

**PLANNING**

28 April 2021  
10.00 am - 2.15 pm

**Present:**

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

**Officers:**

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown  
Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby  
Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey  
Area Development Manager: Toby Williams  
Senior Planner: Aaron Coe  
Senior Planner: Luke Waddington  
Planner: Mary Collins  
Planner: Dean Scrivener  
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe  
Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**21/47/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor McQueen.

**21/48/Plan Declarations of Interest**

| Name               | Item       | Interest  |
|--------------------|------------|---|
| Councillor Baigent | All        | Personal: Member of CamCycle.   |
| Councillor Baigent | 21/49/Plan | Personal: Had had two contacts with Varsity Hotel one immediately after the previous Planning Committee meeting and another call before this meeting. Advised that could not discuss the item with them. Had received an email regarding the application from Varsity Hotel which had been sent to all Planning |

|                       |            | Committee members.   |
|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Councillor Porrer     | 21/49/Plan | Personal: Application in Market Ward where she is a Councillor. Ward Councillors had general discussion about application with residents. Discretion unfettered. Had received an email regarding the application from Varsity Hotel which had been sent to all Planning Committee members. |
| Councillor Page-Croft | 21/53/Plan | Personal: Item was in her ward but had had no involvement with application. Discretion unfettered.   |

### **21/49/Plan 20/02504/S73 - Varsity Hotel and Spa, 24 Thompsons Lane**

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

The case officer advised the Committee that the application should be deferred as officers needed to review additional fire strategy information which had been submitted following the Planning Committee on the 21 April. Additionally statutory consultees (the highways and fire authorities) are being re-consulted on the revised information received.

#### The Committee:

Deferred the application.

### **21/50/Plan 20/03838/FUL - 38 High Street, Chesterton**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing house and the erection of 3 dwellings.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application.

The first representation covered the following issues:

- i. A hedge was removed between Alan Percival Court and 38 High Street last year due to the trees dying.
- ii. Referred to the drawings and noted that a 5m high hedge would be put up and raised concerns about the height of the hedge due to the lack of light to the ground floor flats of Alan Percival Court.
- iii. Was looking at putting up trees along the rear of 38 High Street and would like to discuss this with planning.

The second representation covered the following issues:

- i. The close proximity of the boundary wall and the height of the trees at 5m was a looming and overbearing feature. This would be oppressive if it ran the length of the boundary wall.
- ii. The proposal to plant along the boundary wall would provide not only a screen for privacy but also a vista.
- iii. Was sympathetic to the provision of a screen but did not want this to become oppressive to neighbouring properties.
- iv. Was pleased with this application as the buildings were further away and closer to the High Street. Their only concern related to the proposed screen. Asked for a condition to be imposed which provided a compromise between the needs of the new and existing residents regarding the screen so that light could filter through and it would be a form of vista.

Councillor Green proposed an amendment to the landscape condition requiring the removal of the existing trees on the rear boundary and for specific details of the new planting on the rear boundary to be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval. Councillor Smart seconded this proposal.

The Delivery Manager Development Management advised against the imposition of such a condition as officers were of the view that the application did not make the situation worse and therefore the imposition of the condition was unreasonable.

The amendment to impose Councillor Green's proposed additional condition was **carried by 6 votes to 1**.

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 and
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following:
  - a. amendment to condition 15 to include reference to two EV charging points;
  - b. amendment to condition 21 to require the removal of the existing trees on the rear boundary and for the specific details of the new planting on the rear boundary to be submitted for approval to the Planning Authority.

### **21/51/Plan 20/04303/S73 - 1 Grosvenor Court**

The Committee received a s73 application to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) of permission 19/1250/S73 to permit the introduction of roof terraces to the second-floor flats and changes to the external appearance including height of clay tile cladding lowered to line through with first floor balconies to south east and south west elevation, format of rooflights changed north east elevation, rear elevation (north west) window proportions changed, height of parapet dropped, and balustrades introduced to first floor balconies.

The Planning officer referred to details on the Amendment Sheet.

John Wilson (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the s73 variation application 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, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following informatives:
  - a. that the flat roof space adjoining the roof terrace should not be used as an amenity space; and
  - b. to encourage green roofs where possible (with pointers as to which roofs the informative is referring) where possible.

**21/52/Plan 20/00190/FUL - 44 George Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing dwelling and replaced with new 2.5 storey dwelling and associated works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Objected to the application for 3 reasons: overlooking, over-shading and parking.
- ii. Noted this was the fourth application for a new building on this site since 2016.
- iii. At the second floor, the windows on the rear elevation were full height windows. The rooms were dual aspect so would have windows at the front therefore enquired why the windows at the back had to be so large. Occupants would be able to look directly into rooms and gardens of numbers 42 and 48 and potentially beyond.
- iv. Asked how condition 17 requiring the 'obscured glazing to be retained in perpetuity' would be enforced.
- v. Noted that the report made reference to only one of the previous applications, 17/0671 and the subsequent appeal but a reference to application 16/1817 should also have been included which was rejected on the basis of overlooking into neighbouring properties affecting their amenity. Asked if the Committee members were familiar with the details of these schemes.
- vi. The proposed building would be a storey higher than existing and would impact the garden of number 48 in particular, which was small and confined. 'Light from the sky' as explained in the BRE guide explained how this was important for indoor and outdoor spaces and had become more relevant during Covid lockdowns. Noted that previous applications had included a 'sunpath study', but this application did not have one. Full sunlight analysis and visualisations were required to assess the impact on the amenity of neighbours in this respect.
- vii. The proposals replaced two off street car parking spaces with one - a net loss of one parking space in an area already under high pressure for residents' parking which had recently been exacerbated by the

construction of three new houses opposite which did not provide any off-street parking.

