

PLANNING

29 July 2021
10.05 am - 6.15 pm

Present:

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

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Interim Management Support: Fiona Bradley

Legal Adviser: Stephen Reid

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe

Other Officers Present:

Assistant Director: David Allatt (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Transport Assessment Manager: Jez Tuttle (Cambridgeshire County Council)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/72/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden and Thornburrow.

21/73/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Baigent	21/75/Plan	Personal: Board member of Greater Cambridge Partnership. Chair of City Planning and Transport Committee.
Councillor Flaubert	21/75/Plan	Personal: General discussion of application information received from CamCycle. Discretion unfettered.

Councillor Porrer	21/76/Plan	Personal: Knew someone who lived in F1 and who was named in one of the appendices for the original application, but had no contact with them about this application so discretion unfettered.
Councillor Flaubert	21/77/Plan	Personal: Visited site. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	21/77/Plan	Personal: General discussion of application with residents. Discretion unfettered.

21/74/Plan Minutes

No minutes were submitted for approval by the Committee.

21/75/Plan 16/1134/OUT - West Cambridge Site Madingley Road - 10am

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission with all matters reserved is sought for:

- Up to 370,000 sq m of academic floor space (Class D1 space), commercial/research institute floor space (Class B1b and sui generis research uses) of which not more than 170,000 sq m will be commercial floor space (Class B1b).
- Up to 2,500sqm of nursery floorspace (Class D1).
- Up to 4,000sqm of retail/food and drink floorspace (Classes A1-A5).
- Up to 4,100sqm and not less than 3,000sqm for assembly and leisure floor space;
- Up to 5,700sqm of sui generis uses, including an energy centre and data centre;
- Associated infrastructure, including roads (including adaptations to highway junctions on Madingley Road), pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes, parking, drainage, open spaces, landscaping and earthworks; and demolition of existing buildings and breaking up of hard standing.

The Interim Management Support updated her report by referring to updated wording of conditions 9, 10 (plus informative), 22 (plus informative) and 23 in her presentation.

Phasing (*as amended – shown with strike through and underlining*)

9. Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the first reserved matters application for any development on the site, an Initial Site Wide Phasing Plan which accords with the S106 triggers shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. From the date of the approval of the Initial Site Wide Phasing Plan an ~~annual~~ Updated Site Wide Phasing Plan shall thereafter be submitted to the local planning authority ~~for information each year of the 20 year period hereby approved (condition 4) for~~ with the submission of each reserved matters application. ~~unless all reserved matters have already been submitted prior to this date.~~

The Initial Site Wide Phasing Plan shall include the expected sequence of delivery of development of the following elements:

- a) Provision of reserved matters parcels including amount of floor area
- b) Interventions to primary and secondary roads
- c) Junction improvements
- d) Provision of primary/secondary pedestrian and cycle links
- e) Strategic foul surface water features and SUDS
- f) Car parking including provision of EV charging points
- g) Provision of cycle parking
- h) Cycle and pedestrian routes and links
- i) Strategic electricity and telecommunications networks
- j) Environmental mitigation measures and landscaped areas
- k) Provision of on-site amenities and open space
- l) Public transport enhancements
- m) Energy infrastructure including the installation of gas fired boilers

No development approved under the first reserved matters application shall commence until such a time as the Initial Site Wide Phasing Plan has been approved. The Site Wide Phasing Plan shall then be updated and submitted with each reserved matters application to provide a position statement on progress and delivery of all the elements a) – l-m) above. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details (or subsequently approved phasing details).

Reserve Matters Applications - Requirements for all reserved matters applications *(as amended – shown with underlining)*

10. Reserved Matters Applications for all future development parcels shall be accompanied by the following:

- a) A plan defining the extent of the development parcel.
- b) Supporting statement, including:
 - Relationship with reserved matters applications already approved.
 - Contribution to the vision for West Cambridge set out in the Design and Access Statement Supplement and Design Guidelines.
- c) A schedule identifying the disposition of uses and amount of development within the development parcel including the gross internal area of all uses.
- d) Estimated timing of any outstanding plots under construction within Phase one.
- e) A statement which has regard to the triggers in the S106 Agreement, details of mitigation within that phase.
- f) A review of any previous monitoring and travel demand measures being delivered including traffic surveys and public transport use.
- g) A Transport Assessment and a linked air quality assessment together with a schedule of the mitigation measures required.
- h) The timing and provision and opening of access points into the site.
- i) Updated Travel Plan (including progress on travel plan implementation to date).
- j) Statement demonstrating compliance with the Site Wide Parking Strategy (required by condition 21).
- k) Open space, any interim open space and delivery of north – south green corridors.
- l) Strategic surface and foul surface water features and SuDS.
- m) Strategic electricity and telecommunications networks.
- n) Sustainability Statement and details of energy and heat networks.
- o) Environmental mitigation measures and landscaped areas.
- p) Public Art strategy.
- q) Waste management and minimisation plan.
- r) Any supplements to site wide strategies to address issues, including water management requirements, construction management and waste management, compliance with the site wide Woodland Management Strategy, site wide drainage strategy and the site wide Sustainability Strategy and Energy Strategy.
- s) Amenities Delivery Statement setting out how the development accords with the principles of the Amenities Delivery Strategy. The Statement shall include an updated baseline position of the current provision of amenities on the site; the amount of development which has been delivered (D1/B1 floor space); estimated numbers of staff

and students regularly using the site and the current ratios of amenities to number of users on the site.

