson's Court was meant to be residential development but was part hotel this raised concerns regarding this development.
- 52) There was a succession of taxis between 7-8am and 4-6pm which raised concerns.

**Summing up by the Applicant's Agent**

- 53) Commented that comparisons had been made between the proposed development and Nelsons Court but this development was different as the Owner was not proposing to make student or

part hotel accommodation. This was a long term plan by the Owner which was evident by the larger size flats.

- 54) This was a car free development and the County Council had confirmed that parking permits would not be provided.
- 55) Could appreciate the existing concerns regarding parking but the proposed development would not impact on the area.
- 56) Bin storage was in compliance with policy.
- 57) Had worked with Officers to modify the scheme to respond to the concerns raised regarding the scale of the development.

### **Summing up by the Petitioners**

- 58) Commented that the remit of the development was to maximise return for the Owner.
- 59) Bins were collected 5 days a week and were left in the street. The earliest collection was at 5.18am in the morning and this was immediately outside his window.
- 60) Questioned if this was the right development for the area.

### **Final Comments of the Chair**

- 61) The Chair observed the following:
  - Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties.
  - Application to be considered at a future Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 11.00 am

**CHAIR**