

PLANNING

5 October 2022
10.00 am - 6.20 pm

Present:

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

Councillors Gawthrope Wood and Smart left after the vote on item 22/112/Plan.

Officers:

Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager: Toby Williams
Area Manager (East): Jane Rodens
Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy
Principal Planner: Tom Gray
Senior Planner: Sumaya Nakamya
Senior Planner: Alice Young
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed
Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/105/PlanApologies

No apologies were received.

22/106/PlanDeclarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Collis	22/109/Plan	Personal: was a resident of Aragon Close but had no discussion with residents.
Councillor Porrer	22/108/Plan and 22/109/Plan	Personal: had participated as a Member of the Housing Scrutiny Committee when

		these development proposals were brought through that Committee for approval.
Councillor Porrer	22/114/Plan	Personal: the application was from a business in their Ward but had no discussions with Applicant about the application. Had received emails from students about it but had forwarded those on to the other Ward Councillor colleagues to respond to.
Councillor Gawthorpe Wood	22/108/Plan	Personal: was a resident of Arbury.
Councillor Gawthorpe Wood	22/109/Plan	Personal: was a Ward Councillor but discretion unfettered.
Councillor Gawthorpe Wood and Councillor Smart	22/113/Plan	Prejudicial: both councillors would leave the Council Chamber and not take part in the debate or the decision making.
Councillor Bennett	22/111/Plan	Personal: long term member of CAMRA.

22/107/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

22/108/Plan22-01995-FUL Aylesborough Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing buildings and hardstanding, the erection of 70 new homes, car parking, landscaping, bin and bike stores, substation and associated works.

The Principal Planner updated their report by amending the recommendation set out in the Officer's report and requested delegated authority to draft additional conditions relating to stopping up of the highway and for the construction of a new pavement.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Aylesborough Close.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Block B would face their property and be a dominant building.
- ii. Expressed concerns about overlooking from windows facing their property.
- iii. Expressed concerns about parking.
- iv. New residents would add to existing parking pressures and was aware a neighbour had applied for a disabled parking bay.
- v. One of their trees was proposed to be taken down as part of the application.
- vi. The new buildings would be close to their property; there was no road between their property and the new proposed new buildings.

Jake Smith, Project Manager for the Housing Development Agency addressed the Committee in support of the application.

As part of Member debate the following additional conditions / informatives were requested and voted on by Members:

- i. a condition to secure the remove of PD rights regarding satellite dishes and aerials, this was carried by 5 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 1 abstention.
- ii. a condition securing individual water meters, this was carried by 8 votes in favour to 1 vote against.
- iii. Informatives securing external postboxes, the commissioning of passivhaus standard, e-spur for cycle storage and car club spaces which were supported 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 prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the planning obligations referenced in paragraphs 10.105 of the Officer's report with delegated authority granted to Officers for minor amendments to the reported Heads of Terms;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- iii. the following additional conditions, with delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes:
 - a. highway conditions regarding stopping up of the highway and the construction of a new pavement;
 - b. the removal of permitted development rights regarding aerials and satellite dishes; and
 - c. one which will contain individual flat owners' water consumption to within local plan policy objectives;
- iv. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. e-spurs for cycle storage;
 - b. passivhaus certification standard;
 - c. external post boxes;
 - d. car club spaces.

22/109/Plan22-00583-FUL Aragon and Sackville Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing garages and hardstanding, the erection of 14no houses (7 at Aragon Close and 7 at Sackville Close) together with car parking, green space, landscaping, bin and bike stores and associated infrastructure.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Aragon Close.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The development would result in a net loss of parking spaces for the area. Consideration had not been given to the parking space being lost by the loss of the garages themselves.

- ii. Officers had advised that the garages which were due to be demolished were not used - but this was not the case.
- iii. It was suggested that the open space was not used - but this was not the case and was used daily in the summer by local children.
- iv. Expressed concern about the loss of open space.
- v. Noted that the biodiversity report stated that the development would deliver a net gain in biodiversity. However, a healthy tree was taken down about which the community was not informed.
- vi. The application should be rejected.

Paul Belton (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

As part of Member debate the following additional informatives were approved, unanimously:

- i. the provision of individual water meters; and
- ii. Passivhaus certification standard

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 prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the planning obligations referenced in paragraphs 10.112 of the Officer's report with delegated authority granted to Officers for minor amendments to the reported Heads of Terms;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. provision of individual water meters; and
 - b. Passivhaus certification standard.