- t) Design Guidelines Statement that demonstrates how the application accords with the approved Design Guidelines.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reserved matters applications shall conform to the approved documents.

New informative to inform condition 10

Informative: Env Health – Air Quality Informative, Condition 10.

Requirements for all reserved matters application any revised/updated air quality impact assessment and local air quality mitigation measures/scheme (including Electric Vehicle Charge Point provision) shall include consideration of the air quality baseline conditions, construction and operational phase impacts, cumulative impacts and any mitigation required. If a detailed Air Quality Assessment with atmospheric dispersion modelling is required, it should be carried out in accordance with the most up to date and relevant national/industry best practice guidance documents. The latest available emission factors, background maps and conversion factors shall be used. Guidance may be updated to reflect changes in Government policy; the latest versions of the relevant local policy and guidance should be consulted. Prior to carrying out the assessment, the applicant must discuss the specific details with the Environmental Health team to ensure that the AQA will consider all relevant matters and comply with current policy requirements. The Air Quality Assessment shall have regard to/be in accordance with the scope, methodologies and requirements of relevant sections of the *Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, (Adopted January 2020'* or as superseded <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/greater-cambridge-sustainable-design-and-construction-spd> - section 3.6 - *Pollution (pages 76-144)* and in particular subsection '*Air Quality - Cambridge' pages 113 to 128*. Due regard should also be given to relevant and current up to date Government/national and industry British Standards, Codes of Practice and best practice technical guidance.

Reserved Matters Applications - Site Wide Parking Strategy: Car Parking, EV Charging and Car Club *(as amended – shown with strike through and underlining)*

22. Prior to, or concurrently with the first submission of reserved matters application, a Site Wide Parking Strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The strategy shall set out how parking provision will be phased throughout the development to ensure that a balance between sustainable travel provision is balanced with adequate on-site parking. The Strategy should identify how existing (underutilised) infrastructure is used, as well as temporary provision for parking, contractor parking during construction, and the phased delivery of Multi-Storey Car Parks. In providing this phasing the Strategy should identify the proposed Multi-Storey Car Park at the north east of the site, accessed off Clerk Maxwell Road as the final phase car park, and any reserved matters application for this building shall demonstrate the measures to reduce the need to travel to the site by car that have been implemented. This shall be demonstrated through providing details of:
- a) Provision of cycle hubs and other cycle parking on the site
 - b) Facilities and storage for electric bikes
 - c) Provision of segregated cycleways and pedestrian routes
 - d) Public transport provided through the site including bus stop provision
 - e) Car sharing schemes
 - f) University parking permit allocation policy
 - g) Any other relevant on or off-site mitigation measures provided which reduce the need to travel to the site by car.

The total number of car parking spaces for Phase One should not exceed 2,565 spaces with at least 5% of these spaces for disabled uses. The total number of car parking spaces for the full development should not exceed 4,359 spaces with at least 5% of these spaces for disabled uses.

The Site Wide Parking Strategy should also set out a site wide Electric Vehicle Charging Point provision and infrastructure strategy including an implementation plan.

The Site Wide Parking Strategy shall be appropriate for the proposed end use(s) of the development and shall provide full details of the provision of allocated parking spaces for dedicated electric vehicle charging in line with the principles set out in the NPPF, the Cambridge Local Plan and Cambridge City Council's Air Quality Action Plan. The strategy shall include consideration of both active (slow, fast and rapid) and passive electric vehicle charge point provision and design to enable

the charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

The Site Wide Parking Strategy shall include the following:

~~Dedicated Slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW for at least 50% of new permanent non-residential parking spaces and at least 10 Rapid Charge Points and 10 Fast Charge Points shall be installed across the site. The 10 Fast Charge Points shall be installed within Key Phase 1.~~

1. In Key Phase 1 dedicated slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW for at least 50% of new permanent non-residential parking spaces and at least 10 Rapid Charge Points and 10 at least Fast Charge Points shall be installed across the site.
2. For development beyond Key Phase 1, slow electric vehicle charge points with a minimum power rating output of 7kW shall be installed for at least 90% of new permanent non-residential parking spaces, or an alternative combination of slow, fast and rapid charge points in a strategy to be agreed with the local planning authority which should reflect demand for provision, available technology and Cambridge City Council policy at that time.
3. Additional passive electric vehicle charge provision of the necessary infrastructure including capacity in the connection to the local electricity distribution network and electricity distribution board, as well as the provision of cabling to parking spaces for all remaining car parking spaces to facilitate and enable the future installation and activation of additional active electric vehicle charge points as required.
4. Electric vehicle charge points shall be compliant with BS7671 and BS61851 or as superseded.
5. The implementation plan shall set out the schedule for delivery of the EV infrastructure. Information should include numbers of charge

points, intentions for active and passive provision, location, layout (including placement of EV infrastructure), Charge Rates of active EV charge points (slow, rapid or fast) and availability of power supply.