- viii. Noted that the previous application increased the housing supply by a single additional dwelling, but this application replaced a three-bed house with a slightly larger three-bed house. Queried the necessity of the application and the impact on the environment

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1 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. delegated authority to officers, to draft and include the following:
  - a. an additional condition regarding the provision of EV charging points; and
  - b. an additional informative referencing clean air and the use of coal and wood burning fires.

**21/53/Plan 20/04824/FUL - 130 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing 2 storey house and replacement with three, two-person one bedroom flats and two, three person two bedroom flats in a one and two storey building.

The Planning Officer referred to details on the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Was speaking on behalf of 19 objectors.
- ii. The application ignored a significant road safety issue because of the location of the property. The junction was dangerous and in 2016 was ranked third out of 26 applications for road safety by the Cambridge City LHI panel when applied for double yellow lines in Strangeway Road.
- iii. Referred to two bus stops on a plan displayed during the meeting which were 30m from each entrance, one of which was opposite Heron Close

and the other was three houses down. Each bus stops served 6 buses an hour.

- iv. There were approximately 1900 pupils at three schools within 600m of the site. Strangeway Road was a significant access route for cars, bicycles and pedestrians. Children lingered on this corner.
- v. Queen Edith's Way was narrow and had a speed limit of 20mph but most cars and buses drove between 25-40mph.
- vi. Noted that there were no proposed allocated parking spaces and therefore every car would arrive at the property uncertain whether they would have a parking space.
- vii. Disagreed with the response provided by the Highways Authority that there would be no impact on highway safety.
- viii. Parking provision was dangerous and inadequate. Criticised the use of the Cambridge On-street Parking Strategy 2016 for assessing parking stress as it was out of date and not fit for purpose.
- ix. Policy 82 had not been fulfilled.
- x. Queens Edith's Way did not have double yellow lines and experienced anti-social verge parking.
- xi. Noted staff from Netherhall School parked in Beaumont Road.

A vote was taken on the officer's recommendation to approve the application but subject to the inclusion of additional conditions regarding:

- a. EV and passive charging points and
- b. the flat roof area being a green roof.

**Resolved** (by 6 votes to 1) to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

'Minded to' refuse reasons were provided by Members. An adjournment followed to allow officers to consider advice and to draft the reasons for refusal. Whilst drafting the reasons for refusal it became apparent there was a discrepancy/uncertainty regarding whether or not the application complied with space standards.

In light of the uncertainty, officers advised the Committee the application should be deferred to obtain clarification of space standards compliance.

Some Members indicated that they only had concerns regarding space standards and this was why they had voted to reject the officer's recommendation.

The Committee:

**Resolved unanimously** to defer the application pending clarification of the space standards compliance uncertainty.

**21/54/Plan 20/03704/FUL - Land adjacent 1 Lovers Walk**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing car port and storage area and erection of 1 no. dwelling and associated curtilage.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Objected to the proposal as the area was already densely populated with a couple of dozens of households within 25m of the proposed property. The addition of another household with a car parked outside would not be a benefit to the area.
- ii. There was no designated car park for the new dwelling contrary to requirements.
- iii. On the Site Block Plan - Proposed and Existing the current depiction of the border with 72 Humberstone was not correct.
- iv. The proposed property encroached into the small garden and would do so even more when taking into account the excavation work necessary to lower the land and to put in foundations. It also protrudes into the garden of 70 Humberstone Road beyond the line defined by 1 Lovers Lane. The foundations and excavation work needed to be completely on the land of number 7 so it should not be possible for the building to protrude as it did in the drawings.
- v. Found it problematic the plans lacked external dimensions.
- vi. The height of the property would have a great impact on the amenity of the surrounding gardens. The plans showed that the land would be lowered to allow for the new property. Queried the effect on 70, 72 and 74 Humberstone Road. The external width and length of the property

was needed to understand how the property and its foundations would fit on the land of number 7.

- vii. Reclaimed bricks should be used on any new property so that it was in keeping with the surrounding area. The current building was built with old Cambridge bricks.

Franco Montecalvo (Architect) 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'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, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions covering:
  - a. boundary treatment
  - b. materials
  - c. the removal of householder permitted development rights for use classes A, B, C and E;
  - d. landscaping requiring a separate walkway for accessibility; and
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include an additional informative relating to the Party Wall Act.

The meeting ended at 2.15 pm

**CHAIR**