

## PLANNING

17 December 2019  
10.00 am - 6.30 pm

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Sargeant (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord and Thornburrow

### Officers:

Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly – Park Street item only

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Senior Planner: Andy White

Planner: Mary Collins

Planner: Nick MacDermott

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 19/87/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Page-Croft. Also Councillor McQueen, Councillor Thornburrow attended as her Alternate.

### 19/88/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Sargeant	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Member of Cambridge Bus Users.
Councillor Smart	19/90/Plan	Personal: Knows Neil Curry,

		local hairdresser.
--	--	--------------------

## 19/89/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 19/90/Plan 19/1159/FUL - Park Street Car Park

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing multi-storey car park and erection of an aparthotel (Use Class C1) alongside an underground public car park, public cycle store and associated works

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet and revising the recommendation:

- i. Amend condition 19 (deliveries/servicing).
- ii. New conditions as requested by the Local Lead Flood Authority.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Objector's Agent on behalf of The Maypole Public House and 8 Portugal Place.
- Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
- Resident of Park Parade.
- Local resident.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Any car parking provision, except blue badge, should be minimised.
- ii. The aisle width in some bike storage areas was too small for different types of bikes. Requested a planning condition requiring appropriate parking provision for cargo bikes.
- iii. Referred to section 7.2 of the Officer's report and stated the reported number of representations in support/objection was inaccurate. 109 objections appeared not to be referenced.
- iv. Requested the Committee defer considering the application until all representations could be considered and a balanced response presented. Suggested a sound planning decision could not be made if all representations had not been fully considered.

- v. Expressed specific concerns regarding:
  - a. Provision of car parking.
    - i. Queried if the car park provided the appropriate amount of spaces.
    - ii. Queried if apart-hotel occupants would park in residential areas.
  - b. Gas usage from the Energy Station.
  - c. Public toilet provision.
  - d. Ground water.
  - e. Vibration and noise.
  - f. Impact on local businesses during construction period.
- vi. Requested plans for the hotel be scaled down.

Andrew Heselton (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer (Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Wished to echoed comments made by the Objectors in today's committee.
- ii. Suggested the Council would breach its own Local Plan Policy if the application were approved due to the loss of public toilets:
  - a. There was no proven lack of need to justify removal.
  - b. There were no nearby alternative facilities.
- iii. Disabled facilities were a key feature for the town centre. Expressed concern at the loss of the accessible toilet in Park street.
- iv. Noted the Officer stated in his verbal introduction to Committee that the planning application caused a conflict in policy.
- v. Queried if some car parking spaces could be taken out and replaced with toilet facilities.

The Director of Planning and Economic Development said:

- i. The adopted Local Plan sought to protect community space. The planning application did not breach Local Plan priorities, the Council was following its development plan. Members had to balance competing priorities when making their decision. The loss of the public toilets had to be balanced against the benefits from the application.

- ii. Referred to section 7.2 of the Officer's report and stated the reported number of representations in support/objection was incorrect and should read as follows:

143 letters of representation have been received as a result of this process – ~~116~~ **27** in support, and ~~27~~ **116** objecting.

- iii. Although the Officer's report contained a typographical error where the numbers of representations in support and objection had been switched, the report accurately summarised material issues from the representations.
- iv. Gave a verbal summary of representations to Members of the Planning Committee so they could be confident they were aware of all issues from the report and Planning Portal on the City Council website. The Director referred to issues from the report and Planning Portal during the deliberation in committee.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. To amend triggers (conditions 27 and 28) regarding bird and bee hotel.
- ii. Amend condition 13 (landscaping) to require tree replacements for 20 years rather than 5

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Baigent proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. Public access to the café and courtyard be protected through condition.
- ii. Cycle parking provision.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

#### 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, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; [and]
- ii. delegated authority for Officers to make the following amendments/additions:

- a. Amend condition 13 (landscaping) to require tree replacements for 20 years rather than 5;
- b. Amend condition 19 (deliveries/servicing) to provide an exception for food deliveries to individual rooms;
- c. Change the triggers for conditions 27 and 28 (ecology) from prior to occupation to pre-above ground works;
- d. New condition to secure public accessibility to New Jordan's Yard;
- e. New conditions as requested by the Local Lead Flood Authority;
- f. New condition(s) regarding archaeology in liaison with the County Council.
- g. New condition seeking a revised cycle store layout.

