

## PLANNING

6 November 2019  
10.00 am - 4.30 pm

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Sargeant (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Baigent, Lord, Page-Croft, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

### Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown (for 19/0512/FUL only)  
 Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby  
 Transport Assessment Manager (Cambridgeshire County Council): David Allatt  
 Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
 Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy  
 Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson  
 Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan  
 Senior Planner: Andy White  
 Senior Planner: Alice Young  
 Senior Planning Policy Officer: Bruce Waller  
 Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
 Committee Manager: James Goddard  
 Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 19/69/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Smart (Councillor Thornburrow attended as the Alternate), Green and McQueen (neither for whom did an Alternate attend).

### 19/70/Plan Declarations of Interest

| Name                             | Item       | Interest   |
|----------------------------------|------------|--|
| Councillors Baigent and Sargeant | All        | Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.              |
| Councillor Sargeant              | All        | Personal: Member of Area Bus Users.                          |
| Councillor Page-Croft            | 19/84/Plan | Personal: Had visited the site but had not made any decision |

|                        |            |   |
|------------------------|------------|---|
|                        |            | concerning the application prior to its consideration at Committee. |
| Councillor Tunnacliffe | 19/85/Plan | Personal and prejudicial: Knew the Applicant.                       |

### **19/71/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 September and 2 October were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.**

### **19/72/Plan 19/0512/FUL - Grafton Centre, Fitzroy Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the redevelopment of the existing bus turning head and redundant service area to provide a new hotel and ancillary restaurant (Use Class C1), new public realm (urban park) and landscape improvements together with associated highway works to East Road providing new bus stops and pedestrian and cycle routes.

The Senior Planner updated her report:

- i. Referenced paragraph 8.19. The Environmental Health Officer had suggested that the developer could make a financial contribution towards additional electric vehicle charging points at the Grafton East Car Park to mitigate against any impacts to air quality resulting from the proposal. The Senior Planner considered that the charging points were not required so did not recommend seeking contributions.
- ii. Would seek delegated powers to deal with the detail of the recommended conditions relative to the triggers for conditions 5, 6, 19, 23 and 36.

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

- i. Expressed concern the building was unattractive, too big/bulky and too high.
- ii. There was no parking provided on-site. Visitors may park in nearby residential streets some of which had restrictions limiting parking to

residents only between 09:00-17:00, except for Stafford Street which was 09:00-20:00. The hotel signposted visitors to park in local public car parks, at £18/day. It was disappointing that the developer had not negotiated a discounted rate for hotel visitors to use the car park.

- iii. The tree lined boulevard mentioned in the Supplementary Planning Document was an aspiration. The application would not deliver the two lines of trees along East Road.
- iv. The proposed hotel would dominate neighbours.
- v. The application would cause pollution. Requested an air monitoring station be included in the development to monitor the impact of (hotel) traffic on air quality.
- vi. East Road would become single carriageway in future.

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

Councillor Robertson (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to outline four concerns about the application:

- i. Trees on East Road. The application would not deliver the two lines of trees along East Road as set out in the Supplementary Planning Document; the opportunity to secure them should not be missed.
- ii. Height of new building. Flats opposite the application site had two floors below ground level and would be visually dominated by the proposed hotel.
- iii. Insufficient bike racks for staff and visitors. It was unacceptable for hotel guests to store cycles in their rooms due to insufficient parking provision within the application.
- iv. Travel Plan for hotel.
  - a. Some neighbouring residential streets had restrictions limiting parking to residents only between 09:00-17:00. Other near-by streets had no restrictions. Hotel guests could take residents' spaces.
  - b. The Developer should have done a deal with the Council to provide discounted parking fees in local car parks. This was not something which could be controlled by a planning condition and the Committee should be aware of this prior to making its decision.

