

PLANNING

14 June 2022
10.00 am - 4.00 pm

Present:

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

Also present (physically) Councillor: Bick

Officers:

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Area Manager (East): Jane Rodens

Senior Planner: Mary Collins

Senior Planner: Sumaya Nakamya

Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet

Senior Planner: Charlotte Spencer

Senior Planner: Alice Young

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/59/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden and Page-Croft (Flaubert attended as her Alternate).

Councillor Bennett expected to arrive in the afternoon session.

22/60/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Collis	22/62/Plan	Prejudicial: Was the current Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Food Justice and

		Community Development so would not take part in the discussion or debate at this Committee.
Councillor Porrer	22/62/Plan	Prejudicial: Would speak as Ward Councillor to object to this application, and therefore would not take part in the debate or vote for this item.
Councillor Thornburrow	22/62/Plan	Prejudicial: Spoke as former Executive Councillor when application last brought to Committee so would not take part in the discussion or debate at this Committee.
Councillor Smart	22/64/Plan	Personal: Knows the agent. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	22/64/Plan	Prejudicial: Knows the applicant so would not take part in the discussion or debate at committee for this item.
Councillor Bennett	22/65/Plan	Personal: Member of CAMRA. Personal: Advising on remuneration arrangements for The Ship Pub.
Councillors Collis, Gawthroe Wood and Smart	22/65/Plan	Personal: Application in King's Hedges where s/he is a Ward Councillor. Discretion unfettered.

22/61/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

22/62/Plan 22-00801-FUL, Parkers Piece - 10am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought permission to locate the Observation Wheel for a further four years, on each occasion being erected between 22 March and 10 September with public operation between 1 April - 31 August each year, after grant of current permission ref: 21/01392/FUL for 2021 season expires.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Prospect Row:

- i. The city attracted many visitors. Trip Advisor listed the Big Wheel as an attraction, 166/185 on their list.
- ii. Parker's Piece was a key open space for many people.
- iii. The Big Wheel would take away public amenity and be used by a limited number of people.
- iv. The Big Wheel was unpopular with residents across all city Wards.
- v. The Big Wheel had an impact outside its physical footprint e.g. people could not play ball games near it.
- vi. The Big Wheel structure was semi-permanent and its site would be cordoned off when the Big Wheel was removed to let the grass regrow. It was an object unsuitable for the area.

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

- i. Took exception to the Big Wheel which would ruin a protected open space.
- ii. Drew comparison with what happened to the swimming pool and protected open space on Donkey Common/Parker's Piece in the 1990s. Residents and two local Councillors had to object to overturn a proposal accepted by the Planning Committee. The plan was called in by the Planning Inspector and overturned.
- iii. The Big Wheel was an unsuitable structure for the area.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of York Street:

- i. Suggested the Big Wheel structure was not temporary as it would be in place for six months.
- ii. The Big Wheel structure was unsuitable for the area.

- iii. Open space was being sacrificed for commercial interest. Expressed concern that open space was being lost in return for little economic benefit.
- iv. The Big Wheel would be replaced by an ice rink so open space would be lost for most of the year.

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

- i. This application had nothing to do with the ice rink.
- ii. The Big Wheel was initially contracted (between the City Council and Applicant) to run for one year (last year).
 - a. There were seventy thousand bookings to use the wheel from a range of people (e.g. weddings, family groups including grandparents).
 - b. People travelled from across East Anglia to use the Big Wheel e.g. old school friends (who had not met in years) had travelled from Norfolk to meet at the Wheel.
- iii. The ride was all electric so there were no noise issues and there was a dedicated power supply to Parker's Piece.
- iv. There was lighting on the ride but it was never turned on due to planning conditions restricting operating hours.
- v. Parker's Piece was used by a variety of events such as Big Weekend.
- vi. The Applicant and Council have a contract for a five-year operation. The Big Wheel generated revenue for the Council and was one of the few operators that paid the Council money to use Parker's Piece.
- vii. The Applicant looked at various sites around the City and considered Parker's Piece to be the best site. It would attract visitors into the City.
- viii. The Applicant hoped to start operations in April but these have been delayed until July (if planning permission were approved).

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

- i. He did not raise objections to the Big Wheel in 2021 as it appeared to be a benefit then e.g. a visitor attraction to allow economic recovery from the pandemic (it was one of the few that could go ahead).
- ii. His view had changed in 2022. Social distancing had now ended. There was a variety of events available on Parker's Piece and other areas. The special conditions of 2021 had gone away.