### **19/91/Plan 19/0718/REM - 295-301 Histon Road**

The Committee received an application for reserved matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) for the erection of 27 residential units including affordable dwellings following demolition of existing buildings together with associated infrastructure pursuant to application 15/0519/OUT.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet and revising the recommendation to remove condition 8.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from 3 local residents:

- i. Did not object to the development in principle, but queried why plots 9 and 18 had to be wedged up against the boundary. This was bad planning.
- ii. Took issue with the Applicant's description of the proposed buildings.
- iii. The development would impact on neighbouring properties.
- iv. Requested the application be deferred to allow the Developer time to consider Objector's comments and possibly amend the application.
- v. Flats opposite Tavistock Road were too high at 3-5 storeys and would impact on (existing) neighbouring properties. They would:
  - a. Be inappropriate for the character of the area.
  - b. Impact on neighbours' amenity space.
  - c. Cause overlooking and loss of privacy.
- vi. Queried if the building orientation could be altered by 180 degrees if the height could not. The building could then overlook trees and open spaces instead of peoples' living spaces.

vii. Mature trees in the area attracted many species of birds and wildlife.

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

Councillor Sheil (Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Was speaking on behalf of residents from 305, 309, and 311 Histon Road.
  - a. They understood the need for housing in the area.
  - b. Broadly supported the scheme, but had some concerns.
- ii. Plot 9 and 18 needed to be carefully considered at the outline planning stage in 2015/16.
- iii. The buildings and garages on Plots 9 and 18 were “jammed up against the boundary”. Queried why the property on Plot 9 was positioned where it was and if it could be moved away from the boundary. Suggested moving Plot 18 garage away from boundary to increase the internal space for new residents.
- iv. Queried if building heights were appropriate for Plots 9 and 18. Suggested the building on Plot 18 should be a bungalow, not a multi-storey building, as it was a windfall site.

The Committee Manager read out a written statement submitted by Councillor Payne (Ward Councillor – City Council):

- i. As a City Councillor for Castle ward which includes the McManus Estate, she was supportive of the principle of design for 259-301 Histon Road and its inclusion of 40% affordable housing.
- ii. Stated her appreciation to the Guy Turvill for his efforts to work with residents to minimise the damage and vandalism occurring on site.
- iii. Wished to request that further consideration be given to two aspects of the proposed.
  - a. Height and proximity to Tavistock Road. The suggestion of three storey apartments would mean these houses become significantly overlooked, greatly reducing the quality of life of existing residents. Three storey blocks are also out of keeping with the surrounding properties on the McManus Estate.
  - b. Preservation of trees forming the boundary between application site and Tavistock Road. The row of conifer trees between the application site and the houses on Tavistock Road form a boundary, offering noise protection and privacy to residents. They were also a haven for wildlife. These trees were already damaged by vehicles entering and leaving the development. While the

application regards these trees to be of limited quality, their preservation was important for the privacy of existing residents. Requested this tree boundary be maintained and improved before the new development was occupied. Queried who would be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the conifer trees.

Councillor Green proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to include informatives:

- i. Signage to prevent poor parking.
- ii. Boundary treatment in the landscape condition.

This amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a balcony screen condition.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative regarding hedgehogs.

This amendment was **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 removal of Condition 8; [and]
- iii. the following additional condition:
  - a. a balcony screen condition;[and]
- iv. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. Signage prevent poor parking.
  - b. Boundary treatment in the landscape condition.
  - c. an informative regarding hedgehogs.

#### **19/92/Plan 19/0560/FUL - Land rear of 5-17 New Square**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing garages, relocation of existing sub-station within the site, and redevelopment to provide 8no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted the following:

- i. Highways safety concerns had been addressed.
- ii. Paragraph 8.16 of the officers report contained an error, the building was 50cm, not 30 cm, greater in height than permitted development.
- iii. The applicant confirmed their intention to submit a daylight / sunlight information to demonstrate the impact on 9 Elm Street.
- iv. All windows retained 96% of daylight levels.
- v. The development complied with BRE guidelines as over 90% of sunlight levels were retained.
- vi. Referred to an additional representation from 38 Orchard Street.

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

- i. Objections raised at the Development Control Forum had been ignored.
- ii. The development would create a very narrow street.
- iii. It would not be possible for 2 cars to pass each other on the street, one car would need to reverse into a 'blind spot' for the cars to pass each other.
- iv. Visitor parking would exacerbate existing problems.
- v. Orchard Street was a popular tourist attraction.
- vi. Fewer dwellings on the site would be appreciated.
- vii. The application was a significant overdevelopment of a small site.
- viii. There would be a significant loss of privacy, the report did not mention whether windows would be fixed shut, although it was noted that they would be obscure glazed.
- ix. There would be a significant sense of enclosure on the outdoor space.
- x. They were effected by the highest density element of the scheme.
- xi. Did not object to the principle of development but concerns that had been expressed at the Development Control Forum had not been addressed.

