

PLANNING

2 August 2023
10.00 am - 5.50 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Carling, Levien, Porrer and Thornburrow

Also present (virtually) Councillor Bird

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams
Principal Planner: Aaron Coe
Senior Planner: Mary Collins
Senior Planner: Tom Chenery
Senior Planner: Sumaya Nakamya
Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet
Senior Planner: Alice Young
Senior Planning Officer: Laurence Moore
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

Other Officers Present:

Housing Advice Partnerships Manager: Simon Penn

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

23/66/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Dryden.

23/67/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridgeshire Cycling Campaign.

Councillor Porrer	23/69/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Family members live adjacent to the application. Withdrew from discussion, and did not vote.
Councillor Carling	23/70/Plan	Personal: Sat on Housing Scrutiny Committee which had discussed pods for homeless people. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	23/70/Plan	Personal: This item relates to non-City Council housing pods. She sits on Housing Scrutiny Committee. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	23/72/Plan	Personal: Knew the Applicant socially. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	23/77/Plan	Lives next to St Matthews Piece. Spoke on behalf of residents on the previous tree application.

23/68/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23/69/Plan 23/01081/S73 11 Queen Ediths Way

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

The Committee received a S73 application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of ref: 20/02172/FUL (The erection of new buildings to provide 40 serviced apartments (sui generis) together with hard and soft landscaping, basement car parking spaces and associated infrastructure and works) for the following:

- i. Removal of the consented basement level and associated infrastructure.
- ii. Revised siting of above ground bin enclosure.
- iii. Revised site of plant room and enclosure.
- iv. Relocation of stair and lift core, and main entrance to block B.
- v. Minor changes to the arrangement of openings to block B.
- vi. Amendments to wording of conditions 19 (management plan), 25 (electrical services) and 34 (provision of Blue Badge Parking Spaces) to reflect changes to approved drawings.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Queen Ediths Way who objected to the:

- i. Reduction in number of car parking spaces, it was unreasonable to expect 5 spaces to be used by 40 people. The number of spaces proposed were insufficient. This would negatively impact nearby streets.
- ii. Impact of the application on neighbouring properties.
- iii. Loss of privacy caused by moving the lift to Queen Ediths Way and associated overlooking.
- iv. Placement of planting on roof. Queried noise and heat mitigation measures to reduce the impact on neighbours.
- v. Placement of bins and bin store. There was no clear management strategy.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Holbrook Road. Written statement read by Committee Manager:

- i. Document (2661-10-03-B) dated 15 May 2023 did not provide enough details about the protection and preservation of boundary's hedges along the border which were very mature (20 yrs Old). The hedges were important to the Objector and acted as a privacy shield for them from the site. Off-late had observed there was quite an amount of work happening on the site and were concerned the contractor involved in the building work might damage the hedges. Urged the Planning Committee to advise the property owners/contractors to take all care in safeguarding the existing hedges all along the property boundaries and not damage/remove them no matter the outcome of this proposed development.
- ii. As per the site shadow study document (20-02172-FUL) dated 6 May 2021 from the previous planning application, Block B would block the sunshine the Objector received at the moment. The newly proposed

development plan would overshadow their house located in Holbrook Road and would cause detrimental damage to Objector's mental health and well-being.

- iii. Block C of the development appeared to be exactly adjacent to Objector's back garden touching the hedges as shown in the (2661-10-03-B) document dated 15 May 2023. With no wall separating the boundaries it might pose a security issue for Objectors and also become very noisy once occupied.

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

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. A management plan was required to ensure waste bins were not moved too early in the day.
- ii. The property design needed to take into account climate change and the size of full grown trees.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to grant the S73 application for in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), 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 amend condition 31 regarding the hours of bin collection;
- iii. an informative to be included on the planning permission that the foundation design would take into account climate change and the size of full grown trees.