The strategy shall include the provision of a minimum of one car club or pool car vehicle with one dedicated car club or car pool parking space per 10,000sqm of new floor space. The new dedicated car parking spaces shall be for the exclusive use of car club or pool car vehicle(s). The car club parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved strategy prior to the first occupation of the development that triggers an additional space and shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

New informative to inform condition 22

Informative: Env Health – Site Wide Parking Strategy, Condition 22.

The Site Wide Parking Strategy, in particular the EV charging provision details, shall be in accordance with the scope, methodologies and requirements of relevant sections of the *Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, (Adopted January 2020, or as superseded, <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/greater-cambridge-sustainable-design-and-construction-spdc> - section 3.6 - Pollution (pages 76-144) and in particular subsection 'Air Quality - Cambridge' pages 113 to 128. Due regard should also be given to relevant and current up to date Government/national and industry British Standards, Codes of Practice and best practice technical guidance.*

Reserved Matters Applications - Cycle Parking (as amended – shown with underlining)

23. Any reserved matters application for new buildings or open space shall include details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the approved development and demonstrate that the provision is in accordance with the approach to cycle parking approved as part of the Design Guidelines for the site and shall apply the principles within LTN 1/20 (or its successor). The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences and shall thereafter be retained and shall not be used for any other purpose.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Chairman, Clerk Maxwell Road Residents Committee:

- i. The application should satisfy Local Plan policies 80 and 81.
- ii. Expressed concern the application would impact on traffic flow and parking in the area, specifically Clerk Maxwell Road.
- iii. The planned car park would open onto Clerk Maxwell Road. Cyclist commuters would also use this access, increasing traffic flow pressure.
- iv. Proposed JJ Thomson Avenue as an alternative access route.
 - a. Little or no impact on the greenway.
 - b. Road surface already exists.
 - c. Left turn off JJ Thomson Avenue.
 - d. no tail back to Madingley Road.
 - e. Provides vehicle reservoir.
 - f. Keeps site traffic on site.
- v. It was better to keep cars in one large car park than two smaller ones.
 - a. Concentrate parking near M11.
 - b. Away from residential.
 - c. Traffic off Madingley Road.
 - d. Partial sound barrier for site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from CamCycle:

- i. It had been five years since the application had been submitted. The Applicant had made some positive changes.
- ii. Expected an increase in bus/bike traffic in Silver Street due to the application.
- iii. Referred to the Greater Cambridge Partnership scheme in the Officer's report. Public transport was a key issue for the site.
- iv. Took issue with the routes suggested as these would:
 - a. exacerbate existing traffic flow issues;
 - b. make the streets unsuitable for other users if buses increased traffic levels to those higher than road capacity could safely contain.

Professor Neely (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. It had taken time for the application to progress to this stage.
- ii. Key issues:
 - a. Transport.
 - i. The proposal enormously increased the number of people and volume of traffic on-site.
 - ii. Highway Authority comments had led the University to focus more on public transport.
 - iii. The situation needed to be monitored and managed to review the impact of the site on the area as detailed applications came forward in future.
 - iv. Expressed disappointment that the planned car park remained at the Clerk Maxwell Road end of the site. This junction could not handle the extra volume in traffic.
 - v. Sought clarification that transport routes remained within the gift of Greater Cambridge Partnership and would not be set by the City Council Planning Committee at this meeting.
 - b. Height of new building.
 - c. Light pollution.

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

- i. Condition 22 or 23 should reference provision for adaptable bikes and cargo bikes.
- ii. An informative encouraging the Applicant to recycle grey water.

It was agreed in the meeting that condition 22 was the appropriate condition to amend.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Gawthrope Wood proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative to discourage the use of gas boilers, or to justify their use if implemented.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for outline 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 and amendments in presentation (listed above);
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the amended conditions;
- iv. amend Condition 22 to reference provision for adaptable bikes and cargo bikes;
- v. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. encouraging the Applicant to recycle grey water;
 - b. discouraging the use of gas boilers, or to justify their use if implemented.

21/76/Plan 21/00264/FUL - Blocks B2 & F2 Devonshire Quarter Devonshire Road - 14.15pm

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of two new buildings comprising Class E(g)i/E(g)ii floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant and cycle parking for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) with multi-storey car park for Network Rail, including car and cycle parking, for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park, utilising the existing pedestrian and cycle access, restricted to emergency access to the railway only.