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



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

- i. Welcomed the changes which had been made to the application since the Development Control Forum.
- ii. The bike space and visitor cycle space was appreciated.
- iii. Parking on college grounds would be appreciated.
- iv. Expressed concerns regarding the narrow width of the road.
- v. The lack of a passing place was a concern, she was also concerned that this would create a problem for residents and commuters.
- vi. Queried speed controls.
- vii. Noted that bins would be collected from the site and put back by bin operators.

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.

**19/93/Plan 19/0964/FUL - 1 Regent Street**

Councillor Thornburrow left the table to speak to the Committee as a Ward Member; she took no part in the determination of the application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for proposed low carbon refurbishment works to the building including replacement passivhaus windows, the installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, a disabled entrance ramp and associated works.

The Senior Planning Officer presented his report to the Committee.

John French (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. He had previously spoken in strong defence of the Conservation Area however this application concerned an important trade-off between conservation area and climate change considerations.
- ii. He noted the test of 'less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area' but it was a judgement whether any harm to the Conservation Area is outweighed by any public benefit brought about by the development.
- iii. Took issue with the 'public benefit' having to achieve a technical standard.
- iv. The applicant was trying to do as much as they could to reduce their carbon footprint.
- v. The Council had declared a climate emergency therefore change was required.
- vi. The City Centre remained functionally attractive and embraced change taking into consideration the City's role as a centre for technology.
- vii. On balance he could accept a decision to approve this application.
- viii. Planning policy used the language 'harm' however this could be better described as 'differences'.
- ix. The building will still be in situ and could arguably look refreshed and be a more pleasant place in which to work.
- x. Noted the application was a delicate balance for the Committee to determine.
- xi. Commented that local planning policy guidance was required in light of the climate emergency declaration.

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

- i. Pointed out that in this instance the heritage asset was the Conservation Area and not Entopia House of itself. This proposal would not cause harm to the Conservation Area although if one came to the view that it would, then surely the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh such harm.
- ii. Refusal of the application would be a step backwards following the Council's declaration of a climate emergency.
- iii. The application was not solely about improving the building thermally because there were other improvements.

- iv. The Council, visitors to the city and its residents could learn about sustainable improvements to buildings directly as a result of this exemplar scheme which would benefit all.
- v. Window typology was not mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal, if it was important then it would have been included within it.
- vi. The existing windows were not the original windows but a poor replacement. The replacement windows proposed in the application would not harm the Conservation Area.
- vii. The Council needed to consider the justification of the application in terms of the public benefit. The proposed windows would address climate emergency considerations.
- viii. Asked the Committee to approve the application. It would not damage the street scene.

#### The Committee:

Both the Delivery Manager Development Management and the Senior Planning Officer responded to the Committee's queries concerning the proposal and its impact and the "harm" test addressed in the report and the Senior Planning Officer's presentation. The Committee concluded by 3 votes to 2 that this proposal would not in their view cause "harm" to the Conservation Area. Additionally, the Committee was mindful of the perceptible public benefits in terms of an exemplar scheme achieving carbon reduction and by taking positive action relative to the Council's declaration of a climate emergency as material considerations to weigh in the planning balance.

The Chair brought closure to the debate and took the Committee to the vote on the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application which was lost by 2 votes to 3.

The Committee then discussed the reason for approving the application. Two members found no harm and one found harm but felt the public benefit outweighed the harm. Committee then resolved (by 2 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions) that the reason for granting planning permission contrary to the Officer recommendation is:

- i. There was no "harm" to Heritage Interests - notably the character and appearance of the conservation area - arising from the proposals and the development would give rise to public benefit comprising the

significant improvement to the environmental performance of an existing building.

The Chair called a short break and when the meeting reconvened Councillor Baigent did not return to the meeting.

