

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

26 September 2019
10.00 - 11.30 am

Present

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Baigent, Green, Lord, Porrer, Smart and Thornburrow

Other Councillors: Bick

Officers:

Area Planning Manager: Toby Williams

Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Committee Manager: James Goddard

For Applicant:

Peter McKeown (Agent)

Mark Tavaré (Architect)

Chris Senior (Architect)

For Petitioners:

Resident of Orchard Street

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/18/DCF Declarations of Interest

Opening Remarks by Chair

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

Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Herbert, McQueen, Page-Croft, Sargeant and Tunnacliffe.

Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	19/19/DCF	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

19/19/DCF Application and Petition Details

Application and Petition Details

Application No: 19/0560/FUL

Site Address: Land Rear Of 5-17 New Square Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 1EY

Description: 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.

Applicant: Jesus College

Agent: Mr Perpetua In Perpetuum Ltd

Lead Petitioner: Resident of Orchard Street

Case Officer: Mairead O'Sullivan

Text of Petition: Concerns raised regarding –

- i) **Loss of amenity:** Further decrease in number of off-street parking spaces against increased demand.
- ii) **Sustainability:** Overdevelopment height/ elevation – single storey garages replaced with some double height buildings, concerns of overlooking. Small units discourage long term leases and opportunity to become part of a rich and varied community.
- iii) **Visual impact:** No provision for cycles, storage of waste bins. Orchard St/Elm St are visited by tourists and visitors. It is vitally important that bicycles and bins are safely and securely stored.

Case by Agent

Mark Tavare made the following points:

- 1) Described the site location.
- 2) Design process timeline:
 - i. 09.03.18 Pre-application meeting at Guildhall
 - ii. 13.06.18 Pre-application email response
 - iii. 19.07.18 Public Consultation Exhibition at Jesus College
 - iv. 17.08.18 Pre-application meeting at Guildhall
 - v. 30.08.18 Progress meeting with Ward Councillors
- 3) Public Consultation:
 - i. 10 dwellings was thought to be overdevelopment.
 - ii. Arrangement for storage/collection of bins needed.
 - iii. Preference for soft landscaping in front of dwellings.
 - iv. Concerns about noise pollution.
 - v. Concerns of impact on existing resident residential amenity.

- vi. Garages were let to local people.
- 4) Described the final submission site plan.

Peter McKeown made the following points:

- 5) The application was subject to pre-application discussions with city council officers. A public consultation event occurred in July.
- 6) The principle of development was acceptable and the proposals were compliant with Policies 3 and 52 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 7) The proposals would result in the loss of 21 single garages, all in the ownership of the applicant. These were rented out on short term leases and not protected in Policy terms.
- 8) The site was located entirely within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Existing residents had permits and were entitled to park on the surrounding streets. New residents of the development would not be entitled to parking permits.
- 9) Consultee responses were all positive (the Tree Officer responded the day before this meeting).
- 10) Grounds for requesting a DCF:
 - i. Loss of amenity – reduction in off street parking spaces.
 - ii. Overdevelopment – overlooking from two storey elements.
 - iii. Visual impact– no provision for cycles or storage of waste bins.
- 11) Changes that could be made:
 - i. Create more residents parking spaces to compensate for the loss of 21 garages.
 - ii. Revisit allocation of visitor parking permits for the new dwellings.
 - iii. Explore opportunities for fewer dwellings.
- 12) Bin and cycle storage:
 - i. Policy compliant cycle parking was provided for the 8 new dwellings.
 - ii. There was no requirement for the scheme to provide cycle parking for adjoining properties.
 - iii. Four of the units had bin storage provided on plot. Communal bins were provided for the other four units and the properties on New Square to the rear.

Case by Petitioners

The Petitioner spoke on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

13) Residents wanted a development that enhanced the character of the area. They were not against the developing the area, but took issue with the specific details in this application.

14) Concerns of Local Residents:

- i. Lack of consultation. Invitations were limited to properties immediately backing onto proposed development – one side of Orchard Street cottages and one side of New Square.
- ii. This was the fourth development in the area by the developer.
- iii. Overdevelopment of site.
- iv. Safety:
 - o Creating a narrow street with walls either side. Two cars could not pass due to a lack of room along the entire (narrow) length of Elm Street. The road was used as a cut through for other parts of the city. The application would exacerbate the current situation.
 - o New property building windows would open onto the street.

Solution: Push back the whole development by 2 metres into New Square back-gardens and create a pavement and / or create a passing place at the mid-point.

- v. Height of two storey buildings. Overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking.

Solution: Change to single storey. Create the desired second bedroom within the stairwell space of current design.

- vi. The chimneys on the proposed plan serve no function and interfere with the tree line making the view one of 'prison bars'. They are present in some drawings, but not all, so design details were inconsistent.

Solution: Remove the chimneys.

- vii. The Highways report was useful but the comments made were based mainly on a flawed theoretical assessment of the geography of the street and that resident traffic is the main volume of traffic. There was no empirical data to back up the report.

