

## **PLANNING**

4 June 2020  
10.00 am - 2.20 pm

### **Present:**

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

### **Officers:**

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby  
Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey  
Area Development Manager: Toby Williams  
Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson  
Planner: Mary Collins  
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

### **20/41/Plan Apologies**

No apologies were received.

### **20/42/Plan Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and Cambridge Cycling Campaign

### **20/43/Plan Minutes - To follow**

The minutes of previous meetings to follow.

### **20/44/Plan 18/1890/FUL - Family Centre, Malta Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of nine residential units comprising a terrace of 4 x three bedroom houses, 4 x two bedroom flats and 1 x one bedroom flat with access, car parking, and associated landscaping, following the demolition of the existing building on site, at Malta Road, Cambridge.

The Committee noted the additional information in the Amendment Sheet including an informative regarding hedgehog friendly fencing.

Richard Seamark (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Herbert (Coleridge Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Application would be significant back land development.
- ii. Three storey height would be overbearing.
- iii. Would cause loss of light and overshadowing.
- iv. Would be inappropriate intensification.
- v. Neighbours would lose winter sunlight.
- vi. A small building was being replaced by an imposing development.
- vii. Roof gardens were unacceptable due to overlooking and impact on the privacy of neighbours.
- viii. Design does not respect local area.
- ix. Removal of trees would result in the loss of a wildlife corridor.
- x. Previous application for this site questioned the site access.
- xi. Would have a significant impact on Marmora Road.

The Committee discussed imposing additional conditions requiring solid screens to the roof garden which would address privacy concerns; a requirement to restrict garage use to vehicle storage and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System. Additional informatives regarding the use of low planting to mitigate tree loss, fire safety and hedgehog friendly fencing were also suggested.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** 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. with delegated authority to officers to draft and include the following additional conditions in respect of:
  - a. Garages to remain for the use of vehicle storage,
  - b. Solid screening to roof gardens,
  - c. Inclusion of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System and
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. Fire safety (access for fire tenders),
  - b. Hedgehog friendly fencing,
  - c. Low planting to mitigate for tree loss.

### **20/45/Plan 18/1796/FUL - 386 Milton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use to large scale HMO (sui generis), including detached annexe.

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

- i. How is it possible for the annex to be included in this application when it does not have planning permission?
- ii. Design was out of keeping with the area.
- iii. Annex is too close to neighbours.
- iv. Neighbours want to know why the annex has not been demolished.
- v. House was too small for the proposed number of occupants.

Members of the Committee raised concerns regarding the quality of life for future residents, space standards, lack of covered walkway from annex to main house, lack of amenity space and the suitability as a HMO.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 1)** to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. Amenity of future residents. (Local Plan Policy 52D)
- ii. Space standards (Local Plan Policy 52C)

- iii. Privacy of neighbours (Local Plan Policy 52C)
- iv. Unacceptable internal layout.
- v. Scale of development.

The Committee granted delegated authority to Officers in consultation with the Chair and Spokes to settle the full text of the reasons for refusal to accord with the resolution.

### **20/46/Plan 18/1803/FUL - 6 Sherbourne Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a first-floor extension to an existing bungalow to create 2no flats and a duplex dwelling with associated parking.

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

- i. Development would have a negative impact on the area.
- ii. Would be part of a wider intensification of the area.
- iii. Community feel was being lost.
- iv. Previous family orientated area was become a dormitory area.
- v. Transient nature of newer residents problematic for cohesion of area.
- vi. Would result in overlooking.
- vii. Neighbours would lose morning sunlight to properties and evening light to patio.
- viii. Proposed boundary treatment inadequate.
- ix. Privacy fencing/screening needed.
- x. Parking information appears to be based on an out of date survey.
- xi. Concerned about the loss of biodiversity.

Councillor Bird (East Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Shares concerns about the loss of sunlight for neighbours.
- ii. Proposed build line is close to the boundary of the site.
- iii. Additional parking in the area would be dangerous.
- iv. Design was out of character with the area.
- v. Additional traffic in the area would be problematic.
- vi. Unacceptable impact on number 8 and number 4.

The Committee suggested that additional conditions regarding, biodiversity, the boundary fence treatment and the allocation of one of the parking spaces to the ground floor flat were needed.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. delegated authority to officers in consultation with the Chair and Spokes to settle the text of additional conditions covering;
  - a) Pre-build approval of a green buffer zone;
  - b) Allocation of a dedicated parking space for the ground floor flat; and
  - c) Privacy fence to be completed before any other work on site; and
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission:
  - a) to indicate that should this building be a new build, not an extension, further planning permission would be needed.

**20/47/Plan Dates for Planning Committee June, July, August**

The Committee agreed the following changes to the meeting schedule:

- 9<sup>th</sup> June 2020 cancelled
- 17<sup>th</sup> June 2020 additional Meeting

On-going dates as per existing Calendar.

The meeting ended at 2.20 pm

**CHAIR**