

PLANNING

21 April 2021
10.00 am - 5.00 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), D. Baigent (Vice-Chair), McQueen, Page-Croft, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey
Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson
Principal Sustainability Consultant: Emma Davies
Senior Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb
Senior Planner: Aaron Coe
Senior Planner: Saffron Loasby
Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies
Conservation Officer: Gail Green
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

Principal Transport Officer: Tam Parry
Local Highways Engineer: Jon Finney

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/35/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Green.

21/36/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Thornburrow	21/38/Plan and 21/40/Plan	Personal: Application in Trumpington Ward where she is a Councillor. Ward Councillors had general discussion about application

		with residents. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Baigent	21/41/Plan	Personal: Used to be a member of the Fire Service. Member of Fellowship of Fire Engineers. Member of CamCycle.
Councillor Porrer	21/41/Plan	Personal: Application in Market Ward where she is a Councillor. Ward Councillors had general discussion about application with residents. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Page-Croft	21/45/Plan	Personal: Application in Queen Ediths Ward where she is a Councillor. Ward Councillors had general discussion about application with residents. Discretion unfettered.

21/37/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/38/Plan 20/04826/FUL - Lockton House, Clarendon Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of Lockton House and 1&2 Brooklands Avenue and the replacement with two new buildings comprising offices (Use Class E), flexible commercial space (Use Class E) to include a cafe, underground parking and utilities, erection of covered walkways, electricity substation, bin stores, access, cycle parking and associated hard and soft landscaping.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to updated condition wording on the amendment sheet and revised recommendation wording in his presentation:

The recommendation is to APPROVE the proposal subject to:

- delegated authority for officers to complete the signing of a S106 Agreement to secure the financial contribution for the Chisholm Trail;

- planning conditions as set out in the Officer's report and the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a representative of Brooklands Avenue and Area Residents' Association:

- i. There was adequate space designated for office provision in the Local Plan 2018. This site was not allocated for new office development in the Local Plan and lay outside the Opportunity Area described under Policy 25. Therefore, this proposal contravenes the Local Plan.
- ii. This was overdevelopment on mainly residential narrow roads. Blocks A and B together would have over three times the existing floor area of Lockton House. Block A would extend south from Brooklands Avenue by around 40 metres, creating an unacceptable loss of privacy and sense of enclosure for the remaining terrace, which includes residential use.
- iii. Demolishing 1 and 2 Brooklands Avenue, opposite the Royal Albert Homes, to build Block A, with large picture windows and a commercial café at ground floor level, would destroy the integrity of a Victorian terrace, and prejudice its future. The design, with an entrance wider than the bay window next door, was inappropriate and damaged the character of the terrace. This terrace makes an important visual contribution to the street scene. It should remain intact.
- iv. Unlike Lockton House, which is placed side-on to Clarendon Road, the bulk of Block B would present five storeys of excessive massing and scale on a wider frontage, with three roof terraces. It would be built right up to the eastern and southern boundaries and loom incongruously over the two storey houses opposite and next to them. Replacement of Lockton House by Block A and B would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. A screen of 42 mature evergreen trees at the southern boundary would be lost. Both Blocks would overshadow and overlook neighbouring properties having an adverse impact on residential amenity. These buildings are out-of-scale and out of character for the Conservation Area and harm the setting of the Grade II listed Royal Albert Homes.
- v. The Design and Conservation Panel have twice given this an Amber verdict, meaning significant changes are required. One member abstained, believing the case for demolition of Lockton House had not been made. The Panel said the footprint should be reduced, and Block B

made less overbearing to Clarendon Road. To quote from the October 2020 minutes: “the Panel believes the current proposal is treading the boundary of overdevelopment and, indeed, may have strayed over that boundary.” I think it has.