Solution: A more robust survey to be made which puts the traffic flow of the street in the wider context of traffic movement in the Kite.

- viii. Queried if Councillors were happy with an electricity sub-station being located between two houses.

Case Officer's Comments:

- 15) Details regarding the application were sent to neighbouring properties.
- 16) Subsequent to this, fifteen representations were received from local residents. Key issues:
- a. Loss of garages.
 - b. Parking.
 - c. Application design.
 - d. Visibility in narrow street.
 - e. Neighbours' amenity.
- 17) Statutory consultees raised no objections, subject to planning conditions.

Case by Ward Councillors

Councillor Porrer spoke as a Ward Councillor on behalf of local residents. She made the following points:

- 18) Had no objection to the development, just wanted to ensure it was appropriate.
- 19) Bins:
- i. It was unclear on plans if back alleys (used to access bins) were lockable to avoid anti-social behaviour.
 - ii. Queried if Waste Operatives would have access to collect bins, or if they would be left on pavements and block the street.
 - iii. It was unclear on plans if recycling (green) bins were provided.
- 20) Amenity space. Queried if there was sufficient:
- i. Private amenity space for residents, or if this would be taken up by bike/bin storage.
 - ii. Space allocated for bike storage and different types of bikes eg cargo bikes.
- 21) A tree (that was not protected) was being lost. Queried what compensation measures would be put in place for loss of gardens and biodiversity as a result of this application.

Councillor Bick spoke as a Ward Councillor on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 22) The Applicant and Petitioners wanted a high quality application on the site.
- 23) Concern: The application would exacerbate parking issues in the area by removing off-street parking and forcing cars on-street, which would increase demand in the area.
- 24) Concern: Width of the road.
 - i. The road was used as a cut through by commuters.
 - ii. Elm Street was a narrow road which raised safety concerns.
 - iii. Requested officers obtained more data from the Highways Authority to get a better idea of road usage to confirm if there would be issues or not.

Members' Questions and Comments:

Peter McKeown answered as follows in response to Members' questions and comments:

- 25) Locked gates would be provided for the bin stores. Was happy to accept a condition requiring this.
- 26) All New Square properties would have access to bin stores. All bin types would be provided ie black and green. This was policy compliant.
- 27) New Square bins would be collected from Elm Street. So communal bins may be introduced for New Square.
- 28) All units were expected to have adequate private amenity space.
- 29) Cycle parking was policy compliant with one space per bedroom. The Applicant could look at providing more including space for cargo bikes.
- 30) Would check bike storage arrangements on New Square.
- 31) The tree near no. 97 would be removed. Bird and bat boxes would be provided, as would pockets of green space along Elm Street. It would be reviewed if fruit trees would be located in larger gardens.
- 32) Visitor permits were controlled by the County Council.
- 33) Would clarify with the Applicant on the number of visitor permits that could be issued. Residents were entitled to 100 days parking per year.
- 34) Would leave it to the Highways Agency to comment on parking issues. The application was policy compliant.

- 35) There was a discrepancy in submitted plans, 2 cars could not pass each other on Elm Street.
- 36) Will liaise with College if garage provision could be offered on another part of the College estate. The College owned land around the site.
- 37) Alleys in the site would remain communal in perpetuity. The College (as land owner) would ensure communal areas were not sold off with houses as part of permitted development.
- 38) The application would not alter the pavement width on Elm Street, but drop kerbs would be removed.
- 39) The accommodation was C3 class for Fellows and private residents, not students.
- 40) The application was compliant with Policy 51.
- 41) No laybys were planned for delivery vehicles.
- 42) A traffic management plan requirement was expected as part of planning conditions.
- 43) The Conservation Officer supported including chimneys as part of a building ventilation system.

Chris Senior answered as follows in response to Members' questions and comments:

- 44) Details on the planting scheme could be submitted as part of the submission to demonstrate what would be practicable.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

- 45) The proposed development was high quality, sustainable and complied with national planning policy. It had been designed to have no negative impact on residential amenity.
- 46) Consultation had been undertaken.
- 47) Undertook to review issues raised in the DCF. Would discuss the provision of a layby in Elm Street with the Applicant. Also Councillor Porrer's request for clarification on how the level of amenity space provided was policy compliant.
- 48) The application should reduce the number of vehicle movements in Elm Street.

Summing up by the Petitioners

- 49) The Kite Area was tightly packed, it was hard to fit in anymore growth.
- 50) Reiterated concerns:
- i. Garages (to be removed) were used to store cars. Their loss was a concern.
 - ii. Overlooking and overdevelopment of site.
 - iii. Safety concern due to narrowness of road and lack of passing space. Queried accuracy of drawings showing two cars could pass.
- 51) Asked for two storey building height to be reduced.
- 52) Queried if visitors to the area were prioritised over residents.

Final Comments of the Chair

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

The meeting ended at 11.30 am

CHAIR