

PLANNING

6 September 2023
10.00 am - 7.15 pm

Present:

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

Councillor Flaubert left after the vote on item 23/85/Plan.

Councillor Dryden left after the vote on item 23/86/Plan.

Councillor Baigent left after the vote on item 23/90/Plan.

Councillor Carling withdrew from the Committee for item 23/88/Plan and spoke as Ward Councillor for this item.

Officers present in person:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Senior Planner: Tom Chenery

Senior Planning Officer: James Truett

Senior Planner: Nick Yager

Senior Planner: Alice Young

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunnicliffe

Officer present virtually:

Principal Planner: Tom Gray

Principal Planner: Michael Hammond

Senior Planner: Mary Collins

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

23/80/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Levien, Councillor Flaubert attended as alternate.

23/81/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Carling	23/88/Plan	Would speak as Ward Councillor and not take part in debate or

		decision.
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Bennett	23/88/Plan	Personal: Had responded to an email sent from an objector but had copied email to officers. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Bennett	23/91/Plan	Personal: Had involvement with Landlord. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Flaubert	23/83/Plan and 23/84/Plan	Personal: The application fell within their ward. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Baigent	23/83/Plan and 23/84/Plan	Personal: Had attending a wedding at Anstey Hall.
Councillor Carling	23/86/Plan	Personal: Was a student at Cambridge University but had no involvement with the application as attended a different college.

23/82/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23/83/Plan 20-01426-FUL Anstey Hall

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the:

- i. Construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom apartments.
- ii. Change of use of land to public open space. Change of use of Anstey Hall to mixed uses including ancillary use on the lower ground, ground and first floor to serve the residential retirement community; 5x staff accommodation on the second floor; a C3 private flatted dwelling on the second floor; and 7x short -term guest accommodation on the ground and first floor.

- iii. Demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link, provision of pedestrian access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of wall, hard and soft landscaping, car parking and pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road.

The Principal Planner updated their report by referring to the amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet advising a formal Committee Member site visit had been undertaken on 30 August. The reasons for refusal 7 and 8 had been amended to the following:

- i. Reason for refusal 7 - insufficient information was submitted in regard to an energy strategy for the site that followed the energy hierarchy. In addition, the proposed layout of the retirement accommodation blocks lacked cross-ventilation to satisfy an adequate overheating strategy being in place therefore, the proposal failed to be in accordance with Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020).
- ii. Corrected a typographical error in reason for refusal 8 – should state ‘refuse’ strategy and not ‘refuge’.

Mr John Adrian de Bruyne (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Piper Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Did not have any objections to the proposal in principle and would accept the proposal for retirement homes.
- ii. Was concerned about the proximity of certain parts of the development to Piper Road.
- iii. The north-west corner of Block C showed a part of the building which came out close to the boundary of Piper Road. Page 50 of the agenda, section 9.146 stated the distance to the nearest property was 42 metres. However, our measurement on the plan was 18 metres.
- iv. The applicant had since said that they could remove the corner part of the building design which would be acceptable.
- v. The access road to Block C was shown on the plans as being very closer to Piper Road, which would destroy several trees. The applicant has said that this would not be case, hoped this statement was correct.

- vi. Expressed concern regarding the height of the blocks and whether this would have a negative effect on the visual impact of the surrounding environment.