The Principal Planning Officer read through the following conditions which would attach to the planning permission:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.  
Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
3. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development, hereby permitted, shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified within the application form and on the approved plans  
Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 61)
4. No new windows shall be constructed in the existing building, nor existing windows altered until drawings at a scale of 1:10 of details of new or altered sills, lintels, jambs, transoms, and mullions have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 61)
5. BREEAM Condition 1 – Design Stage Certification

Within 6 months of commencement of development, a BRE issued Design Stage Certificate shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that BREEAM 'outstanding' as a minimum will be met. Where the interim certificate shows a shortfall in credits for BREEAM 'outstanding', a statement shall be submitted identifying how the shortfall will be addressed. In the event that such a rating is replaced by a comparable national measure of sustainability for building design, the equivalent level of measure shall be applicable to the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and promoting principles of sustainable construction and efficient use of buildings (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 28).

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** to approve the conditions to be attached to the planning permission now granted by the Committee.

#### **19/94/Plan 19/0651/FUL - 23 Barrow Road**

Councillor Thornburrow left the table to speak to the Committee as a Ward Member; she took no part in the determination of the application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a bike store.

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

- i. Spoke on behalf of a substantial number of residents whose objections centred on the protection of the unique qualities of the Barrow Road Conservation Area.
- ii. All houses on Barrow Road are situated on substantial plots, bike stores did not need to be sited forward of the building line.
- iii. A recent survey of residents showed that most were enthusiastic cyclists and had bike storage at the back or side of the house or a simple rack at the front and not a built store in the front garden.
- iv. The original application to refurbish the property included a bike shed at the front of the property but this was removed on the advice of the

Planning Officer at the time. The bike store could have been included within the envelope of the property but the owner chose not to do this.

- v. Granting permission on the condition that the bike shed was hidden behind a hedge was relying on nature to conceal the permanent structure. Questioned how the Planning Officer would monitor this condition in the future.
- vi. Expressed concerns that this application would set a precedent for future development of permanent structures forward of the building line, contrary to planning guidance.
- vii. Barrow Road was modelled on the open streetscape of the garden suburb movement.
- viii. The proposal had the potential to adversely harm the character and appearance of Barrow Road. It did not comply with policy 61 of the Local Plan.
- ix. Asked the Committee to maintain the protection afforded by the Conservation Area guidelines and refuse the application.

Graham Riley (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Neighbours had referred to previous planning application, the previous works undertaken were a direct reason for this application.
- ii. This was development which required planning permission and should comply with Conservation Area Appraisal.
- iii. Buildings and structures should not come forward in front of the building line as it would detract from the Conservation Area.
- iv. Hedges in a Conservation Area were not protected and could therefore be removed at any time and would leave the bike store looking quite prominent.
- v. The bike store materials should be similar to those used in the area.
- vi. The justification for the application was to encourage cycling in Cambridge. However she referred to the resident's survey which showed that half of resident's already used bikes and that there was a trend for young families to have bike stores at the rear of the property or in the garage or a bike rack at the front of the house. She disputed

the contention that putting a bike shed at the front of the house would encourage people to use bikes.

- vii. The application had to be considered against the public benefit. There was no public benefit to have the bike shed at the front of the site.

A condition was proposed that the hedge be retained at a minimum height whilst the bike store was in situ and that it would have to be replaced if the hedge become damaged or diseased. The exact wording would be delegated to officers.

This amendment was carried **by 3 votes to 0 with 1 abstention**.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (2 votes to 2 – 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’s report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer’s report; and
- ii. the following additional condition requiring retention of the hedge at a minimum height of 1.5 metres, and its replacement if it dies, or becomes damaged.

#### **19/95/Plan 19/0183/FUL - 3 Saxon Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear extension and rear roof extension.

The Planning Officer referred to amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a relative on behalf of a local resident:

- i. The application would cause a huge loss of light to the resident in terms of where she slept and lived in the property.
- ii. There was a 2 metre wall on one side of the resident’s property which already obstructed light. The extension would cause further enclosure.

- iii. When the resident bought their house, they did not think that the neighbouring property would be extended any further than it already was.
- iv. The length of the garden was 7 metres and the extension to the neighbour's property would reach half of that and would be overbearing to the resident.
- v. The application would cause overshadowing.
- vi. 14 letters of objection had been sent into the Planning Department.
- vii. The resident's amenity would be severely affected by the planning application and the application was contrary to Local Plan Policy 58.