- vi. This application would be overdevelopment due to inappropriate scale, height and excessive massing. Both Blocks would have an adverse impact on neighbours’ living conditions, and would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

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

- i. His house would be damaged by this application.
- ii. If the application were approved there would be an 11m high wall along his boundary rising to 14m on the corner and then continuing back at that height for 30m to link with Lockton House. It would feel like being at the end of a canyon.
- iii. The proposed entrance to Lockton House next to his front door would create an access for 500 people and provide ground level views into his garden and from the corner of the garden high level windows will provide intrusive views not only into No.3 but also the whole of the Conservation Area.
- iv. Expressed concern that the development was occurring in a terrace, this was unacceptable whether in a Conservation Area or not.
- v. Suggested that if residents wished to extend their terrace properties to the extent of their garden, permission would be (rightly) refused because of the overwhelming damage to neighbours.
- vi. The rebuilding and extending of 1 and 2 Brooklands Avenue in this application had not been considered as work to the terrace but only as an addition to Lockton House. The effect on its neighbours was the most important aspect to consider which had not been done. Despite a number of requests no planning officer has visited to see the effect.
- vii. This application would have a negative impact on 1-7 Brooklands Avenue which was an exceptional terrace. The application openly stated that it intended to create a public entrance to Lockton House within the terrace which is 100m away.
- viii. There should be no connection between Lockton House and Brooklands Avenue. Any application for either should be quite separate.
- ix. Expressed concern the application was an exercise in over development, building tight up to all boundaries to triple the floorspace in order to make it economic to demolish perfectly sound and valuable buildings to build more office space.

- x. This would destroy the nature of 1 -7 Brooklands Avenue and overwhelm the Conservation Area.
- xi. If the Application were granted the Conservation Area designation should be removed since this is exactly what the proposal does.

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

Councillor Summerbell (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application through a written statement read by Committee Manager:

- i. Submitted a statement in opposition to the development contrary to the officer's report because:
 - The proposal would harm the Conservation Area.
 - The negative impact on the residential amenity.
 - There is significant impact on tree cover.
- ii. Issues with respect to Conservation Area:
 - a. Failed to enhance or preserve the character of Conservation Area. It does not comply with Policies 55 and 61 (it would dwarf the surrounding buildings, especially the terraced houses and would treble the size of the current block). Significant negative impact on the "fine group of buildings" (as The Conservation Appraisal states) that are 1-7 Brooklands Avenue.
 - b. Policy 60: the proposed height will be 21.2m and built significantly closer to surrounding roads and buildings. The current building only reaches this height at a recessed sixth story, therefore with a much lower impact than the proposed design. Members must take into account the aspect as well as the absolute height. There are also roof terraces on Block B. There would surely be significant issues with overlooking surrounding buildings and residences.
 - c. There was already adequate space designated for office provision in the Local Plan. Lockton House and 1 and 2 Brooklands Avenue are not identified as sites for office development within the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. Policy 25: 'Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area' does not identify either Lockton House or 1 and 2 Brooklands Avenue as Proposal Sites and these three buildings are not shown within the 'Opportunity Area.' The current proposal for over-intensive office development did not align with this.
- iii. Significant impact on residential amenity:
 - a. Multiple planning documents misidentify 6 Brooklands Avenue as an office building. It is a residence, immediately north of a 21.2m

- high building. The impact on daylight would undoubtedly be significant, contrary to the officer's report.
- b. The 14metre high public walkway causes significant privacy concerns for the residential dwellings that would be immediately overlooked. Office workers can look directly into residents' gardens and windows.
 - c. The impact on number 3 Brooklands Avenue was devastating.
 - d. There have also been concerns raised with respect to flooding:
 - Flooding of basements to properties will get worse: (February 2021 Ramboll Basement Impact Assessment report, reference 1620007220-RAM-XX-XX-XX-X-0003) identified that although there would be a change in groundwater flow direction, the changes in groundwater elevation would be in the region of a few centimetres at the location of nearby existing basements".
 - This was likely to be significant given that these properties have had existing issues with flooding, with knock on increases in insurance costs as well as the direct risk.
- iv. Impact on tree cover:
- a. The removal of the 42 mature leylandii trees and the loss of other trees is contrary to Policy 71.
 - b. The justification of the removal of the trees is that they are in poor condition. Questioned the point of the Tree Preservation Order if subject trees can be removed due to the fact they have not been sufficiently cared for.
- v. Environmental considerations:
- a. The proposal is to demolish a relatively recent building.
 - b. The developers have completely misrepresented the concept of whole life carbon in their claims. Given that embodied carbon in new buildings is around half the total of the whole life impact (source: Material Economics report) then the new building would have to have net-negative operational emissions in order to have the whole life performance they claim. This is clearly not the case.
 - c. It was worth noting that the calculation had been based on a 60-year design life which minimises the annualised impact of embodied emissions associated with construction while the developers propose knocking down a building far younger than 60 years.
 - d. In addition, a 60-year design life means that the building would still be standing in the 2080s. It did not meet net zero standards for 2050, and there is no firm commitment to meet that target.
 - e. Furthermore, by presenting the impact per occupant, the developers had flattered the calculation by dividing the fixed costs