The Area Development Manager updated his report by referring to updated condition wording 9 and 11 and the addition of condition 9a on the amendment sheet. (Amendments shown with strike through and underlining/italics.)

Proposed revised condition 9

9. Behind One Station Square, a 3m wide zone to enable cyclists to pass and connect to Station Road from Great Northern Road shall be maintained at all times. The bollards, trees and benches as shown on

plan ref: MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5028 ~~P4~~P2 shall be replaced with cycle friendly alternative bollards at minimum 1.5m spacing, trees and benches relocated prior to the occupation of either B2 or F2, whichever is the sooner.

Reason: In the interests of providing a high-quality cycling link through the CB1 areas (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and 80).

Proposed additional condition 9A

9A. Prior to the commencement of development of B2, a Taxi Management Plan (TMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The TMP shall include:

- a. Transitional arrangements for the management of over-ranked taxis within the CB1 locality displaced by the B2 building, including arrangements for the provision of on the ground marshals (number, time, duration and location), enforcement scope and monitoring.
- b. Permanent arrangements and their phased implementation to assist with the management of taxi arrivals and departures from Station Square including reasonable endeavours to utilise ANPR technology and to develop a digital application for use by taxi drivers. It shall include monitoring provisions.
- c. The results of stakeholder engagement which has informed the proposed transitional and permanent arrangements as per a) and b) above.

The permanent arrangements set out in the approved TMP shall be subject to a TMP Review, submitted to the local planning authority immediately following the expiry of one year following the commencement of development of B2. It shall include the results of any monitoring, consultation with stakeholders and suggested revisions to the TMP as appropriate. The TMP and any revisions thereof shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of development of B2 and shall continue to be implemented for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging the effective management of taxis within the CB1 area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and 80).

Proposed revised condition 11

Great Northern Road Zebra Crossing

11. Prior to the occupation of the F2 building, the proposed zebra crossing to the immediate west of the Great Northern Road mini-roundabout as shown on plan reference MMD-217382-C-DR-10-XX-5027_P7 shall be provided as part of the public realm improvements unless the outcome of a Road Safety Audit indicates that it should not, in which case an alternative scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and provided within the same timescale. The final positioning of the crossing should be located as close to the eastern termination point of Great Northern Road as allowed for through the outcome of the road safety audit.

Reason: In the interests of high safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 80).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from the Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association:

- v. Block B2 height and mass
 - a. Queried justification for overstepping outline plan footprint by 7 metres? This appeared purely operational, not justified in planning terms.
 - b. Out of scale with 2 storey homes on Devonshire Rd and Devonshire Mews, and by comparison with F2.
 - c. Application would be prominent in views along Devonshire Rd from Mill Rd.
 - d. Would provide no amenity to local community.
 - e. Architecture was wholly unremarkable, with no heritage connection as a gateway from the Mill Rd Conservation Area.
- vi. Displacement of over ranked CCLT taxis

- a. The fact that the station masterplan envisaged removal of over ranking in the station car park does not absolve the applicant of responsibility for the impacts of removing this facility.
 - b. Station Area Development Framework required waiting capacity for 30 taxis.
 - c. Outline plan required:
 - i. 20 spaces in the taxi rank (only possible if vehicles queuing to enter the rank are also counted).
 - ii. 8 taxi pick up/set down bays.
 - iii. 16 private vehicle pick up/set down bays.
 - iv. 5 disabled parking bays.
 - v. 2 disabled drop off bays.
 - d. Proposed taxi management plan refers to: “Manage the initial transition when the existing surface car park is decommissioned (to allow construction of B2).” This will be an issue beyond the “transition period.”
 - e. Expressed concern over the size of area affected by ‘taxi waiting’. This covered the station area and nearby roads such as Tenison Avenue, Devonshire Rd, behind One Station Square and Mill Park.
 - f. Took issue with the proposal that the operation of the taxi rank will be monitored on a regular basis and any operational issues raised with the stakeholder group.
- vii. Future proofness of B2.
- a. Multistorey car park likely to be required for extension of cycle park.
 - b. Applicant argues convertibility is not a material consideration. Planning policy supports our view that it is, and therefore should be conditioned as such.
- viii. Cycle route
- a. Commended the Applicant on engaging closely with residents to design and refine a protected cycle route between Devonshire Rd and Station Rd.
 - b. Details are still needed for:
 - i. Changes to Station Rd, e.g. to the County taxi rank.
 - ii. Replacement of speed bumps on Mill Park Rd.
 - iii. Consistent route signage.