Dr Stainsby (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Drew members attention to the conservation Officer's comments which stated that the application did not enhance the area.
- ii. The row of cottages was a small set which had already been extended by 2.5 metres, this application sought to extend the property by a further 3 metres.
- iii. The application was contrary to Local Plan Policy 58.
- iv. Referred to the site plan and commented that this would create a sense of enclosure for 2 Saxon Street.
- v. The loss of light was the most important issue. The amount of light available to the ground floor of 2 Saxon Street was limited.
- vi. Commented that the light expert report did not make a lot of sense. The report stated that the vertical sky component test was likely to fail, this was mentioned in the report but then it said that this did not matter. The rights of the resident next door should not be ignored.
- vii. Questioned the amount of sunlight which would be available in the winter if the application was approved.
- viii. In summary the application would create an enormous sense of enclosure and loss of light to the neighbouring resident.

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 1 with 1 abstention)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

The following reasons for refusal of the application were put to the Committee and voted on separately:

- i. Insufficient information has been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that the development would not result in an unacceptable



loss of light to the rear windows and gardens of the adjacent properties at Nos. 2 and 4 Saxon Street. Consequently, the development would be contrary to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

The Committee supported this reason for refusal unanimously.

- ii. By virtue of the bulk and mass of the rear extension, its siting directly adjacent to both side boundaries and the presence of existing high walls and buildings in the vicinity, the development would result in an unacceptable degree of enclosure to the rear garden and windows of the adjacent properties at Nos. 2 and 4 Saxon Street. In doing so, the development would harm the amenities of the occupiers of those adjacent properties contrary to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

The Committee supported this reason for refusal by 4 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

- iii. The proposed extension, together with previous additions to the property, would result in insufficient retained garden space for the property. Consequently, the development would give rise to a poor level of amenity for its occupiers, contrary to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

The Committee supported this reason for refusal by 3 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 1 with 1 abstention)** to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. Insufficient information has been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that the development would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to the rear windows and gardens of the adjacent properties at Nos. 2 and 4 Saxon Street. Consequently, the development would be contrary to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- ii. By virtue of the bulk and mass of the rear extension, its siting directly adjacent to both side boundaries and the presence of existing high walls and buildings in the vicinity, the development would result in an unacceptable degree of enclosure to the rear garden and windows of the adjacent properties at Nos. 2 and 4 Saxon Street. In doing so, the development would harm the amenities of the occupiers of those adjacent properties contrary to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- iii. The proposed extension, together with previous additions to the property, would result in insufficient retained garden space for the property.

Consequently, the development would give rise to a poor level of amenity for its occupiers, contrary to policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

**The Committee voted to continue the meeting beyond 6pm.**

**19/96/Plan 19/1317/FUL - 95B Glebe Road**

Councillor Sargeant left the meeting prior to the consideration of this agenda item.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey front extension and a partial first floor side extension.

The Planning Officer referred to amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet and also confirmed that Glebe Road was not within the Conservation Area.

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

- i. The existing property was mainly single storey with a roof which sloped away reducing the visual impact. The proposed extension would affect this and affect the height and bulk of the house.
- ii. Overlooking would reduce privacy.
- iii. The bulk of the house would be closer by 5 metres.
- iv. The reasons for objection could be summarised as follows:
  - a. Reduce amenity
  - b. Overbearing effect on outlook
  - c. Loss of privacy
  - d. Create bulky house
- v. The previous application had been refused for the above reasons.
- vi. None of his comments had been included within the planning officer's report.
- vii. Comments regarding privacy had been ignored.
- viii. What was unacceptable in 2006 was still unacceptable today.

Dr Scott (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, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report.

**19/97/Plan 19/0630/FUL - 2 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for Change of Use from A1 (Retail) to A3 (Restaurants and Cafes).

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the correct consultation process had been carried out.

The Committee Manager read out a letter of representation from a local resident who was unable to attending the meeting:

- i. The resident had 35 years business experience on Mill Road.
- ii. Mill Road prided itself on diversity reflected culturally by the business owners and the diverse nature of the goods and services provided.
- iii. The current application did not protect diversity, once an A3 licence was granted it was unlikely to be removed.
- iv. Expressed concerns that there may be little incentive to travel to Mill Road for a single book shop and no other surrounding retail options.
- v. An A3 licence for restaurants and cafes was generic and made no commitment for the type of food that might be sold. Whilst he was a supporter of competition there must be a responsibility to support existing independent businesses.
- vi. Commented that only a limited sample of businesses and individuals were notified about the application and some adjacent business who would be directly affected were not contacted.
- vii. The application should be refused and retail licences should be upheld and protected. In an area already dominated by A3 businesses there did not need to be another.

The Committee requested that an information on fire regulations be included.

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. an informative included on the planning permission in respect of fire regulations.

The meeting ended at 6.30 pm

**CHAIR**