

PLANNING

7 July 2021
10.00 am - 1.05 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), D. Baigent (Vice-Chair), Dryden, Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood, Porrer and Thornburrow

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby
Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey
Area Development Manager: Toby Williams
Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Senior Planner: Charlotte Spencer
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

Planner: Phoebe Carter

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/63/Plan Apologies

Councillor Dryden said he would join the committee during the first planning application as he had another commitment beforehand.

21/64/Plan Declarations of Interest

| Name | Item | Interest |
|---------------------------|------------|---|
| Councillor Baigent | All | Personal: Member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. |
| Councillor Gawthrope Wood | 21/66/Plan | Personal: Member of Housing Scrutiny Committee. Discretion unfettered. |
| Councillor Porrer | 21/66/Plan | Personal: Former Member of Housing Scrutiny Committee. Involved in s106 bid for trees. Discretion unfettered. |

| | | |
|------------------------|------------|---|
| Councillor Baigent | 21/67/Plan | Personal: Has been on Cambridge Wheel with family. |
| Councillor Porrer | 21/67/Plan | Personal: Application in Market Ward where she is a Ward Councillor. Would not vote. |
| Councillor Smart | 21/67/Plan | Personal: Home near site. Discretion unfettered. |
| Councillor Thornburrow | 21/67/Plan | Personal: Would abstain from voting on policy decision as Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport. Was involved in the negotiation of the lease. |

21/65/Plan Minutes

No minutes were received for consideration.

21/66/Plan 21/00659/FUL 71 - 73 Fen Road 10am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing development and the erection of 12no. dwellings together with access, car parking, bin and bike stores, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following (written statements read by the Committee Manager):

- Resident of 5 Cheney Way.
- Resident of 9 Cheney Way.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. 5 Cheney Way: "My statement and the concerns are the same as I expressed previously: Currently we have back garden door access to our house through the public path at the back of our garden. We use this back door access to have access to services such as building and garden works. It seems that the current public path will be closed, and we will lose the back garden door access to our house. I am very concerned about this loss of backdoor access. I would like to be assured

as how the new council house proposal is going to provide the current back door access to our house.”

ii. 9 Cheney Way:

- a. “As one of about 6 houses in Cheney Way most affected by the new development, in addition to my written submission of a few months ago, I would like to stress that since the new houses will be slightly higher than those behind on Cheney Way, there will be an issue of overlooking.
- b. These are clearly chalet style houses with two storeys - these would be more acceptable to the most affected residents of Cheney Way. Visually they would blend in better with existing buildings around the area.
- c. They could still be built to modern standards of insulation etc. One further important point I would like to make is - if, as has been stated, there are no plans to build further back onto the ‘ Five Trees ‘ area - why build a road through the houses? This could easily become an access road for further development.”

Mr Digby (Applicant’s Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that an informative be added to encourage the use of biodiverse roof on the bike sheds.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer’s recommendation that an informative be added to encourage the applicant to consider, if possible, the re-use of the existing bollards on the footpath to the front of the site which are to be removed as part of development at the site entrance onto open space.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) 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 prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- iii. informatives (with delegated authority for officers to draft these in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes) to be included on the planning permission to encourage the Applicant to:
 - a. use biodiverse roof on the bike sheds;
 - b. re-use the bollards on footpath (that will be removed as part of development) at the site entrance onto open space.

Councillor Dryden did not participate in the discussion or decision making for this item.

21/67/Plan 21/01392/FUL Parkers Piece, Parkside 10:30am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the retention on Parker's Piece of an observation wheel until 31st October 2021.

The Senior Planner referred to details on the Amendment Sheet.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to revised text for the condition concerning the diesel generator

She recommends the condition dealing with the diesel generator reads: The diesel-powered generator with noise insulating panels shall only be used for a maximum period of 1 month following date of permission, or up to when the solar panel generator is installed, whichever is sooner. Following the installation of the updated mains electricity supply, any generator shall only be used in the event of mains power failure emergency to safely disembark patrons. It shall not be used as an alternative supply in the event of disconnection from the mains supply following for example non-payment.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 35)

The Delivery Manager advised the Committee this was a Regulation 3 application

Mr Thurston (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application through a written statement read by the Committee Manager.

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

- i. Ward Councillors supported the proposal for an observation wheel but not a live fair in addition to it (which did not come forward in the proposal).
- ii. The Wheel should not lead to over use of the open space as its erection was time limited.
- iii. The North Pole application was not coming forward yet, which was disappointing.
- iv. Suggested a condition for the Committee to consider regarding the Wheel: electricity should not come from a diesel generator.
- v. Had requested this application came forward so residents could be consulted.
- vi. The Wheel owner has used permitted development rights to set it up. This was legal but had upset residents due to noise from the Wheel and its diesel generator.
- vii. Referred to statement from Ward Councillors in March 2021.
- viii. Supported the updated generator condition. Requested the diesel generator use be disallowed for the one month indicated in recommendation, except for emergency evacuation or people on the Wheel.
- ix. Requested confirmation that herbicides/pesticides would not be used to prepare the ground for the Wheel. (Reference Condition1).