23/70/Plan 23/01366/FUL Land Adjacent to 39 Hills Avenue

The Committee received an application for change of use of land to allow siting of 4 modular homes to provide accommodation for homeless people, together with associated access and infrastructure, on Land adjacent to 39 Hills Avenue, Cambridge.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to:

- i. Corrections on the amendment sheet.
 - a. Paragraph 7.1: The third-party representations received have increased to 18.
 - b. Paragraph 8.59 - minor typo, it should read "5 years" rather than 10 years, this was to reflect the recommended condition 3 which was suggesting a 5-year temporary permission.
- ii. Tree T2 and T4 were protected by Tree Protection Orders but T1 was not. It was managed by the local authority.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Baldock Way. Written statement read by Committee Manager:

- i. Much had been made of the fact that the proposed dwellings were for homeless people. Suggested that this risked distracting the committee from its primary focus, which was to decide whether the buildings were suitable in design for the location. They were not. Objected to this planning application because the proposed buildings did not respect the existing character of the area around. With few exceptions, the houses in this and surrounding streets have two storeys and pitched roofs. Single-storey flat-roofed buildings were simply not appropriate, whatever their intended use. The jarring visual impact would only be heightened by the way that they would project beyond the building line in Hills Avenue.
- ii. There was a desperate shortage of affordable housing in Cambridge. This plot would be ideal for two houses which could provide homes for several people. The proximity to a nursery and a primary school would make them ideal for families with children. There were doubtless many such families on the council's waiting list. The proposal to site temporary, prefabricated units on the plot would simply cause further delay to a sensible development.

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

- i. Houses in the area were a hundred years old and part of the 'Homes for Heroes' project.
- ii. Was concerned about neighbours' wellbeing and the impact of the application on their lives.
- iii. The garden site was not big enough to include four homes. Suggested 2 or 3 homes were more appropriate for the site Was concerned over loss of garden space.

- iv. Was concerned about loss of privacy for occupier of 39 Baldock Way.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Baldock Way. Written statement read by Committee Manager:

- i. Lived across the road from the proposed development. Had recently attended a meeting on the site, with 'It Takes a City' at which local residents were able to hear more of the proposals. Residents overwhelmingly felt this was an overdevelopment of the site, and that if residents lost the current community garden then 2, rather than 4, pods would be far more appropriate for a site of this size and location. For the project to be a success the views of current residents, as well as those moving into the area, needed to be respected and considered.
- ii. This area was a very green and leafy garden suburb. It mainly comprised of 3 bedroom family homes. Placing 4 pods on this site, was too many for a garden suburb feeling to be retained. The pods would breach the current building lines on both Baldock Way (by circa 4 metres), and Hills Avenue (by circa 7 metres, equivalent to almost 2 pod widths). The planned pods were entirely out of keeping with more traditional style houses around the site, which date back to the 1920's and have front and back garden spaces, with no breach of building lines.
- iii. If the proposal went ahead, 1 of the 2 trees with preservation orders on them, would have to be cut down, the other a Sweetgum would have the branches cut off to a height of 3.5m above ground level to create headroom for the pod. This would destroy the look of this tree in its prominent position on the corner of Hills Avenue and Baldock Way. The proposed permeable paving and drainage encroached into this trees root protection area, which could be detrimental to its survival.
- iv. Was concerned that the vent pipe for the sewer drain which was to be put in alongside the bike / bin store at the back of the footpath on Baldock Way would emit smells from the sewer into the air.
- v. If there were to be 2 pods, all existing trees could be retained and there would be more natural garden space for residents to enjoy, which we know was so vital to mental health. There would also be less impact on the immediate neighbours.
- vi. Questioned the design of the proposed landscaping which included wood fencing at 1.5 metres high on the back of the footpaths and 2.1 metres high on boundaries with adjoining houses. There were also raised plant

boxes for new plants. Was this fencing really needed and could the plants along the site boundary not go directly into the ground, giving a far more natural feel to the garden, as currently existed?

- vii. Queried placing this project in this residential area, which was very different to the Newmarket Road site, to which it was being compared. The Newmarket Road site had easy access to support networks, shops, the football ground, cafes, and a swimming pool. This area had no such amenities nearby. This aspect was important as the residents would only be here for a year at a time, before moving on, so need places which provide opportunities to meet others quickly, and feel part of a community, before moving on to their more permanent homes.

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

Councillor Bird (Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Modular home made a big positive difference to the homeless community.
- ii. No anti-social behaviour was expected from tenants.
- iii. Hoped to build as many pods as possible for homeless people around the City.
- iv. Asked all city residents to notify the Executive Councillor of land (additional sites) where pods could be sited.

