

PLANNING

17 June 2019
10.00 am - 6.00 pm

Present:

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

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Principal Planner: Patricia Coyle
Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson
Trainee Planner: Aaron Coe
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Daniel Snowdon

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/1/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor McQueen (Councillor Thornburrow as alternate) and Page-Croft.

19/2/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Green	18/1002/FUL	Personal: Operates a guest house
Councillor Sargeant	All	Member of Cambridge Area Bus Users and CamCyle

19/3/Plan 18/1002/FUL - 211-213 Newmarket Road and 2 Godesdone Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing buildings at 211-213 Newmarket Road and the construction of a hotel (C1 use), with change of use and conversion of 2 Godesdone Road to C1 use, and provision of associated infrastructure.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Following a survey undertaken in March 2019 only 3 out of 325 respondents regarded the development as a good idea
- ii. There were numerous shortcomings within the officer's report that omitted facts and was therefore misleading.
- iii. The proposed development represented the third large budget hotel to the existing cluster that were within 100m of one another.
- iv. Planning permission for the other 2 hotels was granted before the new local plan was adopted which contained location and quality criteria which were grounds for refusal of planning permission.
- v. The development would distort the local area with a high density of budget hotel rooms when housing should be a priority.
- vi. Attention to the local plan and national guidance regarding sustainability was deficient. The cumulative impact of the development was a relevant consideration that was absent from the officer's report.

Mr Garth Hanlon, (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

A written statement prepared by Councillor Nicky Massey, (Abbey Ward Councillor) was circulated to the Committee.

Councillor Richard Johnson, (Abbey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:

- i. The new hotel and change of use was not justified in the proposed location.
- ii. The application was based on two assertions. Firstly, that demand for hotel rooms was higher than anticipated in 2012 when detailed hotel demand modelling was undertaken (Hotel Futures report) which underpinned the local plan and secondly that the proposed hotel was a new category of 'super budget' hotel that was not considered in 2012 and therefore represented new demand.
- iii. The Hotel Futures report modelled three scenarios; high, medium and low growth and then calculated the number of rooms required to meet the demand for each scenario. The high growth scenario applied higher demand rates than those the applicant had used within the planning application to claim new need.
- iv. The Hotel Futures report forecast leisure growth at 4.5%p.a however, the applicant had forecast only 3.8%p.a and that business growth would be 2% p.a compared to the applicant's forecast of 1.7%p.a.
- v. The New Premier Inn at the Grafton Centre would mean that provision of hotel rooms would far exceed the projected demand.
- vi. The forecasts contained within the Hotel Future's report that underpinned the Local Plan should be adhered to.
- vii. Recent analysis had demonstrated a weakening of the market and an excess of supply of rooms.
- viii. Drew attention to the competition in the market from Airbnb that was not considered within the officer's report or by the applicant.
- ix. Questioned the rationale that the hotel represented a distinct new hotel category (Super-budget).
- x. The impact upon the local area was unjustified.

Councillor Haf Davies, (Abbey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:

- i. The environmental impacts would be unacceptable should planning permission be granted.
- ii. The number of bedrooms on a fairly small site represented very high intensity use which could only be achieved by excavating a basement level and no provision for amenity space.
- iii. Pre-application advice contained concerns of the case officer regarding over development stating that the intensity of the proposed use would not be appropriate for the site.
- iv. Proposed drainage for the development was not sustainable as it required constant pumping and questioned whether planned mitigation would be effective.

- v. There would be a severe adverse impact on air quality resulting from approximately 76 arrivals and 76 departures daily from the hotel based on estimated occupancy rates.
- vi. The application did not support objective 3 of the Council's Climate Change Strategy to reduce emissions from transport by promoting sustainable transport, reducing car travel congestion, and encouraging behaviour change. The proposed site was located in an air quality management area it was also an air pollution hotspot.
- vii. Questioned the accuracy of the traffic movement forecasts undertaken by the applicant.
- viii. A 90 room hotel would generate significant noise and disturbance for local residents from taxis dropping off and collecting guests.
- ix. The lack of amenity within the hotel would result in guests congregating in the street and causing disturbance.

Councillor Whitehead (Abbey Division Councillor for Cambridgeshire County Council) submitted a written statement to the Committee that expressed the following issues.

- i. The applicant's low estimates of the number of vehicle movements appeared unrealistic and would add to congestion and cause severe harm.
- ii. The application would impact upon road safety as it presented an increased risk of vehicle collision.
- iii. The Newmarket Road/Coldhams Lane junction was exceptionally dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists and the application would increase risk.
- iv. Overnight parking stress in the area surrounding the proposed hotel that would be exacerbated by the proposed development.

During the course of discussion Members raised a number of concerns regarding the application including, overdevelopment, transport and loss of amenity.