- c. A protected route through Station Square was still needed for those travelling to the station, local shops and bars; and also living in or visiting the Railyard student accommodation.
- ix. Great Northern Rd
 - a. Maximum delivery vehicle sizes must be agreed and enforced to avoid unnecessary danger to people walking and cycling especially through the space behind One Station Square.
 - b. With the loss of parking spaces on Great Northern Rd, the remaining spaces need to be re designated for deliveries and short stay parking (to better serve residents of the road).
- x. Great Northern Road mini-roundabout
 - a. The walking route in front of F2 would be busy.
 - b. Suggested moving the pedestrian crossing away from the corner of Sainsbury's and closer to the mini-roundabout.
 - c. Suggested raising the crossing and tightening corner radius out of Station Square to keep vehicle speeds low. Alternatively, please create a conventional side road crossing arrangement.

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

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

Cycle route

A safe space was required for:

- i. A cycle route during construction.
- ii. A cycle route across the service yard which had a turning head for lorries. Queried if the turning head could be retained if a (3m) cycle lane went through it.
- iii. Cyclists and pedestrians between buildings B2 and F2.

Parking

- iv. The car park should be adaptable (including access ramps and parking spaces) so it could become cycle parking in future (if there was demand).
- v. A link would then need to be installed between the upper floor of the car park and the cycle park to facilitate entry/exit.
- vi. Current cycle parking was not secure. Future parking facilities should be.

Buildings

- vii. B2 was still too big and would dominate Devonshire Rd housing. The application was different to what was given permission in outline planning permission.
- viii. B2 should not be built closer to Devonshire Rd housing.
- ix. F2 building first and higher floors stopped the planting of trees as the floors overhung cycle routes. The ground floor had been cut away to allow space for cycle routes.

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:

- vi. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet.
- vii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following minor, non-significant amendments to those conditions and/or significant amendment or additional conditions.

21/77/Plan 20/01229/FUL - 34 Barrow Road - 16.00pm

The application sought approval for erection of a new residential dwelling following demolition of the existing dwelling.

The Planning Officer updated their report by referring to the amendment sheet highlighting a response of objection received from City Councillor Copley.

The Planning Officer also informed the Committee that although the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in 2021 this did not alter the assessment or the recommendation of this application.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

Resident of 36 Barrow Road

- i. Disappointed the applicant and agent had declined to engage directly with residents.
- ii. The only amendment made by applicant in response to resident's objections were to reduce the ridge height by a 'pencil length' and obscure glaze half of the master bedroom window on the south elevation.

- iii. Believed the Planning Officers' determination was not accurate by stating the application was for a two-storey dwelling; the application was a three-storey dwelling in a conservation area defined by two-story houses.
- iv. No. 36 Barrow Road had been described as diminutive in the Planning Officer's report. The dwelling had a roof height higher than 9 other houses in proximity. However, it would be made to feel diminutive next to the proposed three-storey building, 662sqm, with a higher ridge height of 1m.
- v. The proposed massing was too big for the immediate context.
- vi. The overbearing design would affect the residential amenity in lieu of the boundary trees.
- vii. There would be no opportunity to plant natural screening along the boundary behind the annex, garage, and bin store.
- viii. Questioned why a boundary tree planting plan not been insisted upon.
- ix. The proposed replacement of mature boundary trees between the houses was not feasible.
- x. The application needed to be redesigned to preserve the boundary trees and uphold the character of the conservation area.
- xi. The footprint of the single storey annex (36 Barrow Road), garden and bin store had always been built up to the boundary of 34 Barrow Road. The boundary walls had not changed.
- xii. Requested the same condition for the first-floor window position for fixed obscure glazing be included to the five third storey windows at head heighted.
- xiii. Was one of thirty-four residents who had objected to this application.
- xiv. The application has put the conservation area at risk by breaching the City Council's terms of reference and would set a harmful precedence.

Public speaker on behalf of 32 Barrow Road

- i. The application had failed to acknowledge the limitation of the plot and believed it to be over ambitious with too much accommodation on site.
- ii. The submission failed to disguise the scale and massing and causing significant harm to the character of the conservation area.
- iii. In addition to the loss of trees on the site, the root protection of trees on 32 Barrow Road would be compromised.

- iv. The room in the roof space was itself a family home sized accommodation of 146m² exceeding all national space standards for family homes.
- v. The proposal would cause significant harm to the residents of 32 Barrow Road due to the domineering and overbearing appearance when viewed from the garden and the rear facing rooms in the home; the application filled up the entire width of the plot of 32 Barrow Road.
- vi. The attempt to disguise the bulk of the proposed property did not work. The front elevation and the rear elevation were too far apart, the side elevations that give way to the harm.
- vii. The harm was less than substantial harm to the conservation area; the statutory test of such harm was that there must be public benefit to outweigh that harm. The proposed replacement home was not sufficient not outweigh that harm.
- viii. Asked that the Committee protect the conservation area in the area.