The Committee Manager read out the following points on behalf of Councillor Davies (Ward Councillor):

- i. It was clear from conversations she had with individual residents and the feedback provided at the onsite drop-in organised by It Takes a City earlier in the summer that, while many residents were supportive in principle of this application, they were concerned by the degree of over development of the site. They, and Cllr Davies, expressed a marked preference for three pods rather than four. This would enable the retention of the open aspect of this corner plot referred to in the officer's report and also the retention of at least one tree now slated for removal.
- ii. Hoped committee would be able to recommend this approach for reconsideration by the applicant. Given the Applicant's desire for

community goodwill towards, and support for the site, this seemed like a positive compromise.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. Amend Conditions 10, 12 and 14 to refer to protected trees and roots.
- ii. Include a soft and hard landscape scheme that referenced boundary treatment.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) 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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the following amendments to conditions:

- i. amend Conditions 10, 12 and 14 to refer to protected trees and roots;
- ii. include a soft and hard landscape scheme that referenced boundary treatment.

23/71/Plan 22/04891/HFUL 25 Devonshire Road

Application deferred to a future Planning Committee due to error in consultation document sent to neighbour.

23/72/Plan 22/03855/OUT 3-5 Fen Road

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The application sought approval for the development of 2 No. dwellings and associated works in rear garden of 3-5 Fen Road with some matters reserved except for access, layout and scale.

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

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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the

Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

23/73/Plan 22/05070/FUL Land to Rear of 208-210 Queen Ediths Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 8 new homes, car parking, landscaping, bin and bike stores and associated works.

Mr van der Vyer (HDA Programme Manager) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councilor Baigent proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded deferring the application to allow cycle parking to be made policy compliant.

The Committee:

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

23/74/Plan 22/03731/S106A Land Between Bridewell Rd and Lucerne Close

The Committee received an application for modification of planning obligations contained in a Section 106 Agreement dated 20 December 1993 made between (1) Cambridge City Council and (2) Granta Housing Society Limited.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for modification of planning obligations 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.

23/75/Plan 23/01014/FUL 159 Vinery Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of an existing dwelling and outbuilding, and the construction of 3no. four bedroom houses and 1no. five bedroom house, with associated external works, including a new dropped kerb road access, and bicycle, refuse and recycling stores

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to encourage implementation of air source heat pumps.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Bennett proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to encourage water usage of under 110L per person.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an M42 condition.

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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), 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 an additional M42 condition;
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission to encourage:
 - a. water usage of under 110L per person;
 - b. implementation of air source heat pumps.

23/76/Plan 23/00199/FUL 145 Perne Road

The Committee received an application for change of use of existing HMO to 4 No. flats including two storey rear extension and new bin and bike store.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident (written statements read by Committee Manager):

- i. This was a residential area, and changing the usage of the house to flats means that the number of people in this small area would dramatically increase. A total of 6 bedrooms, potentially each with a double bed, could mean up to 12 people at the property. This was overcrowding.

Believed they were buying in a residential area, with a standard residence next door. Did not expect that it would suddenly become a high-density area.

- ii. Three of the four entrances to the flats were at the side of the property adjoining Objector's property, so the high volume of foot traffic accessing these flats at the side of their house was also a safety and security concern.
- iii. The access area to these three flats shown on the documents appeared to be over the boundary to Objector's property. The boundary line didn't seem correct, it appeared to be wiggly where the line as per the property deed was a straight line.
- iv. The substantial two storages extension would certainly block light to Objector's property, which was not acceptable as per the Right to Light (Date Added: 2 January 2023).

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

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the intended use of the property should be agreed by Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Carling proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a 10% biodiversity target in Condition 6.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. M42 condition.
- ii. Encourage cycle parking at the front of the property.

The 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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- ii. amend Condition 6 to include a 10% biodiversity target;
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. the intended use of the property to be agreed by Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes;
 - b. M42;
- iv. an informative included on the planning permission to encourage cycle parking at the front of the property.

23/77/Plan TWA 23/0119/TTPO - St Matthews Centre

Application deferred to a future Planning Committee to allow more time for a Councillor briefing and to address queries about technical issues with further details in the Officer's report.

23/78/Plan TWA 23/0159/TTPO Howes Place

Application deferred to a future Planning Committee to allow more time for a Councillor briefing and to address queries about technical issues with further details in the Officer's report.

23/79/Plan Owlstone Croft, Owlstone Road - Planning Appeal - APP/Q0505/W/23/3323130

The Planning Committee resolved to exclude members of the public from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The Committee received a report regarding planning application 22/02066/FUL at Owlstone Croft refused at Planning Committee on 11 January 2023. An appeal had been lodged against this decision.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to note the officer report.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

CHAIR