22/110/Plan22-00922-FUL Perse Upper School Hills Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of a new sports centre to include a swimming pool, sports hall, climbing wall, entrance lobby, changing

village and plant and storage areas, together with associated car and cycle parking, infrastructure and landscaping.

The Planner updated their report by referring to (i) the amendments contained in the Amendment Sheet and (ii) revised wording of condition 3 to read “The use of the indoor facilities hereby approved shall not commence unless and until a completed Community Use Agreement has been entered into with the local planning authority by the owner of the development and its operator”.

Alison Shakespeare (Bursar of the Perse School) 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 as updated by the amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet;
- ii. the revised text of condition 3 reading ‘The use of the indoor facilities hereby approved shall not commence unless and until a completed Community Use Agreement has been entered into with the local planning authority by the owner of the development and its operator’;
- iii. an amendment to condition 16 to include reference to single occupancy car use; and
- iv. an informative to the permission regarding disabled access.

22/111/Plan21-05549-FUL Emperor 21 Hills Rd

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the retention of building frontage facade and the introduction of a mixed use development comprising basement and ground floor public house and an office/business Use (Class E(g)) to the rear and on the upper floors along with access, cycle parking and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing buildings.

It was noted that the application was in Market Ward, not in Petersfield Ward as stated in the Officer’s report.

The Planner updated their report by referring to the matters included within the Amendment Sheet.

The Committee received three representations in objection to the application.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. expressed concerns about the daylight/sunlight assessment;
- ii. expressed concerns about overlooking;
- iii. felt if the development went ahead they would be forced to live their lives in either public or in darkness;
- iv. expressed concerns about air source heat pumps;
- v. no provision for off-street parking facility meant that illegal and dangerous parking would result;
- vi. appreciated the Planning Officer's site visit;
- vii. Cambridge Place was a cul-de-sac where pedestrians and cyclists shared the passageway;
- viii. offices for up to 100 people would generate more traffic and add to existing demand to park on double yellow lines;
- ix. noted the covid pandemic had shown the importance of outdoor space and noted that fewer pubs had pub gardens;
- x. this application would see the loss of the entire pub garden;
- xi. noted that no accommodation had been allocated to the licensee; and
- xii. the dining area was located in the basement.

Peter McKeown (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Gilderdale (Market Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Did not think that the application was planning policy compliant.
- ii. Expressed concern on highway safety grounds that there would be significant impact on Cambridge Place, St Paul's Place and Hills Road.
- iii. Noted a loss of parking spaces for the pub, which could be used for servicing. Referred to Planning Policy 81 paragraph 9.23. Also commented that the loss of parking for the pub meant that anyone needing a car for accessibility reasons would not be able to park. Referred to Planning Policies 58 and 56(k).
- iv. Expressed concern around the viability of the pub and referred to Planning Policy 76d.

- v. Noted residents had raised concerns about noise from the pub and that this may become worse with the loss of the pub garden. Requested sound proofing if the pub was rebuilt.
- vi. Expressed concern regarding the loss of light for Dazeley House residents and the broader impact on local residents.
- vii. Noted air source heat pumps were proposed to be situated on the roof and thought adverse noise impacts could be minimised if these were integrated internally within the building.
- viii. Expressed concern that there was no construction management plan.
- ix. Questioned how the building would be constructed without impacting on residents; the roads were not suitable and there were no parking spaces.

A vote was taken on the Officer's recommendation for approval of the application which was lost by 2 votes in favour to 4 against and 3 abstentions.

The Committee expressed concerns regarding the development which were summarised by the Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager to include:

- i. impact on residential amenity including light and enclosure;
- ii. impact on servicing and highway safety;
- iii. impact on the viability of the pub including the loss of the pub garden and cellage;
- iv. impact of the size and the massing of the development;
- v. cycle parking.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reasons giving Officers delegated authority to draft complete reasons for refusal in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and Spokes specifically relative to:

- i. the impact on residential amenity including light and enclosure;
- ii. the impact on servicing and highway safety;
- iii. the impact on the viability of the pub including the loss of its pub garden and cellage;
- iv. the impact of the size and the massing of the development; and
- v. cycle parking.