- iii. The Big Wheel did not attract many people in 2021 when there was little competition. Other activities could now make better use of space on Parker's Piece. There was little support from City centre businesses and little support from residents/stakeholders.
- iv. This was not a temporary structure. It would dominate the open space for six months every year, for four years. This conflicted with the Parker's Piece Conservation Plan. The ground could not be used whilst the open space recovered from the Big Wheel e.g. reseeding of grass.
- v. The Big Wheel damaged the ospace so mitigation measures were needed e.g. replacement of turf.
- vi. Did not support the application.

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

- i. There were many concerns from across the City about the Big Wheel.
- ii. There were no planning grounds to accept the application. Referred to details set out in the Officer's report.
 - a. No evidence of economic or public benefit.
 - b. Harm to open space was not temporary. It would last seven months out of twelve. Mitigation measures such as returfing were not sustainable as the Big Wheel would undo them each time it was erected.
- iii. Did not support the application.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative to look at options to improve the carbon footprint of the development such as solar panels on the Big Wheel gondolas.

This amendment was **carried by 3 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the informative to look at options to improve the carbon footprint of the development such as solar panels on the Big Wheel gondolas.

Councillors Bennett, Collis Porrer and Thornburrow did not take part in the discussion or decision making on this item.

22/63/Plan 19-1324-FUL, 102-108 Shelford Road - 10:30am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for refurbishment and extension of existing semi-detached dwelling known as 102-104 Shelford Road to create 6no. flats. Demolition of semi-detached dwelling (known as 106-108 Shelford Road) and erection of three storey apartment block (containing six flats) all with associated parking and landscaped amenity areas.

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

- i. Strongly objected to this planning application both in the initial and revised forms.
- ii. 102-108 Shelford Road was originally developed and currently provides 4 residential family dwellings represented by 2 semi-detached buildings with front and back gardens, drive and parking space(s). The building design and theme is typical to this area of Shelford Road from the Addenbrookes Road junction to Trumpington Street. These family dwellings are a maximum of 2-storey and are detached/semi-detached houses with gardens. Even the residential buildings opposite 102-108 Shelford Road that have been converted to flats retain their original façade and 2-storey elevation. Any new development in this area must respect and be sympathetic to the existing buildings and streetscape. The planned imposing new buildings with 12 apartments with balconies at 102-108 and the 3-storey plan for 106-108 Shelford Road would distract from the intended and existing character of this Cambridge suburban road.
- iii. The new development will provide 12 apartment dwellings dramatically increasing the population density in this small land area. Many of the apartments have balconies facing the rear and the intended parking and outdoor areas are to the rear of the development at the sensitive boundary adjacent to Trumpington Place. This will dramatically increase the noise levels both from the residents and their vehicles from what is currently a lovely peaceful neighbourhood. The elevated rear facing balconies will overlook residents' properties and gardens on Trumpington Place and as such will invade their privacy.

- iv. Surface water and sewage drainage is directed from Trumpington Place to pipes and wells on Shelford Road. There have been a number of incidents when common sewage pipes(s) have been blocked resulting in a back flow of raw sewage into garden wells. Anglia Water have informed residents that the existing network of pipes is old, overloaded and not fit for purpose. Any further increase in volume caused by residents of 12 apartments can only exacerbate the existing situation.
- v. The intersection of Addenbrookes Road and Shelford Road is extremely busy with traffic in all four directions particularly at peak times when traffic can be at a standstill. Recent improvements at this intersection have enabled traffic to flow more freely and increased the safety of pedestrians, dog-walkers and cyclists. The intended driveway to the proposed new development is dangerously close to this intersection and will undoubtedly interfere with the free flow of traffic and act as an additional hazard to cyclists and pedestrians.
- vi. There is already very limited street parking on or near Shelford Road with many residents and/or their visitors parking in side streets, on pavements and grass verges. This results in street parking congestion, access problems for the general public to pavements and the destruction of grass verges. The proposed parking area for the development will be insufficient for the residents and their visitors who will look to park in the aforementioned areas exacerbating the problems and causing a hazard to other vehicles and pedestrians.
- vii. A number of mature trees would need to be felled for the development to go ahead. These trees are a hive of biodiversity and provide a small sanctuary for wildlife in this rapidly developing area. The trees also provide some shelter, sound dampening and reduce air pollution to the neighbourhood.

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

- i. The development is inappropriate for the area.
- ii. Design does not respect the character and context of the site and surrounding area.
- iii. Impact of overlooking and loss of privacy.
- iv. Increased noise and disturbance.