Councillor Bick (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. He expressed scepticism regarding the proposal.
- ii. Acknowledged the Applicant was willing to discuss issues with stakeholders.
- iii. Welcomed Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) future plans to narrow East Road to manage road space. This could impact on congestion and cycle safety as the East Road work was not being undertaken as part of a joined-up scheme.
- iv. GCP had not adopted a comprehensive Transport Strategy to tackle congestion.
- v. It would be hard for the Committee to reject the application based on the impact of a future GCP Transport Strategy.
- vi. The application would humanise the brutal streetscape in East Road. There were unattractive buildings and four lanes of traffic at present. The application could improve these in conjunction with the GCP Transport Strategy.
- vii. Sought clarification on three questions that could be answered as part of the Committee's discussion of this item:
  - a. Referred to paragraph 6.3 of the Officer's report and sought reassurance that further public realm improvements would be secured to the general area in future and this would not be limited to just the hotel application.
  - b. Sought reassurance that if an extra crossing was installed in front of the hotel it would not negatively impact on the Burleigh/Norfolk Street crossing by making pedestrians wait longer.
  - c. Sought reassurance that more than two bus stops would be provided if required in future.

The Transport Assessment Manager addressed the Committee to clarify the Highway Authority's position:

- i. Summarised the GCP/Highway Authority's response to transport concerns.
- ii. Gave reassurance that if an extra crossing was installed in front of the hotel it would not negatively impact on the Burleigh/Norfolk Street crossing.
- iii. Gave reassurance that as the area changed there would be scope to change the transport provision eg the number of bus stops.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer addressed the Committee to clarify the planning policy position regarding the provision of hotel rooms.

- i. The number of hotel rooms expected in and around Cambridge was 2,500. Approximately 1,000 had been built since the 2012 Visitor Accommodation Study was undertaken, a further 600 had planning

permission. The study is due to be refreshed as the situation had changed since 2012.

- ii. This planning application would bring strategic benefits to the area particularly as the number of visitors to the City was increasing.

### The Committee:

Considered using the Adjourned Decision Protocol (ADP). The Committee **resolved (by 5 votes to 0)** it was minded to refuse the application. Members specified design; scale; the drop off facilities for disabled guests; highway work impact on residents; the over provision of hotel rooms in Cambridge; and highway safety as indicative of minded to refuse reasons.

Members were invited to consider deferring today's determination of the application rather than to apply the ADP because of the nature of the minded to refuse reasons.

Councillor Page-Croft proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded a proposal to defer a decision on the application without invoking the ADP.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1)** to defer determination of the application to allow for further consideration/work to address the indicative minded to refuse reasons relating to:

- i. Design, scale and massing.
- ii. Drop off arrangements for disabled guests.
- iii. Impact of the highway works on residents to the south of the site on East Road.
- iv. Cumulative impact of overprovision of hotel rooms.
- v. Highway safety in respect of public realm improvements to East Road.
- vi. Lack of sufficient accessible cycle parking.

### **19/73/Plan 19/1034/FUL - 66-80B Colville Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing flats 66-80B Colville Road and the erection of 69 affordable dwellings, including 6 houses and 63 apartments, including resident and public car parking, landscaping and associated works

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to the Amendment Sheet and introducing two further - conditions 31 and 32 for inclusion consequent to advice from the Environmental Health Officer.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a new condition should require two electric vehicle charging points to be installed in the disabled bays and two at the front of the parking area (instead of rear).

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; [and]
- ii. the following additional conditions:
  - a. No development shall commence (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), until a written report, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details only.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

- b. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the demolition / construction period has been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36.

- c. Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:
1. Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
  2. Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
  3. Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
  4. Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
  5. Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

- d. Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, and prior to first occupation, an amended plan showing the location of electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) paragraphs, 110, 170 and 181, Policy 36

of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan (2018).

### **19/74/Plan 18/0090/FUL - 63 New Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a residential development containing 10 flats comprising 3, 2-bed units, 6, 1-bed units and 1 studio unit along with 1 car parking space and cycle parking following demolition of the existing buildings on 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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

### **19/75/Plan 18/1552/S73 - 8 Seymour Street**

The Committee received a s73 application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) and remove conditions 3 (Preliminary Contamination Assessment), 4 (Site Investigation Report & Remediation Strategy), 5 (Implementation of Remediation), 6 (Completion Report), 7 (Materials management Plan), and 21 (Contaminated land assessment and remediation strategy) of planning permission 18/0581/FUL

On the basis this application does not call for any s106 Agreement the Principal Planner updated his report by referring to the Amendment Sheet which amended his recommendation as follows:

**APPROVE** subject to ~~completion of the s106 Agreement and the~~ following conditions:

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Seymour Street:

- i. The original application included a cut out section of the building. This was removed since the Objector moved into the neighbouring property.
- ii. Expressed concern about loss of light and ventilation as a result of the current application which could impact on the Objector's health.