over a far bigger site than the original. This was clearly not a fair like-for-like comparison.

- f. Members would recall concerns they raised at the last planning meeting about the development on Hills Road, which was subsequently rejected. That concerned a development demolishing older buildings aiming for a BREEAM outstanding rating. This development is demolishing a newer building far better suited to refurbishment and the proposal targets a less efficient energy and carbon performance. Asked Members to apply the same level of scrutiny to this development, as it did not meet Net-Zero by 2050 targets.

Councillor Jones (Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. As the local County Councillor she strongly objected to the Lockton House and 1 & 2 Brooklands Avenue development on two grounds:
 - a. poor quality and inaccuracy of the submission and
 - b. cumulative impact of traffic in the conservation area.
- ii. She thought it was clear from the ongoing significant errors and omissions in the documentation that the developers had no knowledge of the site and the area. The documents consistently contained errors about location, traffic flows and nearby buildings, which suggested they were 'cut and pasted' from another development.
- iii. Talked with the developers in October 2020 to raise issues about construction traffic, increased traffic flows in the area and wider concerns about the cumulative impact of motor traffic. Explained that severe disruption had required bollards to be installed by the County Council to prevent delivery lorries from blocking residents' access. Was reassured that not only were there to be fewer car parking spaces and more bike parking on site but also that the 'servicing' and 'deliveries' required would be to a dedicated delivery bay on Brooklands Avenue. The exception was only for 'refuse collection' from Clarendon Road. The concerns Councillor Jones raised about taxi traffic and drop-offs-pick-ups from the premises (and about construction traffic access) therefore seemed to have been answered.
 - a. Having read the report of the meeting between Councillor Jones and developers, the Vectos report (and its subsequent updates), she found that her concerns about traffic were fully justified. Deliveries were now planned for Clarendon Road as well as Brooklands Avenue, with Vectos assessing this as a likely option for drivers. All taxi pick-ups and drop-offs would move to Clarendon Road too. But with no planned delivery bays or pick-up/drop-off

bays the potential for congestion and conflict will be significant. This was precisely what she and local residents tried to avoid by getting bollards installed through our successful County Local Highway Improvement scheme.

- b. Clarendon Road and surrounding streets are part of a Conservation Area already subject to increasing traffic from large-scale nearby developments, yet it was assumed that local pay and display space was available for employees on these streets. Spaces in Clarendon and Fitzwilliam Roads have been over-subscribed in recent (non-pandemic) years. It was also clear that, with 500 office jobs, this residential area would experience traffic pressures. The Vectos report expected people to drive to the site for meetings, since the report flagged “a maximum stay of 8 hours, therefore suitable for employees’ and notes likely problems with the “lack of two way working” on Clarendon Road.
- c. Clarendon Road and Brooklands Avenue were not built for heavy traffic, contrary to the Vectos report. The application would exacerbate existing traffic noise, flow, parking and pollution issues.
- iv. To conclude: it seemed that the developers have belatedly realised that the development would generate much more car and lorry traffic than admitted and are altering their plans in an ad hoc way. The Brooklands Avenue café would create more delivery pressures and the deliberate shift of traffic to Clarendon Road will impose on this and other Conservation Area streets in an unacceptable way.

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

- i. This application was in fact two applications:
 - a. demolition of Lockton House and 1&2 Brooklands Avenue.
 - b. replacement with two new buildings.
- ii. The current terrace made an important visual contribution to the street scene.
- iii. Numbers 5 and 6 Clarendon Road were houses not offices. They would be particularly affected.
- iv. Suggested the application did not meet Policies 55 and 61 of the Local Plan.
- v. Block B would loom over the terrace.
- vi. Brookland Avenue was already heavily used by pedestrians, cycles and vehicles. The application would create a delivery bay for the site which would exacerbate traffic issues in the area.