The following written statement was read out by the Committee Manger on behalf of a local resident:

- i. Strongly objected to this proposal, as many others have done in the past. Both myself and many other residents were shocked that it had been permitted to reach committee stage.
- ii. The design of the proposed dwelling continues to grossly offend the principles of the conservation area. It is an over imposing structure that negatively dominates the residences around it, steals light, adversely impacts the street scene, damages the natural environment and will be harmful to the health and wellbeing of the residents of Porson and Barrow Roads. The City Council should be mindful of this harm, and its legal and moral responsibility to its residents.
- iii. Despite significant objections by residents since last year, the proposal essentially remains largely unchanged since these objections were made. This is a designated conservation area, and the City Council is ignoring the principles of this designation. Conservation areas are meant to have extremely strict rules about development that may infringe on a designated area. We are hopeful that the Council will be transparent about why they have chosen to be so dismissive of this in this particular case, on this

plot. The Council has not permitted many less intrusive schemes in conservation areas in Cambridge. This lack of consistency needs to be defended in relation to this application.

- iv. You will also no doubt be aware that the 20th Century Society has made strong representations to the Council, sharing the expert view that the existing house is of architectural merit, such that it should be designated a Building of Local Interest. The proposal should be refused even on this point alone, much as there are so many other reasons to refuse it, and little of merit to support it.
- v. Hoped that the City Council Planning Department would heed the overwhelming objections to this proposal and refuse it. We hope that the view that the existing dwelling will be designated a building of local interest. We are hopeful we will not need to pursue resolution of this matter in the Courts.

Mike Derbyshire, Bidwells (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Agreed with the Planning Officer that the application provided accessible living accommodation and a good level of indoor and outdoor amenity.
- ii. Did not agree with the Planning Officer's comments the proposed development would preserve the appearance of the conservation area and would not have significant adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding occupants.
- iii. The Barrow Road Conservation Area Appraisal from June 2016 outlined the features and characteristics of the Barrow Road area that would be diminished by the proposed development.
- iv. The appraisal stated that "The road is distinguished by its low-density layout with wide green verges planted with flowering cherry trees behind which stand detached two-storey houses" that give a "predominant impression of greenery and openness" (section 3.1). "The relationship between the buildings and their leafy setting is particularly important for the road's distinctive character. " (4.). Key characteristics are that "architectural unity is ensured by the common scale of the houses: all were originally designed as detached two storey dwellings and have the same ridge height."
- v. The recommendation of the appraisal emphasised preservation of the roofs, the common ridge height and the character of the road should be preserved.

- vi. In order to develop a design that was appropriate for the immediate neighbourhood in the Barrow Road conservation area there is no evidence that the applicant, or their agent, proactively engaged with local residents outside the generic planning process.
- vii. The proposed development had been referred to as a two-storey building. This would appear as a three-storey building which would impact the local amenity.
- viii. The proposal was different to all other houses in the area who have changed their two-storey storage space into living space and this would stand out with its three-storey appearance.
- ix. The application proposed a third storey of 146m² occupying most of the footprint in depth and breadth, which was out of context with the neighbourhood and character of the conservation area.
- x. The floorspace would increase by 2.8 times, twice that of neighbouring properties and the ridge height would be more than 10% higher of its closest neighbours.
- xi. The proposed building would have the highest ridge height in the neighbourhood by over 9m. The case officer acknowledged that the ridge height had been reduced, but this was only by 17cm.
- xii. Ridge heights varied across Barrow Road, which was a long road, but this application would stand out in terms of height and massing within the immediate neighbourhood.
- xiii. Section 6.2 of the Planning Officer's report referred to 36 Barrow Road as diminutive. This was not the case.
- xiv. The application was not sympathetic to the local characteristics and history; it was not consistent with the height and form of neighbouring properties and over all street scene.
- xv. The Barrow Road Conservation Area's boundary tree design precedent should be preserved, enhanced, and respected when designing 34 Barrow Road. Replacement trees would take many years to reach the same level of biodiversity
- xvi. With regards to the application for 33 Porson Road, close to the application, the Tree Officer commented on "the important boundary trees that contribute significantly to the character of the conservation area". As a result, the owners redesigned their building to sit further away from the boundary trees (just under 6 metres).
- xvii. According to policy development would not be permitted which involves felling of trees of amenity or other value unless there are benefits to the public; asked what those were benefits as believed to be none.

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

- i. it is a great concern about the balance between tree and other habitat loss in the City of Cambridge in the context of ongoing development.
- ii. Reference the view of the Tree Officer which was as follows: "the development requires the loss of a number of trees that will impact on the contribution the site makes to amenity and character of the conservation area." As we have heard at the recent Full Council meeting, many trees replanted die. Furthermore, the time taken for newly planted trees to reach maturity is an order of several decades.
- iii. Climate change is an urgent and pressing issue and has been declared as a climate emergency by the City Council in 2019.
- iv. Object to the assumption that newly planted trees can be counted as equivalent to mature trees (irrespective of whether they have suffer disease). Policy 59 part b states that "existing features including trees, natural habitats, boundary treatments and historic street furniture and/or surfaces that positively contribute to the quality and character of an area are retained and protected".
- v. Ask the committee to request the applicant finds a proposal that does not require the loss of the mature trees on this site. I cannot see that this application will provide any other improvements for the residents of the City of Cambridge - as it will not alleviate the housing crisis (via for example providing affordable homes) and results in the loss of a building of unusual architecture from a celebrated architect (see the objection on the planning portal listed under Jesus College).
- vi. Understood that planning committees were very restricted in their decision making but put to you that policy 59.b should not be breached via acceptance of this application."