Mr Brand (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 1)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer's amended recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**19/76/Plan 19/0992/FUL - 2 Green End Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the conversion and minor external works to the existing 4 bed dwelling to create 4 1bed dwellings, including the insertion of 4 dormer windows and alterations to the window openings, cycle and bin store provision and associated works.

The Principal Planner referred to the amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The resident was disabled and required access to their property at all times.
- ii. The development was for 4 dwellings, which could accommodate 8 people and therefore 8 cars being parked at the development. The chance of the resident's driveway being blocked was high, which was a big concern for the resident.
- iii. Questioned what would be done to prevent the driveway being blocked.
- iv. The development could be used for Air B n B's, and therefore it was unlikely that there would be long term residents living in the development.
- v. The development encroached on the residential amenity of the resident.
- vi. The development was overdevelopment of the site.
- vii. The design of the development gave a sense of being 'squeezed' by the resident.

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's report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and to the amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet.

**19/77/Plan 18/1499/S73 - Jubilee House, 3 Hooper Street**

The Committee received a section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of permission 15/1194/FUL (change of use from office (B1a) to form 2 x 2 bed and 6 x 1 bed residential units (C3) along with a 3 storey rear extension, with roof terrace, and alterations) to allow alterations to the approved balcony balustrading.

The Senior Planning Officer referred to condition 7 contained in the Amendment Sheet and further updated condition 7 at the committee meeting:

7. Within three months of the granting of permission, the 1.7m Pilkington level 5 obscure glazed balcony screens, as shown on drawing no 106.305.C2, shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and the obscure glazed balcony screens shall be retained in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity. There shall be no further use of the balcony until the obscure glazed screens subject to this condition have been installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 58)

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer plus the amendment to condition 7 as verbally updated at the committee meeting.

**19/78/Plan 19/0859/FUL - 33 Porson Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a new 2 storey dwelling, incorporating rear roof terraces, following the demolition of the existing property.

The Senior Planner referred to the need for an additional condition to prevent the flat roof element of the development from being used as an amenity space.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from two local residents.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The development would overlook adjoining properties.
- ii. The scale of the development was disproportionate to its surroundings.
- iii. There had been 14 objections to the application.
- iv. This property was the biggest house on the road and the application proposed to increase the roof height by 10%.
- v. There would be a loss of residential amenity as the increase in the size of the property to the west elevation would mean that the occupants of the development would then be able to look directly into one of the resident's bedrooms.
- vi. The property would extend further than the last extension.
- vii. Expressed concerns regarding the visual impact of the chimney but noted that the Architect had indicated a revised plan would be submitted.

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

#### 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's report, subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including an additional condition to prevent use of flat-roofed elements of the development from being used as amenity space.

#### **19/79/Plan 19/0896/OUT - Achray Gazeley Road**

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 2 dwellings with a revised car parking layout for the existing dwelling.

The Senior Planner referred to amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Asked that planning approval be limited to a single storey dwelling.
- ii. A two-storey development would threaten the privacy of Fairfield in Gazeley Road, 8 Clay Farm houses and properties in Wingate Way.
- iii. Existing hedges, trees and fences provided inadequate protection against the loss of privacy.
- iv. There was precedent for single storey developments on Gazeley Road.
- v. Archay provided a boundary between low density housing in Gazeley Road and higher density on Clay Farm, this demarcation should be retained to maintain the character of the area.
- vi. A bungalow on the site would meet housing need in Cambridge for a high quality, single storey, large property.
- vii. Access to the site was difficult because Gazeley Road was a private single lane with a narrow entrance / exit on to Trumpington Road.
- viii. High density housing would exacerbate drainage problems to the rear of properties on Clay Farm Drive.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 1)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the additional condition and the revised text to the condition contained in the Amendment Sheet.

**19/80/Plan 19/1048/FUL - Land to the North of Christ the Redeemer Church, Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use of land for the siting of 5 temporary homes to provide accommodation for homeless people together with 1 temporary home for a warden/key worker.

The Senior Planner updated the Committee on the requirement for additional conditions relating to occupation of the dwellings.

Martin Clarke (Applicant) 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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the following additional conditions.