22/112/Plan21-01065-FUL Sandy Lane

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought planning permission for 26 dwellings with a mix of four 4-bed and twenty-two 5-bed and an offer of 9 affordable housing units delivered on an adjacent site.

The application was presently with the Planning Inspectorate on appeal against non-determination which meant that the local planning authority no longer had any power to determine it. The Officer's report sought Members' endorsement of a minded-to position for a refusal decision. Subject to Members' endorsement, Officers would then have approval to submit a Statement of Case to the Planning Inspectorate recommending the application be dismissed on the grounds specified therein.

The Committee received two representations in objection to the application.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. a photograph of Sandy Lane was displayed for Members to see;
- ii. felt Sandy Lane was unsuitable for construction vehicles to drive up and down;
- iii. felt access to the site should be from Elizabeth Way;
- iv. raised concerns regarding car parking if the development went forward noting some residents would not park underground and some property owners would have more than one car and felt that the number of visitors had been underestimated;
- v. noted objections which raised concerns about housing density.
- vi. raised concerns about the impact on De Freville Avenue and Sandy Lane if the development went ahead. There would be lots of movements on these streets from bicycles, e-bikes, cargo bikes, pedestrians and cars;
- vii. noted in the past that a dust bin lorry and fire engine were unable to gain access as the road was partially blocked;
- viii. noted visibility was poor when exiting Sandy Lane into De Freville Avenue;
- ix. noted the Highways Authority would not adopt Sandy Lane;
- x. wanted a traffic management order to regulate Sandy Lane as if it was adopted; and
- xi. asked the Committee and the Planning Inspector to consider the traffic access and safety issues in Sandy Lane.

The Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager advised that paragraph 10.166 of the Officer's report be amended to read 'Delegated authority is granted to Officers to negotiate and complete a s106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in line with the Heads of Terms in paragraph 10.133 of this report in the event that one is required as part of the appeal process'.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to endorse the Officer's minded to refuse position for the reasons set out in the Officer's report subject to:

- i. an amendment to reason for refusal 2 to include a reference to air source heat pumps;
- ii. an amendment to reason for refusal 4 to include a reference to gated communities and social cohesion;
- iii. an amendment to reasons for refusal 2 and 4 regarding stepped access;
- iv. the amendment to paragraph 10.166 of the Officer's report as recommended by the Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager; and
- v. delegated authority to Officers to draft the amendments detailed above and to include reference to the appropriate NPPF policies.

22/113/Plan19-1453-FUL Sha Jalal Mosque

Councillor Gawthrope Wood and the Chair Councillor Smart withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making for the item.

Councillor D.Baigent as Vice-Chair, chaired the Committee for the determination of this application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for:

- (1) a two-storey extension with single storey projecting bay for a Mimbar pulpit;
- (2) an increase in the total number of occupants permitted at any one time for the community use of the ground floor of the premises on:
 - (i) Saturday to Thursday between 09:00 hrs and 23:00 hrs with up to a maximum of 29 occupants;
 - (ii) Friday between 09:00 hrs and 12:00 hrs with up to a maximum of 29 occupants and;

- (iii) on Friday between 12:00 hrs to 16:00 hrs with up to a maximum of 37 occupants and;
- (iv) on Friday between 16:00 hrs and 23:00 hrs with up to a maximum of 29 occupants.
- (3) (i) The community use on the ground floor of the premises between 09:00 hrs and 23:00 hrs Monday to Sunday inclusive;
- (ii) A 30 minute opening for morning prayer between 02:50 hrs and 07:00 hrs, Monday to Sunday inclusive, with up to a maximum of 29 occupants; and
- (iii) during the period of Ramadan only, between 23:30 hrs and 02:30 hrs the following day, for up to 2 hours, Monday to Sunday inclusive, with up to a maximum of 37 occupants.