- vii. Expressed safety concern that the delivery bay was in the middle of the site pedestrian entrance. There had been various accidents in the area over the last five years.
- viii. Did not agree there was need for further office space in the city. Lockdown had shifted demand from offices to home working.
- ix. It was not easy to convert offices to housing if use permission were changed in future.
- x. The application would adversely affect houses in the Clarendon Road Conservation Area. This would lead to loss of amenity, light and privacy. Office blocks would overlook nearby houses. Expressed concern about:
 - a. out of character with the area;
 - b. overbearing;
 - c. massing;
 - d. out of scale;
 - e. over development of site.
 - f. loss of trees that would be removed so application could be built.
- xi. The footprint of the application should be reduced.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to:

- i. control the size of heavy commercial vehicles delivery times;
- ii. investigate if a condition could be implemented to retain public access by preventing the courtyard from being gated;
- iii. planters should remain on the outside of the terrace area.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative requesting maximum levels of carbon reduction as outlined in the Sustainability Statement.

This amendment was **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. formal determination this was not Environmental Impact Assessment development;
- ii. the prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority granted to Officers to

- negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on terms considered appropriate and necessary;
- iii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet;
 - iv. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. requiring a service agreement to control heavy commercial vehicle delivery times;
 - b. the courtyard should remain publicly accessible; and
 - c. planters should remain on the outside of the terrace area in perpetuity;
 - v. an informative included on the planning permission:
 - a. requesting maximum levels of carbon reduction as per option 2 in the Officer's report (paragraph 8.93).

21/39/Plan 20/03843/FUL - Carlyle House, Carlyle Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey roof extension to create a third floor. First, second and third floor rear extension. Refuse and secure cycle stores to the rear boundary.

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

- i. Firstly: Contradicting the excellent work done and the impressive vision shown in both the Local Area Plan and Mitcham's Corner Framework:
 - a. The proposed building does not meet the requirements for any new development to "create altered or new roof profiles that are sympathetic to existing buildings and the surrounding area" which "do not unacceptably overlook, overshadow, or visibly dominate neighbouring properties." According to the Mitcham's Corner Framework, "building heights along the north western edge of the site "should reflect those of the adjacent 1-17 Carlyle Road".
 - b. Neither does it offer "coherent structures that reinforce the unique quality of the area... through well-designed architecture, developed in a sensitive and sustainable manner and built to the highest quality".

- c. It was of an inappropriate mass and scale and the development exacerbated the impact of an already ugly office building. It certainly does not protect and enhance the character of a Conservation Area right next to the city centre.
- ii. Secondly: The negative effect on immediate neighbours:
 - a. The terrace opposite would lose light and be significantly overshadowed, since the houses were 2.5 storeys high and this development will be 4 storeys.
 - b. Loss of privacy because of the 'bird's eye view' created by the additional 4th 'penthouse' floor. The office building was often open outside normal office hours and workers would have a clear view into neighbour's bedrooms.
 - c. The new rear extension overlooks/overshadows the Protected Open Space at Grasmere Gardens' lawns.
 - d. Its scale will adversely affect the subsequent redevelopment at Henry Giles House, where the aim is to be in sympathy with surrounding rooflines.
- iii. Thirdly: Negative environmental and community impact:
 - a. The pandemic made it clear that fewer offices would be needed in future, so this extra office space in a residential area was superfluous and ill-located.
 - b. The development would reduce on-site parking and lead to additional traffic, access and parking issues.
 - c. It would detract from a largely residential community recently revitalised by a new play park and traffic pinch point, making the area safer and more family friendly.
 - d. If the longer-term plan is to convert to residential use under permitted development rights, the issues over mass and scaling, loss of light and privacy, poor design, and adverse effects on the community would be more urgent.
- iv. Believed the planned proposal would constitute a kind of 'test case' for whether the bold vision and high standards of the Local Area Plan and Mitcham's Corner Framework are adhered to in practice, and such a large and ugly development, if approved, would potentially set a precedent for a poor standard of design and build.