- v. Surrounding roads and access.
- vi. Misleading information within the Bidwells' Planning Statement.
- vii. There have been surface drainage issues in Trumpington Place, causing flooding in gardens and the paved area inside the estate. Anglian Water reports that the drains for Trumpington Place are connected in a "Y" formation to the house behind Trumpington Place on Shelford Road. There have been blockages, backing up into Trumpington Place drains, hence the concern that further blockages could occur particularly with the increased number of residential units.

Mrs Thompson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative that the converted flat should have a lift provision so it was M4(2) compliant.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Councillor Bennett joined the Committee part way through the discussion on this item so did not take part in the vote.

Resolved (by 7 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the informative that the converted flat should have a lift provision so it was M4(2) compliant.

22/64/Plan 22-00857-HFUL, 41 Barrow Road, Cambridge - 11am

The Applicant asked for this item to be deferred to the next Planning Committee as some of the information they wished to present to make their case was not currently in the public domain so could not be considered by the Committee enabling it "to make a balanced decision".

The Committee:

Resolved by 6 votes to 0 to defer the application.

22/65/Plan 22-00278-FUL_ Former Jenny Wren - 11:30am

Councillor Flaubert left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a 3 storey building with flexible use at ground floor containing Use Class E or a Sui Generis Pub or drinking establishment with nine residential units on the upper floors, along with landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated infrastructure.

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

- i. Expressed concern that the loss of the Jenny Wren would mean that people had further to travel to visit their local pub.
- ii. The City Council put in planning conditions in 2017 to ensure a pub would return. It has not although permission was in place for the developers (to use).
- iii. Inadequate marketing of the site as a pub meant the focus was on using it as a building site.
- iv. The site had multiple uses at present, some were community focusses, some not. The current application did not help community well-being.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to amend Condition 31 so the managers flat (as shown on the first floor plan) is included in the re-marketing of the ground floor unit.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0.**

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to add a balcony to unit S9.

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 1.**

The Area Manager suggested adding a privacy screen to the balcony.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 1.**

The Committee:

Resolved (3 votes to 3 – 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, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer’s report;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include an additional condition to add a balcony to unit S9 with a privacy screen;
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to amend Condition 31 so the managers flat (as shown on the first floor plan) is included in the re-marketing of the ground floor unit as required by condition 31.

22/66/Plan 21-00483-FUL, The Guildhall, Market St, Cambridge - 12pm

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for installation of 6No. antennas on 3No. on new offset brackets & support poles installed on new climbable tripod support, mounted on new steel grillage frames. Installation of radio equipment within existing equipment cabin and removal of existing 6No. antennas and replaced with 6No. antennas fixed to wall and braced back to upper roof level and new ancillary equipment.

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

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer’s recommendation requiring the removal of redundant telecommunication equipment where appropriate.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0.**

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the informative to remove redundant telecommunication equipment where appropriate.

22/67/Plan 21-00484-LBC, The Guildhall, Market St, Cambridge - 12:30pm

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for installation of 6No. antennas on 3No. on new offset brackets & support poles installed on new climbable tripod support, mounted on new steel grillage frames. Installation of radio equipment within existing equipment cabin and removal of existing 6No. antennas and replaced with 6No. antennas fixed to wall and braced back to upper roof level and new ancillary equipment.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to grant the application for listed building consent 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.

22/68/Plan 22-01870-HFUL, 15 Bulstrode Gardens - 1pm

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey and first floor rear extensions, side and rear roof extensions, and relocation of front porch.

Councillor Nethsingha (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application. [The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf of the Applicant which addressed the Committee in support of the application].

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

22/69/Plan 22-0096-FUL - Land adj Kendal Way - 1:30pm

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a 3bed dwelling including landscaping and parking.

Councillor Bennet proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an external power source for disability scooter or powered chair.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a cycle store should be included at the front of the property.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. A larger space should be provided for bike storage.
- ii. To include a green or brown roof on the bike store.

The amendments were **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional condition:
 - a. details to be provided of a cycle store to cater for 3 standard/adapted bikes, plus structure details eg green/brown roof;
- iii. to include an informative requesting an external power source and covered area for disability scooter or powered chair.

22/70/Plan June City Enforcement Report - 2pm

The Committee received an information report from the Principal Planning Compliance Officer.

On 30th April 2022 there were 140 open cases, including 61 Short Term Visitor Accommodation investigations. The previous figure at the end of February was 161.

In March 2022, 15 new cases were opened and 21 investigations were closed.

In April 2022, 29 new cases were opened and 14 investigations were closed.

The Committee:

Noted the Officer's report.

The meeting ended at 4.00 pm

CHAIR