Councillor Thornburrow who had given apologies for the meeting addressed the Committee about the application through a written statement read by the Committee Manager:

- i. This is an important Conservation Area in Cambridge. Most the homes were designed by the same architect, Norman Myers, between 1931 and 1939, while the building under consideration is one of two modernist buildings in this important conservation area. It was built in 1956 to a design by David Roberts.
- ii. From our planning training we know that in a conservation area, special attention should be given to development that preserves or enhances the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- iii. There is legal precedent that this duty creates a "strong presumption" against granting planning permission for developments that would harm a conservation area, and that therefore decision makers must give

- considerable importance to any harm to the conservation area arising from the proposal.
- iv. Believed this proposal would cause harm to the Conservation Area and should be rejected on these grounds.
 - v. The Design and Access Statement for the proposed replacement house at 34 Barrow Road claims that it: 'will be of an Arts & Crafts style of a similar scale to and with details seen on other nearby dwellings' (para 3.0). This is highly questionable.
 - vi. There is a marked architectural consistency in the houses in Barrow Road, which were mostly designed by the same architect, Norman Myers, between 1931 and 1939. They were individual designs but shared a basic design strategy of a two-storey rectangular block across the site frontage, with a moderately steep, hipped roof of plain tiles without dormers; the eaves height aligning with the first-floor window head. This basic element was varied by selecting from a palette of secondary architectural features, producing a pleasant and subdued mixture of regularity and variety.
 - vii. The proposed house does not share this design strategy and does not form a natural addition to the Myers streetscape: it is considerably larger, taller, and coarser. The stated design objective is to fit into the existing context, but it fails.
 - viii. The essence of Arts & Crafts architecture is not the haphazard sprinkling of architectural details that were popular in the first decade of the 20th century, but an architectural integrity that unifies function, form, material and details in a considered and satisfying whole. An Arts & Crafts building can be in many different styles, but a feeble pastiche like the proposed replacement house at 34 Barrow Road cannot be considered a valid Arts & Crafts design.
 - ix. The proposed replacement house attempts to pack a greatly increased floor area on the site and incorporates a large second floor (second floors are not characteristic of Barrow Roadhouses). Others have written about the functional shortcomings, and headroom at second floor is a real issue, but it is not my concern here
 - x. The street elevation is dominated by two gables (also not characteristic of Barrow Roadhouses), which have a roof pitch of about 50 degrees, but to accommodate the large second floor area the roof between these gables is spread. It has a substantially lower pitch of about 38 degrees which is not shown on the elevation drawings.
 - xi. David Roberts (1911-82) was the most important local architect working in Cambridge in the 1950s and '60s. Many of Roberts' buildings have been demolished, but this should not be taken as a justification for

- further demolition; on the contrary, increased consideration should be given to conserving his remaining buildings.
- xii. Roberts was in practice from 1948 to 1982 and 34 Barrow Road dates from 1956, only twenty years after the pre-war houses in Barrow Road.
 - xiii. The intervening period was dominated by World War II and the post-war creation of the Welfare State; the revolution in society, politics and the economy was matched by a revolution in architecture.
 - xiv. Traditional styles like the late Arts & Crafts of Norman Myers in Barrow Road were swept away. The critic John Summerson said: 'There is now, what there was not before the war, a real school of modern design in Great Britain. ... [There is] an agreement to be radical ... This radicalism is the great thing in English architecture today' (Modern Architecture in Britain, ed. T Dannatt, 1959, p.27). David Roberts designed the house at 34 Barrow Road in this new spirit. His design is as a strong marker of the cultural context of the 1950s as Norman Myers' houses are markers of the cultural context of the 1930s; and its contribution to Cambridge's architectural heritage is far greater than the pastiche Arts & Crafts design of the proposed replacement.
 - xv. 34 Barrow Road is a good design of the 1950s. The taut, geometrical forms and slender detailing were not the result of penny-pinching – they were the aesthetic objective. Compare the two- storey block at 34 Barrow Road with the side wing of Alvar Aalto's celebrated Villa Mairea of 1938-39, a major work of an acknowledged master of modern architecture. Both designs have exactly the same unadorned rectangular massing with evenly-spaced windows of similar proportions; the west-facing windows of 34 Barrow Road have the same asymmetrical arrangement of wide-and-narrow panes. The building cost for 34 Barrow Road was £6000, a good budget for the 1950s: it was an ambitious, deliberately radical design.
 - xvi. Like all buildings of the 1950s, 34 Barrow Road falls short of today's expectations in many respects, such as thermal insulation, kitchen layout and design, provision of bathrooms, etc, but there would be no difficulty in upgrading these features (just at the 1930s houses in Barrow Road are upgraded). The size of 34 Barrow Road is also smaller than would be expected in high-status detached house today. However, it is perfectly possible for a sympathetic design to expand 34 Barrow Road while retaining its architectural character and cultural significance.
 - xvii. The proposed replacement house at 34 Barrow Road is a poor imitation of the Arts & Crafts style that tries to pack a greatly increased floor area onto the site, despite functional shortcomings. It is an inappropriate design that does not respect the quiet, unassuming quality of Norman Myers' pre-war houses. It fails to meet the stated objective of fitting