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

- i. Parker's Piece had been actively used by people up to the pandemic. The aim now and in future was to provide a space for families.
- ii. The London Eye was controversial when set up, now it was a welcome feature.
- iii. Expected positive and negative comments for the Parker's Piece Wheel.
- iv. Hoped an alternative power source (electric) to fossil fuel (diesel) was used.
- v. The Wheel was already used by families although it had only been in place a short time.

The Senior Planner proposed an amendment to include an informative that herbicides/pesticides would not be used to prepare the ground for the Wheel.

The Delivery Manager proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that condition 1 should be revised as follows:

The hereby approved observation wheel and associated structures shall be fully removed and the area made good, in accordance with details that shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, by the 31st October 2021 ~~unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.~~

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the recreational area, and to limit visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policy 55, 56, 58, 61 and 67)

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 0.**

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that Officers be given delegated powers to revise wording to condition 4 (in liaison with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes) reflecting the intention to use a solar power generator.

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 0.**

The Committee:

Resolved by 5 votes to 0 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 as amended in her presentation;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include revised conditions 1 and 4;
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission that herbicides/pesticides should not be used to prepare the ground for the Wheel.

Councillors Porrer and Thornburrow spoke as Ward Councillors for this item so did not participate in the Committees' discussion or decision making (and for the avoidance of doubt) neither voted on the recommendation.

21/68/Plan 21/00333/FUL McDonald's 639 Newmarket Road 11am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the installation of 2 No. rapid electric vehicle charging stations within the car park of McDonalds and 2 No. existing parking spaces to become EV charging bays, along with associated equipment

Mr Keen (Applicant's representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. "As Committee Members will see from the significant number of representations received from Abbey residents living near to McDonald's, there is real concern amongst residents that installing EVCs in the car park will lead to those car parking spaces being taken up by people charging vehicles (rather than by customers), increasing the parking and traffic pressure in an already very congested area.
- ii. Given that the Barnwell Road roundabout is the biggest traffic hotspot in Abbey, where traffic causes congestion, dangerous driving, and air pollution issues, residents are understandably concerned about the potential impact of these proposals.
- iii. I'd request that Committee Members please pay particular attention to the concerns of residents as per the comments submitted, and that the impact on car parking spaces and any resulting effects on traffic be further scrutinised before making a determination on this application, to ensure there would be no negative impact on parking and traffic. It is noted that the Highways Authority has not commented (their input would be key here), and no studies have been carried out to test the assumption of whether the chargers would be used by customers. The Highway's Authority's view in particular is key to deciding this application.
- iv. Noting the officer's recommendation, if the application is to be approved, could a time limit on charging be considered?"

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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

21/69/Plan 21/01107/FUL 72 Canterbury Street 11:30am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for first floor rear extension to create 2no 2bed apartments.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Canterbury Street (written statement read by Committee Manager):

- i. Spoke as the owner of 70 Canterbury Street next door to 72 Canterbury Street. House is shown on the Block Plan with boundary filed on the Council's application website for this application.
- ii. The space between 72 and 70 Canterbury Street and two windows in Objector's property would be affected by the proposed development. They were the stair landing window and the ground floor kitchen window.
- iii. The grounds for objections were:
 - a. The proposed extension would block out the light coming onto the landing where the stairs turn, making it dangerous because the stairs are very narrow and need to be very well lit. The space would be enclosed outside the window by the proposed extension.
 - b. It would also stop the light coming into the kitchen which was small.
 - c. The loss of this light was unsustainable as the Objector would be required to use electric lights during the day forcing them to use more electricity.
- iv. Asked for this application to be refused until the impact of the proposed extension on Objector's property had been dealt with.

In response to a query from the Objector, the Senior Planner confirmed there was a typing mistake in section 8.11 on page 81 of the agenda, it should be Canterbury Street and not Canterbury Close

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

- i. Condition 8 should be amended so passive provision for electric vehicle charging points could be provided for both parking spaces.
- ii. A green roof could be provided on the bike shed to encourage biodiversity.

The amendments were noted but not voted on.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to defer the application to allow time for a site visit to check the impact of the proposed extension on light in 70 Canterbury Street property.

21/70/Plan 21/01125/HFUL 8 Kelsey Crescent 12noon

Application deferred to a future Planning Committee to allow Objector time to present information they considered material to their case. Information had been submitted to officers, but not uploaded into the public domain. Members agreed to the deferral.

21/71/Plan S106 Variation Reports 12:30

Report 1

The proposal relates to a scheme of 22 dwellings granted planning permission in September 1995. The dwellings consist of 10 houses and 12 flats at 53-59 (odd), 60-76 and 78 Bosworth Road. All dwellings are affordable homes within the ownership of Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing (MTVH). MTVH have over 2000 properties within Cambridge.

Recommendation: Approve modification to the s106 agreement as outlined in paragraphs 8.3 and 8.4 of the Officer's report.

Report 2

The proposal relates to a scheme of 20 dwellings granted planning permission in January 1995. The dwellings consist of 12 houses and 8 flats at 112-120 New Street and 150-178 York Street and are all affordable homes within the ownership of Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing (MTVH). MTVH have over 2000 properties within Cambridge.

Recommendation: Approve modification to the s106 agreement as outlined in paragraphs 8.3 and 8.4 of the Officer's report.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to accept the officer recommendation to approve the modification to the s106 Agreements covering the properties the subject matter of Reports 1 and 2.

The meeting ended at 1.05 pm

CHAIR