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

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. Condition 15: Require passive provision for electric vehicle charging points so the number or points could potentially be increased in the future.
- ii. Require details of the mast location during construction.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to restrict Class E use to offices and café (not nursery etc).

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;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. Condition 15: Require passive provision for electric vehicle charging points so they could potentially be increased in future;
 - b. Require details of the mast location during construction;
 - c. restrict Class E use to offices and café (not nursery etc).

21/40/Plan 20/01609/FUL - 25B Bishops Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of two dwellings comprising of 1No. 2-bed and 1No. 5-bed dwelling following the demolition of the existing bungalow.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to late representations from 18 Bishops Road, 21 Bishops Road and 20 Exeter Close.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from an Exeter Close resident:

- i. This plan would involve the loss of a bungalow with disabled parking from the housing stock: this was raised by the Access Officer at an early stage as a reason for rejecting the application. Although the planned houses will conform to the required disabled access regulations, the nearest parking for the proposed Plot 1 would be well over 100 metres away up a gravel and somewhat uneven track it was unrealistic to describe the development as providing disabled access, either for its residents or visitors.
- ii. Objected to the over-development of the site: to replace a 2-bedroom bungalow with two houses with 7 bedrooms in a total ground area of less than 320 square metres means that the density is well out of line with anything nearby in Bishops Road.
- iii. This would increase the number of traffic movements which would exacerbate traffic flow and parking issues in the area.
- iv. The increase in vehicle movements will not only be due to cars but could also be due to van deliveries. Having a greater number of residents on the 25B plot is likely to result in more van deliveries along the track. This track is privately owned, narrow, and has a corner in it. There is no provision for turning vans at or beyond the 25B plot, so they have to reverse. Damage to roofing, gutters and fences has already occurred; such damage will be more likely with more such vehicle movements.
- v. If, in spite of these objections, this application was approved:
 - a. Noted the revision on the plan in the positioning of the Plot 1 house; this marginally improves the light loss to a well-used room in Objector's house and paved seating area.
 - b. The plan included the demolishing of the brick wall (between Objector's property and Plot 1). Was concerned about the possible consequential structural damage to Objector's main sewer (which runs extremely close at the base of the wall) and to the foundations of their house, which may also be affected by the digging of the deeper foundations to the Plot 1 house. Understood that a 'Party Wall Agreement' would be needed, and asked that (as a condition) a structural surveyor be appointed to assess these and other potential damage issues.

- c. During the demolition and building phases, access to the site would be extremely difficult and there would need to be limits on the length, width and height of site service vehicles. Access to the site would cause great disruption both to those residents using the track from Bishops Road and in Bishops Road itself, where it is likely that large lorries would have to off-load onto smaller ones for access to the site.

Councillor Summerbell (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application through a written statement (read by Committee Manager):

- i. Raised residents' concerns around the proposed work:
 - a. Density of the development was out of keeping with the rest of the area – a 2 bed bungalow was being replaced by two houses with a total of seven bedrooms.
 - b. The impact of this increase in population on traffic and parking, particularly on a narrow private track shared by residents.
 - c. There was particular concern around emergency vehicle access from elderly residents.
 - d. Access for construction vehicles, noting particular damage to buildings that had already occurred due to vehicle access.
 - e. Safe access to Exeter Close from the rear of the plot.
- ii. Individual residents also raised concerns about being overlooked and structural risks to their houses from construction work very close by.
- iii. The Access Officer recommended refusal and residents echoed concerns about loss of accessible housing.
- iv. If the Committee were minded to approve the application, he would recommend inclusion of the following conditions:
 - a. A restriction on the size of vehicles allowed to access the site during construction, to a maximum of 2.3m wide and 2.4m high. If larger vehicles are required they will have to access the site via Exeter close.
 - b. A restriction on working hours from 8am to 6pm given the unusually close proximity to residents, and the fact that more people will be spending more time at home than in typical times.
 - c. A review, completed prior to construction, of the safety implications and vehicle access requirements to the site once construction is complete.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. to restrict construction vehicle size via the Transport Management Plan;
- ii. landscaping condition to include details of measures to prevent car parking on plot 1.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to prevent use of flat roof other than for maintenance purposes.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative requesting a working fire prevention sprinkler system.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 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;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. to restrict construction vehicle size via the Transport Management Plan;
 - b. landscaping condition to include details of measures to prevent car parking on plot 1;
 - c. to prevent use of flat roof other than for maintenance purposes;
- iii. include an informative on the planning permission requesting a working fire prevention sprinkler system.