- comfortably into the existing context and by no stretch could it be called Arts & Crafts.
- xviii. The existing house of 1956 by David Roberts is a good design that is a strong marker of the cultural context of the 1950s. The taut, geometrical forms and slender detailing were a deliberate aesthetic choice, comparable to contemporary work by other major architects. The house could be renovated to meet current performance standards, and expanded sympathetically to retain its architectural character and cultural significance.
- xix. The replacement of David Roberts' house by the proposed design would impoverish the architectural heritage of Cambridge. This view is supported by the Twentieth Century Society and Cambridge Past Present and Future.
- xx. The replacement of this significant building, with this failed attempt to echo the Arts & Crafts style of nearby houses would harm this conservation area. It should be refused under
- Policy 55: Responding to context
 - Policy 57: Designing new buildings
 - Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
 - Policy 62: Local heritage assets
 - NPPF para 124, 127, 194 and 196
- xxi. Others argue that the application should also be refused under Policies 50, 52, 58, 59, 60 and 70. All the arguments put forward should be considered as grounds for refusal.

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

- i. It should be recognised that Barrow Road was a very special road within Cambridge.
- ii. Residents had chosen to keep the road private, retain the gas lighting and preserve the arts and crafts style of the house.
- iii. The existing house at 34 Barrow Road did not intrude on the street scape and was low profile.
- iv. Agreed that development needed as the house had stood empty for a long period of time. The proposed replacement was for a massive structure and out of scale with all the houses in Barrow Road.
- v. The proposed application would dominate the immediate neighbouring properties and cause unnecessary loss of trees.

- vi. Other houses in the area were half the size to the proposed application. Special attention should be given to development in a conservation area which should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- vii. The proposed building was clearly three-storey and should not be referred to as a two-storey building.
- viii. Would urge the Committee to reject the case officers' comments that the proposed house would sit well in the road.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 2 votes to 2, and on the Chair's casting vote) 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.

- i. With delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions of the windows on the second floor (if the windows were above 1.7m in height they would not be obscured glazed but if below a condition would be added for these windows to be obscured glazed) in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

21/78/Plan 21/00383/FUL - 5 Luard Close - 16.30pm

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing house and garage and erection of 5-bedroom house with integral garage and new crossover with dropped kerb.

The Planning Officer referred to details on the amendment sheet highlighting the additional condition requested by the Highways Authority and the drainage condition previously recommended by Highways would be removed as no longer considered necessary.

Drawing number 6321-1 01B shows that the private water generated by the site will not fall towards the adopted public highway and thus the condition requested by the Highway Authority in its comments of 6th July is not required.

The Plan also shows a soakaway in the front garden, and the Highway Authority requests the following condition be applied in respect of the same:

A proposed soakaway to the front of the property be situated so no part of the same is within 5m of any part of the carriageway in Luard Close (this would comply with the guidance within the current building regulations).

Reason: to prevent any potential future degradation of the adopted public highway.

The Highway Authority seeks that the 'site plan' submitted on the 19th July does not form part of the approved documents as it contains information that will relate to the Traffic Management Plan and this has the potential to create conflict between two documents.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a condition be added to include an EV charging point on site.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**

Councillor Porrer requested that the wording to condition 20 be revised to ensure biodiversity net gain and an additional informative added to encourage the use of air source heat pumps as part of the condition regarding carbon reduction.

These amendments were **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 and amendment sheet;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include revised condition 20 and additional conditional for the EV charging point.
- iii. Informative (with delegated authority for officers to draft this in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes) to be included on the planning permission for the use of air source heat pumps.

21/79/Plan 21/00437/FUL - 31 Newnham Road - 17.00pm

This item was deferred.

21/80/Plan 21/00434/HFUL - 167 Chesterton Road - 17.30pm

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that an informative be added regarding a party wall agreement.

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 the conditions recommended by the Officer and the following:

- i. informative (with delegated authority for officers to draft this in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes) to be included on the planning permission for a party wall agreement.

The meeting ended at 6.15 pm

CHAIR