The Chairman established that the application was likely to be refused on being put to the vote and with the agreement of the Committee proposed that Members were minded to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- i. The proposed development would conflict with policy 77 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 due to location of site partly in a residential road. There was also insufficient evidence submitted that demonstrated the need for accommodation over and above that identified in the Hotel

- Futures report 2012 on which the policy was framed. On being put to the vote the reason for refusal was carried 6 votes in favour and 1 abstention.
- ii. Insufficient information had been submitted with the application that demonstrated the development would not have an unacceptable transport impact. The proposal was therefore contrary to policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, notably paragraph 9.22 which aimed to achieve a zero increase or reduction in car traffic in locations including Newmarket Road. On being put to the vote the reason for refusal was carried unanimously.
 - iii. Due to absence of amenities in the proposed hotel and the absence of adequate pick up and drop arrangements on site, the development would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to occupiers of adjacent residential properties through increased comings and goings and increased numbers of visitors congregating on Godesdone Road and increased vehicle (notably taxi) in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. On being put to the vote the reason for refusal was carried 6 votes in favour and 1 against.

Following officer advice the Committee **unanimously resolved** to move a 'minded to' resolution to refuse planning permission contrary to the officer recommendation for the reasons set out above.

19/4/Plan 19/0175/FUL - Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of an apartment building (45 affordable dwellings), the erection of a mixed use building with community centre and ancillary office and meeting rooms on the ground floor with 4 affordable dwellings above. It also sought the change of use of the Gate House to a mixed use (commercial ground floor (A1/A2/A3/B1/D1 in the alternative) and 1 dwelling on first floor), together with associated external works including provision of open space (including play area), cycle parking, landscaping and demolition of 'link building' attached to Old Library (Grade II listed).

The presenting officer drew attention to the proposed amendments to the application set out within the amendment sheet circulated in advance of the meeting.

The Chairman explained that he would exercise his discretion and consider agenda items 5 and 6 together however, would be voted on separately. Public speakers would therefore have 6 minutes in which to address the Committee.

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

Resident (1) raised the following issues in her representation:

- i. The height of building B01 was out of proportion with the area and contrary to planning guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- ii. The development was substantial and the plan for the junction with Mill Road was inadequate and traffic signals were needed.
- iii. Commercial unit B11 was unnecessary as there were plenty of retail units on Mill Road. In particular there should be no alcohol license associated with the commercial unit.
- iv. There was a conflict of interest regarding Councillors membership of the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP).

Resident (2) raised the following issues in his representation:

- i. There was a failure by the Council to apply planning policies including policy 24 and figure 3.10 which covered improvements to Mill Road and access to the development. There was also inadequate consideration of cycle and pedestrian safety.
- ii. The Council had not adequately considered the heritage asset library under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The library was now closed, unsafe and required substantial renovation.

Resident (3) raised the following issues in her representation:

- i. She had been engaged since April 2014 organising community groups and although community provision had increased during the application there was a huge demand for provision.
- ii. Capacity of the hall had decreased from the original 150 seat hall that was originally proposed.

- iii. The proposed location of the electricity sub-station was inappropriate and needed to be sited elsewhere.
- iv. There was a lack of adequate kitchen facilities in the community provision to be able to hold events such as cookery workshops.
- v. The community provision required reconfiguration and therefore the application should be deferred.

David Digby and Fiona Bryant (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Richard Johnson (Abbey Ward Councillor), Executive Councillor for Housing and Board Member of the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The development was of strategic importance as there were approximately 2,500 families on the housing register, the provision of new Council tenancy homes was essential.
- ii. The development assisted the Council's main priority of tackling the city's housing crisis.
- iii. The devolution deal had energised the process and enable the Council to construct over 500 new council homes.
- iv. In order to meet the commitment the Council had agreed to release its Mill Road depot site.
- v. There was a commitment that half of the units provided would be for council rent.
- vi. The housing manager was closely involved in design workshops and the homes meet the M42 accessibility standard and also meet high sustainability standards with low carbon emissions and gains in terms of biodiversity.
- vii. The community centre was designed to meet BREEAM certificate for excellence.

With the unanimous agreement of the Committee it was proposed that provision of a scheme for boundary treatments prior to the commencement of works above ground be secured by condition.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/5/Plan 19/0176/LBC - Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought permission for the demolition of a 'link building' attached to the Old Library (Grade II listed).

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers

Following the conclusion of the item the Chairman adjourned the meeting for lunch at 13.57.

19/6/Plan 18/1990/FUL - Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single storey building to house an electricity substation, and associated screening.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There was a need to review the provision of community facilities across the site we would be concerned that if approved the application would prevent a review taking place.
- ii. There was no curtilage available for bins or external servicing for the library and therefore raised questions of how any refurbishment of the library would impact upon the demands for Gatehouse Court.
- iii. The planning application was premature as the County Council were imminently bringing forward proposals for the library.

David Digby and Fiona Bryant (Applicants) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

With the unanimous agreement of the Committee it was proposed that provision of a scheme for boundary treatments prior to the commencement of works above ground be secured by condition.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/7/Plan 18/1947/S73 - Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

The Committee received a S73 application.