The Committee received two representations in objection to the application from residents of Darwin Drive.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. represented themselves and 25 other people / 17 properties within the vicinity of the application site;
- ii. a petition had been submitted objecting to the application;
- iii. objected to the increased hours of use and the number of people attending as this would adversely impact the residents nearby;
- iv. noise and disturbance would be caused during the night;
- v. noted that different versions of the planning application had been submitted but the impact assessment by officers had not changed;
- vi. in 2011, the North Area Committee rejected the application on the grounds that it would adversely affect residential amenity;
- vii. the application would increase the size, scale and intensity of use of the site and cause unacceptable noise at night;
- viii. requested that due weight was given to the professional opinion of those advising the Committee and reasons be given if Members disagreed;
- ix. referred to NPPF paragraph 180 and Cambridge Local Plan Policy 35 and said the same rules should apply to all community rooms in the area;
- x. considered planning permission granted on a trial basis would place the onus on residents to prove disturbance which was tricky to do;
- xi. noted that an Environmental Health consultation response from August 2022 stated that the application could have potential significant adverse noise impacts. The World Health Organisation detailed what these impacts might be; and
- xii. expressed concerns about breaches of planning conditions.

A representative of the Applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Interim Development Management and Planning Compliance Manager advised the Committee that following the judicial review of its Committee decision on 1 December 2021, the Court subsequently quashed the Council's decision to grant planning permission hence the Committee must now consider the application afresh as now presented. The description of the planning application had been amended to include reference to Ramadan and to more accurately reflect what the applicant was seeking.

Following Member discussion around a temporary permission being granted for part 3(iii) of the application proposal, the Interim Development Management and Planning Compliance Manager commented that in their opinion a temporary permission with regard to part (3)(iii) of the Applicant's proposal would be unreasonable given the integral nature that part (3)(iii) has with the use of the building nevertheless, that there was some flexibility regarding a temporary permission for part 3(ii) of the proposal.

Members voted on the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application for the reason set out in the Officer's report. There were no votes cast in favour but a unanimous vote against accepting the Officer recommendation.

Officers asked Members to provide reasons for supporting approval of the application contrary to the Officer recommendation which were given as follows.

- i. Did not oppose the extension the use of the building had been on-going for some 20 years.
- ii. Approval would enable Ramadan to be held/ celebrated enabling the building to be used for its purpose; it was an important provision for the community.
- iii. Considered the increased hours and people as set out in the Applicant's proposal 3(ii) should be conditioned for a year to ensure that the Management Plan was robust and being met.
- iv. Considered the issues regarding noise overnight could be managed through robust conditions and through a time limited permission.
- v. Wanted a robust noise management plan particularly for noise arising from those arriving and exiting the building.
- vi. The potential noise from the site during the morning, the afternoon and the evening time, would be no more than that created by people talking in the street or vehicle noise similar to background noise.

- vii. Considered Ramadan was a short period and an important community festival. Christmas celebration and student May Balls were not dissimilar.
- viii. Expressed concern with the early morning hours [02.50-07.00] and requested a temporary permission and a noise management plan, which included the need for monitoring decibel readings.

At this point the Legal Officer reminded Members they were in a neutral position and whilst they had voted against accepting the Officer recommendation they had made no other resolution. He referred Members to the advice which had been provided by the Council's Environmental Health Officer reminding Members of the last two sentences of the Officer's reason for refusal which stated: 'The application site is in a residential area consequently the use of the site and the building is not considered appropriate for any further intensification of their use. The mitigation measures being proposed to overcome harm are not considered appropriate or sufficiently robust to overcome the identified to the amenity of the neighbouring properties'.

Members indicated that they were minded to approve the application. The Planning Officer shared a proposed list of draft conditions on the television screens within the Council Chamber and talked Members through them.

Time Limit

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

Plans

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the below approved plans:

- 107 (02)
- 01 A Site Location Plan

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Materials

3 The materials to be used in the external construction of the development, hereby permitted, shall match the existing building in type, colour and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 58).

Opening Hours and Occupancy

Pre-extension – Standard opening hours and maximum number of occupants

4 Prior to the completion of the two-storey extension hereby permitted the ground floor of the premises: (i) shall not be occupied by more than 20 people at any one time; and (ii) shall only be in use between the hours of 09.00 and 21.00 Monday to Sunday and 09.00 and 22.30 Monday to Sunday throughout the months of June and July.

Reason: To ensure that there is no intensification in the use of the building in order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent residential properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 73).

Post-extension – Standard opening hours and maximum number of occupants

5 Following the completion of the two-storey extension hereby permitted, and subject to parts 6, 7 and 8, the ground floor of the premises: (i) shall not be occupied by more than 29 people at any one time; and (ii) shall only be in use between the hours of 09.00 and 23.00 hours Monday to Sunday.