21/41/Plan 20/02504/S73 - Varsity Hotel and Spa, 24 Thompsons Lane

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the removal of condition 2 (vehicle parking) of planning permission 08/1610/FUL.

Councillor Dryden (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application through a written statement read by Committee Manager:

- i. Fire safety and Pollution, if taxis are going into the hotel undercroft, they will leave their engines running which may well pose a fire risk and cause more pollution to staff in the covered area. The Planning Officer in his report mentioned the Grenfell disaster with fire in mind.
 - a. The Planning Officer quoted the Fire Officer in the application: "It is therefore my professional opinion that vehicles should not be parked in the undercroft".
 - b. So why a condition asking to put taxis in there?
- ii. On a practical level, most people who have ordered a taxi will be waiting outside for it. Taxis will also not drive into the hotel to drop people off.
 - a. To ask a taxi driver to leave the taxi outside, walk in to the hotel reception to ask for the gate to open, then drive in and navigate the undercroft, to then drive out again across a dropped pavement to either pick up or drop off does not make sense. It would also cause more potential collisions as the taxi crosses the pavement both in going in and coming out.
- iii. The Planning Officer's report stated in 8.6 in relation to a previous appeal that "...the 4.5m carriageway with footways on both sides was considered to be 'sufficient to allow most small or medium sized commercial vehicles to load or unload on the kerbside without causing undue difficulty'.
 - a. A taxi picking a guest up or dropping a guest off outside is therefore fine. Why go against an Appeals Officer who has visited the site?
- iv. Disabled Valet Service made sense for the following reasons:
 - a. Fire Risk: The access officer correctly understands the importance of the fire risk of vehicles within the hotel.
 - b. Valet Parking: He also supports the provision of the ongoing offer from the applicant of a free Valet Parking service for disabled guests in the correspondence with the applicant and access officer and in the applicants existing travel plan.
 - c. Convenience for Disabled Guests: Agreed with the Applicant that it was more disruptive for disabled guests to park their car outside, go into the hotel to ask for the gate to open, then navigate the undercroft in what is a tight area and park their car rather than have their car valet parked for them off site.
- v. Supported the removal of the disabled bay, conditioned by the offering of a free valet service for disabled users.
- vi. There was no need to condition the taxi turning area.

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

- i. Residents were concerned about the traffic situation in the area, which would be exacerbated by the hotel and valet service.
- ii. It was a good idea to retain the taxi drop off facility.
- iii. Agreed with comments in the fire safety report.

The Committee:

The application was deferred to seek further information from:

- i. a representative of the fire authority on whether the fire egress route was affected by storage arrangements and more generally on fire safety matters relevant to the application and
- ii. a highways officer concerning highway parking etc. More particularly Members asked their officers invite those officers to be available to provide professional advice when this item returns to Committee for determination.

21/42/Plan 20/03838/FUL - 38 High Street, Chesterton

Application deferred to the next Planning Committee as the Committee had insufficient time to properly consider the application.

21/43/Plan 20/04303/S73 - 1 Grosvenor Court

Application deferred to the next Planning Committee as the Committee had insufficient time to properly consider the application.

21/44/Plan 20/00190/FUL - 44 George Street

Application deferred to the next Planning Committee as the Committee had insufficient time to properly consider the application.

21/45/Plan 20/04824/FUL - 130 Queen Ediths Way

Application deferred to the next Planning Committee as the Committee had insufficient time to properly consider the application.

21/46/Plan 20/03704/FUL - Land adjacent 1 Lovers Walk

Application deferred to the next Planning Committee as the Committee had insufficient time to properly consider the application.

The meeting ended at 5.00 pm

CHAIR