Condition 10

No person shall occupy any of the 5 homeless accommodation units hereby permitted unless such person shall have first been approved in writing by Cambridge City Council as an individual meeting the qualifying homeless resident status in accordance with the Cambridge City Council's Housing First Tenant Selection Criteria, as defined within the Housing First for Cambridge Proposals for Expansion and Development dated January 2019 as amended.

Reason: To meet the need for accommodation for homeless people within Cambridge in accordance with Policy 47 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Condition 11

The warden unit shall only be occupied by a warden/keyworker offering out of hours support to the residents of the temporary homes hereby approved.

Reason: To meet the need for accommodation for homeless people within Cambridge in accordance with Policy 47 of the Cambridge Local Plan.

**19/81/Plan 18/1805/FUL - Land to the rear of 89-91 DeFreville Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey 2 bed dwelling.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The Officer's report contained errors and omissions and failed to interpret objections correctly.
- ii. The previously approved application had lapsed and should not be used as an authority to approve the current application.
- iii. The Committee had approved a new Boathouse which was located in front of his house and towered above it.
- iv. The Planning Officer had not visited his property and had little knowledge of how the development would enclose and dominate his property on the eastern side.

Mr Langley (Applicant) 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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

### **19/82/Plan 18/1397/FUL - 38 Ramsden Square**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for: the erection of an attached building containing 2 dwellings, single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory and rear box dormer with Juliet balcony to the main dwelling and the retrospective subdivision of the main dwelling into 2 flats.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 0)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report.

**19/83/Plan 19/0329/FUL - Land rear of 386 Milton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the retention of the existing outbuilding for garaging of motor vehicles and cycle storage together with the construction of 1 detached bungalow.

The Senior Planner confirmed that an informative could be added to the permission relating to fire engine access to respond to the Committee's concerns.

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including an informative regarding fire appliance arrangements.

**19/84/Plan 19/0484/FUL - 3 Luard Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing 3 bed dwelling and the replacement of a new 4 bed dwelling, including a new bike shed and bin store.

The Principal Planner referred to amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet and also recommended an amendment to condition 15 adding a trigger point.

Mr Pomeroy (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to Members' concerns the Principal Planner confirmed condition 12 could be amended to include the provision of bin storage facilities.

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the following amendments to conditions 12 and 15.

Condition 12

Full details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles and of bin storage shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bicycles and bins. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 57 and 82)

Condition 15

Prior to the bringing into use of the access points, hereby permitted, two pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided each side of both the vehicular accesses to the proposed development. The splays are to be measured from and along the highway boundary. Such splays shall be within the red line of the site and shall thereafter be maintained free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81).

**19/85/Plan 18/2009/FUL - 1 Pikes Walk**

Councillor Tunnacliffe having declared a personal and prejudicial interest at the beginning of this meeting left the room for the determination of this item taking no part in it.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear extension to provide an additional dwelling, a second-floor rear extension to the existing flat and an additional window to the ground floor side elevation.

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



The representation covered the following issues:

- i. 98 Kings Street had been extended in 1992 with a 2-storey extension, part of which was a former art gallery. The extension took up a considerable amount of the garden space resulting with the balcony at 98 Kings Street becoming its main amenity space.
- ii. The main concern was the loss of light to 98 Kings Street as a result of the development.
- iii. The proposed second floor extension would create a sense of enclosure at 98 Kings Street.
- iv. The balcony at 98 Kings Street was a substantial garden / outdoor space and had been described as a hidden treasure, if the development was built this would be lost forever.

Councillor Bick (Market Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Looked to the Committee to safeguard the resident's amenity.
- ii. Expressed concerns about the second-floor extension which added an extra bedroom.
- iii. He disagreed with the statement in paragraph 8.13 of the officer's report which stated that the extension would not add to the enclosure of 98 King's Street. His view was that the resident at 98 King's Street was already living in an enclosed position and any further enclosure was serious. This issue also added importance to the roof terrace.
- iv. The addition of an extra storey would make a significant difference in the context of enclosure which already existed at 98 King's Street.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 2 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**19/86/Plan 19/0720/FUL - Unit 2 Cambridge Railway Station, Station Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use to A4 (Drinking establishment), the use of external space for outdoor seating and the installation of lighting and signage to the front and side elevation.

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

The meeting ended at 4.30 pm

**CHAIR**