

**PLANNING**

7 September 2022  
10.00 am - 2.50 pm

**Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Bennett, Dryden, Gawthrope Wood, Page-Croft, Porrer and Thornburrow

Also present (virtually) Councillors: Carling and Scutt

**Officers:**

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Senior Planner: Tom Gray

Senior Planner: Charlotte Spencer

Senior Planner: Nick Yager

Senior Planner: Alice Young

Principal Planning Enforcement Officer: John Shuttlewood

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

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

**22/92/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Baigent and Collis.

**22/93/Plan Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Gawthrope Wood	22/97/Plan	Personal: Knows Suez Road residents. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	22/99/Plan	Personal: Knows the owner and involved in pre-app meeting.  Would not take part in discussion or decision making.

Councillor Porrer	22/103/Plan	Personal: Contacted by interested party, but referred them to Tree Officer. Discretion unfettered.
-------------------	-------------	--

### **22/94/Plan Minutes**

No minutes were presented at Committee for review.

### **22/95/Plan 22-02618-S73 Lockton House**

The Committee received an S73 application to vary condition 2 of ref: 20/04826/FUL (Demolition of Lockton House and 1&2 Brooklands Avenue and replacement with two new buildings comprising offices (Use Class E), flexible commercial space (Use Class E) to include a cafe, underground parking and utilities, erection of covered walkways, electricity substation, bin stores, access, cycle parking and associated hard and soft landscaping) for the retention of the gable wall of 1-2 Brooklands Avenue and associated alterations to form and appearance of Building A, installation of PV panels on Building A and B, air handling plant decks on Building A and ventilation screen to ramped vehicle entrance to Building B to meet net zero carbon aspirations, fenestration changes, and other minor material amendments.

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

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for S73 permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to conditions and the prior completion of a S106 Agreement as set out in the Officer recommendation.

### **22/96/Plan 22-02030-FUL Rear of 1 Priory Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a new single storey dwelling.

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

- i. There has been an attempt to characterise the Benson Area as being subject to general infill. This was not the case:
  - a. 15 houses have been built onto Westfield Lane.
  - b. 18 houses have been built onto North Street.
  - c. 4 houses have been built onto Canterbury Street.
  - d. There was a difference of scale between the gardens of the houses facing the main roads, and those in the original terracing in the Benson.
  - e. This mattered when a developer decided to divide a plot in two (the plot, not the garden).
  - f. It meant that the brick wall proposed for number 1, which would replace a fence and greenery, would extend almost three quarters of the way down Objector's back garden, ending 7m from their back door. A back door was not shown on the maps presented, as they omit the extensions at numbers 3 and 5, erected, with planning permission, in 2007 and 2004 respectively.
- ii. There had been an attempt to characterise the land as a "brownfield site".
  - a. It was a well-tended and much-loved garden, with accompanying shed, in a conservation area.
  - b. Referred to public comments on the Planning Portal about the value of gardens to the area.
- iii. There has been an attempt to portray the development as neutral to all but the most immediate neighbours.
  - a. Residents of Priory Street did not want this precedent. Westfield Lane was a narrow road so work would be intrusive. Residents believed placing a house on the corner of Piggy Lane – the name of the un-adopted gravel track – would either block or make unsafe their use of the narrow lane to access their gardens and garages.

In response to councillor comments whilst debating the application the Senior Planner proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to include a:

- i. Landscape condition.
- ii. Condition requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3)** 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 amendments to the Officer's recommendation to include a:

- i. landscape condition; and
- ii. condition requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

### **22/97/Plan 22-01952-FUL 108 Suez Rd**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear, and rear roof extension including a Juliet balcony. Erection of new linked 2 bed dwelling and associated works.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a boundary treatment condition which should provide for the inclusion of a gate allow access to the site.

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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the amendment to include a boundary treatment condition that included gate demarcation.

### **22/98/Plan 19-1453-FUL Shah Jalal Mosque, 107 Darwin Drive**

Due to issues with the description of development, Officers recommended Councillors should not determine this item today.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to withdraw the application from today's Agenda.

### **22/99/Plan 22-01784-FUL Prospect Row**

Councillor Porrer withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

The Committee received an application for change of use to residential with first floor extension.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1)** to grant the application for change of use 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.

### **22/100/Plan21-00809-FUL Cambridge Snooker and Pool Centre**

Due to issues with the description of development, Officers recommended Councillors should not determine this item today.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to withdraw the application from today's Agenda.

### **22/101/Plan22-02127-FUL 611 Newmarket Road Cambridge**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing house and erection of eight flats and one maisonette (net eight new homes) together with ancillary works.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to updated recommendation wording on the amendment sheet.

The recommendation as laid out in the Officer report is incorrect. The application is now at appeal for non - determination. Therefore, the Council can no longer determine the application. Officers are asking Members for the recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate seeking dismissal of the appeal.

Recommendation of page 1, para 1.5, para 9.80 and para 10.1 are incorrect. Officers are asking Members to endorse the Officer recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate to dismiss the appeal.

To endorse the Officer recommendation and request that the Planning Inspectorate DISMISS the appealed application for the reasons as set out in the Officer report at pages 139 – 140.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to endorse the Officer recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate seeking dismissal of the appeal.

**22/102/Plan22-02519-HFUL 19 Fortescue Road, Cambridge Committee**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey front extension.

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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**22/103/Plan22-0669-TTPO Tree Works 76 De Freville Avenue**

The Committee received an application to:

- i. APPROVE removal of T1 subject to conditions.
- ii. REFUSE crown reduction of T3.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of De Freville Avenue:

- i. A TPO was placed on T1 tree by the council on 6 June 2022. A proposal to fell this tree was submitted to the council just 3 weeks later.
- ii. Two independent professional assessments undertaken on behalf of the neighbour, confirmed the tree was not significantly decayed nor at risk of failing. A forest ecologist advised there was no sign of bough failure or anything else that would raise concern for safety issues and confirmed that the tree was healthy.
- iii. T1 was a valuable public amenity.

- iv. If there was any decay, crown reduction work was more appropriate than felling.
- v. Requested the proposal be refused, or deferred to allow further investigation to ascertain the viability of T1.

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

- i. Many residents had contacted Ward Councillors. They were concerned about T1 proposed work, but agreed T3 needed tree work.
- ii. The Applicant originally intended to remove six trees but had now amended this to two trees.
- iii. Referred to the independent assessments sourced by Objectors that could not be shared with Councillors in committee today as they were unable to receive new information after the agenda had been published.
- iv. Disagreed with the Officer's report that few people wanted to retain the tree.
- v. Requested the proposal be refused, or deferred to allow further investigation to ascertain the viability of T1.

The Committee:

**Resolved (5 votes to 2) to defer the application.**

## **22/104/PlanEnforcement Report September 2022**

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

On 30th July 2022 there were 136 open cases, including 61 Short Term Visitor Accommodation investigations.

In July 2022, 21 new cases were opened and 29 investigations were closed.

In July 2022, two formal enforcement notices were served.

**The Committee:**

**Noted** the Officer's report.

The meeting ended at 2.50 pm

**CHAIR**