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

Post – Extension – Friday prayer maximum number of occupants

6 Following the completion of the two-storey extension hereby permitted, on Fridays between the hours of 12:00 and 16:00 the ground floor of the premises shall not be occupied by more than 37 people at any one time.

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

Post Extension – Early morning opening (if to be temporary for 1 year)

7A The ground floor of the premises shall only be in operation between the hours of 2.50am – 7.00am for 30 minutes Monday – Sunday for a temporary

period of 1 year only from the date of the completion of the extension after which the use between these hours shall cease.

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

Post Extension – Ramadan Time-Limit

8 Following the completion of the two-storey extension hereby permitted, the ground floor of the premises shall be permitted to be in use during the period of Ramadan only for a maximum of 120 minutes between the hours of 23:30 and 02:30 the following day, Monday to Sunday inclusive. During this time the ground floor shall be occupied by no more than 37 people at any one time.

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

Noise report

9 During the operation of the community facilities on the ground floor the recommended mitigation measures detailed in the Noise Report (2184_FP01.0 V2 and 2184_AC_2.0) shall be put into and remain in place.

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

Transport Statement

10 During the operation of the community facilities on the ground floor the mitigation measures detailed in the Transport Statement (1710-34/TS/01 Rev A) shall be put into and remain in place.

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

Management Plan

11 Prior to the completion of the permitted extension, the Management Plan of the Community facility shall be updated in line with the recommendations of the Transport Statement, Supporting Statement and Noise Reports and agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The agreed Management Plan shall be put into and remain in place following use of the extension.

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

Cycle Parking

12 Prior to any works above slab level of the permitted extension, details of the cycle parking shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed cycle parking shall be retained and maintained for the community use.

Reason To protect the amenity of adjoining residential properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 82).

Limitations of the Flats

13 The occupation of the first floor residential flat hereby permitted shall be limited to persons directly associated with the group or management of the community facility.

Reason: To protect residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

Rear Garden

14 The rear garden shall be used solely in conjunction with, and ancillary to, the residential flat hereby permitted and shall not be used, occupied or let for any purpose other than for private residential purposes.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining residential properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

Community Use

15 The community use hereby permitted relates solely to the ground floor of the building. The upper floor and rear gardens shall not be used for any purpose other than private residential use.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining residential properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35).

Hard and Soft Landscaping

16 Prior to the use of the permitted extension details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme (excluding the private residential garden associated with the first floor residential unit) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:

- a) car parking layouts, hard surfacing materials; signs, lighting
- b) planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme;

c) boundary treatments indicating the type, positions, design, and materials of any new boundary treatments to be erected. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place as soon as is reasonably practicable, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 69).

Traffic Management Plan

17 No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The principal areas of concern that should be addressed are: i) Movement and control of muck away vehicles (all loading and unloading should be undertaken where possible off the adopted public highway) ii) Contractor parking, with all such parking to be within the curtilage of the site where possible iii) Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway where possible.) iv) Control of dust, mud and debris, and the means to prevent mud or debris being deposited onto the adopted public highway. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before development commences, highway safety will be maintained during the course of development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

First Floor Side Window

18 The development, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the proposed first floor study window in the south west elevation of the development has, apart from any top hung vent, been fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity and shall be fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

Members voted unanimously to amend proposed condition 8 to express the maximum occupancy at both before and after construction of the extension during the Ramadan period.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to grant planning permission subject to the above conditions with an amendment to condition 8 to express the maximum occupancy at both before and after construction of the extension during the Ramadan period.

22/114/Plan22-0778-FUL Varsity Hotel and Spa

Following a vote to determine whether the Committee would extend beyond 6pm, Committee resolved not to do so, consequently this application was deferred to a future Committee.

22/115/Plan22-01504-FUL 196 Green End Road, Cambridge

Following a vote to determine whether the Committee would extend beyond 6pm, Committee resolved not to do so, consequently this application was deferred to a future Committee.

22/116/PlanTree Works 76 De Freville Avenue

Following a vote to determine whether the Committee would extend beyond 6pm, Committee resolved not to do so, consequently this application was deferred to a future Committee.

22/117/PlanEnforcement Report October 2022

Following a vote to determine whether the Committee would extend beyond 6pm, Committee resolved not to do so, consequently this report was deferred to a future Committee.

The meeting ended at 6.20 pm

CHAIR