The application sought approval for a S73 application to vary condition 2 of planning permission 17/2245/FUL (182 dwellings, including 50% affordable, 51sqm of Class B1 (Business) or D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) – in the alternative, basement car park (101 spaces), surface water pumping station, open space (including play area), alterations to junction with Mill Road and associated works) to change accessibility levels; introduce 4 additional units, including 1 to replace pumping station; revisions to heights and design of dwellings on Headly Street; and redistribution of 50% affordable housing provision within Phase I to 50% affordable housing provision across both Phases I and II (to be secured through S106).

The Chairman explained that he would exercise his discretion and consider agenda items 8 and 9 together however, would be voted on separately. Public speakers would therefore have 6 minutes in which to address the Committee.

The presenting officer drew attention to the proposed amendments to the application set out within the amendment sheet circulated in advance of the meeting.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. In phase 1 building B09 was permitted to have 3 floors on the basis that it was a statement building and it would be different from surrounding buildings. The proposal for alterations to building height loses the statement building.
- ii. The proposed changes were contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and questioned why Councillors would be prepared to diverge from agreed development standards.
- iii. Regarding changes to the distribution of affordable housing sought assurance that there would not be ghettoising of affordable housing and that all residents would be able to access all external space and amenity. Mill Road was a very mixed environment and it was important to maintain that.

David Digby and Fiona Bryant (Applicants) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/8/Plan 19/0546/S106A - Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for a deed of variation to S106 to substitute the existing requirement to provide 50% affordable housing within Phase I with a requirement to provide 50% affordable housing across both Phases I and II and to ensure that the informal open space is provided and maintained.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/9/Plan 19/0166/S106A - Land at 315-349 Mill Road

The Committee received an application under S106A for the modification of Planning Obligations relating to 14/1496/FUL (Student housing development

consisting of 270 rooms, communal areas, bicycle parking, refuse store, plant room, office, new substation, infrastructure and access) pursuant to Section 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Restrictions on occupation by students) to allow for summer use by students aged 18+ attending other institutions in the City of Cambridge.

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

Councillor Baigent informed the Committee that he had been involved in the campaign against the accommodation being built originally and therefore would not take part in the debate of the item and withdraw from the meeting,

The Committee:

Resolved (5 votes in favour 1 against) 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.

19/10/Plan 18/1876/FUL - Hobson House, 42-44 St Andrews Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use and refurbishment of the existing Grade II listed office building (use Class B1(a) Offices to a 57 bed boutique hotel (Use Class C1) and cafe/tea room (use Class A3), to include replacement of a glazed screen on the St Andrew's street facade, the upgrading of the thermal character of the glazed roof over the drill hall to create a central atrium, the removal of the existing northern wing to create two floors above, a second floor extension to the existing southern wing; together with partial demolition and replacement new-building at the rear and associated works.

The Chairman explained that he would exercise his discretion and consider agenda items 11 and 12 together however, would be voted on separately. Public speakers would therefore have 6 minutes in which to address the Committee.

The presenting officer drew attention to the proposed amendments to the application set out within the amendment sheet circulated in advance of the meeting.

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

A statement was read out on behalf of Councillor John Hipkin (Castle Ward Councillor) in support of the application which covered the following main areas:

- i. The proposed conversion was a fine example of how a listed building could be adapted for a different purpose without compromising its unique features.
- ii. The transport impact of the proposed development would be minimal as the hotel was a short taxi journey from the rail station and was located on major bus routes.
- iii. There was a distinct need for high quality hotel accommodation in the city centre.
- iv. The hotel would not serve regular restaurant food and would therefore support nearby cafés and restaurants.
- v. The application would assist the Council in its aims to achieve more sustainable tourism for the city.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/11/Plan 18/1877/LBC - Hobson House, 42-44 St Andrews Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use and refurbishment of the existing Grade II listed office building (use Class B1(a) Offices to a 57 bed boutique hotel (Use Class C1) and cafe/tea room (use Class A3), to include the replacement of a glazed screen on the St Andrew's street facade, the upgrading the thermal character of the glazed roof over the drill hall to create a central atrium, the removal of the existing northern wing to create two floors above, a second floor extension to the existing southern wing; together with partial demolition and replacement new-building at the rear and associated works.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/12/Plan 18/2025/FUL - Unit 10 Cambridge Retail Park, Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a 2 storey unit for D2 use (gym) with the reduction of the Homebase garden centre and existing service yard and alterations to service yard access. The application also sought the approval for the provision of a cycle store and an ancillary plant compound.

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

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/13/Plan 17/2267/FUL - Land r/o 115, 117 and 119 Shelford Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 9, 2-bedroom flats and associated works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident. The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The objection was from 7 neighbours concerning the impact of the proposed development on Austin Drive.
- ii. Construction traffic will have to travel along Austin drive
- iii. There would be damage to roads and surfaces arising from the construction and questioned who would remedy any damage caused.
- iv. Questioned the impact on drainage as not all drains were adopted.

- v. The ad hoc parking of construction vehicles and construction personnel would cause issues for residents and questioned how it would be prevented and who would be responsible for enforcement.
- vi. The constant construction vehicle movements would be potentially dangerous for children playing in the area.

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

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

19/14/Plan 18/1952/FUL - 6 Wilberforce Road

It was **resolved unanimously** to defer this item to the next meeting of the Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

CHAIR