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

- i. There were a variety of views among Trumpington residents about the general purpose of the application. Some local businesses have submitted statements in support of it. The plan to open the grounds of Anstey Hall to the public was welcomed by many.
- ii. Would like to highlight several concerns from local residents about the possible impact of this development on their neighbourhoods in particular, to the Anstey Hall Barns and Trumpington Meadows areas, both during construction and after completion of the building works.
- iii. A big concern was access to the development, mainly in terms of the construction traffic, but also in the longer term.
- iv. The applicant had told the residents of Anstey Hall Barns that all of the traffic (both construction and ongoing) would use the road to the east of Anstey Hall, i.e. up the side of the Waitrose site (Old Mills Road), and not along the western access road that was shared with Anstey Hall Barns, and that access to the western wing of the development would be via a road going through the development site and across the Park area. However, this change of access arrangements was not reflected in the documentation on the planning portal and not referred to in the amendments to the scheme listed section 2.0 Clarification and Amendments to the Scheme in the Planning, Design and Access Statement (Planning Statement Nov. 2022 Including DAS dated 20 Dec 2022). The planning application and site plan clearly show access points from the east and west of the development site from Maris Lane (see the document entitled Existing Site Plan 20 Dec 2022), whilst some of the documentation submitted by the applicant in support of the planning application also refers to access points to both the east and west of Anstey Hall (together with a new access point from Maris Lane opposite the entrance to Anstey Hall itself).
- v. An access point to the west of the development site would present the residents of Anstey Hall Barns with a significant problem. The access road to Anstey Hall has not been built to a standard which would take the weight of construction traffic or, subsequently waste, removal, or large delivery vehicles. Part of the road has already had to be completely rebuilt because of subsidence, which was hugely disruptive to residents. They are particularly concerned that they do not have to undertake such an exercise again.

- vi. A related problem was the issue of access to the site by waste disposal vehicles. The access road to Anstey Hall Barns was still unable to take the weight of waste disposal vehicles (up to 32 tonnes). Residents take their bins. down the access road and onto Maris Lane for collection.
- vii. All traffic to and from the site, particularly construction traffic, waste disposal vehicles, removal and delivery vehicles, should be required to enter the site via Old Mills Road into the site and not via the shared access road with Anstey Hall Barns.
- viii. Residents were concerned about the parking arrangements, both during the development phase and once the development has been completed. The parking provision near to the retirement flats is significantly insufficient for the residents themselves. The applicant had referred to several local amenities (including the restaurant and swimming pool within the development site itself, the local Waitrose and Sainsbury's supermarkets, the Park and Ride facilities, and the bus stops on Trumpington Road) and suggests that the proximity of these mitigates the need for residents of the retirement village to own and use their own cars. However, access to all of these would require quite lengthy walks, yet many of the residents are likely to have limited mobility.
- ix. It seemed inevitable that the limited parking provision would have a significant impact on local areas, including Maris Lane, Grantchester Road and Trumpington Meadows, as well as the Anstey Hall Barns site.
- x. Adequate parking provision must be ensured within the retirement village, both in terms of residents' parking and visitors' parking.
- xi. The document entitled Planning, Design and Access Statement (Planning Statement Nov. 2022 Including DAS dated 20 Dec 2022) suggests that an area of land shown hatched blue (which falls within the Anstey Hall Barns development is owned by the applicant's company, Trumpington Investments Limited) can be designated as alternative protected open space (pp.91 and 125). Given the loss of protected open space within the development site itself, this land should be designated as alternative protected open space. This area of land had a rich biodiversity with over seventy different species of wildflowers (evidence can be provided, if required) and is home to various bird and other wildlife (including bats). There were ecological conditions and orders made by Cambridge City Council on the planning discharge 14/10159/ Condition 14 with legal documentation. Giving this land the status of protected open space would be beneficial to plants and wildlife and would provide valuable drainage.
- xii. The hatched blue area of land within the Anstey Hall Barns development should be designated as protected open space.

- xiii. The residents are aware that Anstey Hall is a Grade 2* listed building (downgraded from Grade 1). However, they remain concerned that the development of 87 apartments in two three-storey buildings may be too intensive for this location and may be intrusive on the setting of Anstey Hall itself and on adjacent homes. The visual impact on the surrounding skyline could be overbearing.
- xiv. The height of the residential buildings should be taken into serious consideration.

County Councillor Philippa Slatter addressed the Committee with the following points:

- i. When the City Council designed the 2006 Local Plan it recognised the need for more housing in the city and identified Trumpington for a new urban extension.
- ii. Greenbelt land was taken at Clay Farm, Glebe Farm and the former Plant Breeding Institute (PBI), resulting in three large residential developments to the east, south and west of the earlier village, with the provision of new schools, health and community buildings for all.
- iii. The older historical buildings of Trumpington continue to create a good sense of place visually and socially.
- iv. There was no purpose-built provision for older residents as part of the 2006 local plan. Since 2006 five of the six local supported living homes had been lost.
- v. In the 1980's Anstey Hall was a dark and decaying building hidden from public view. When the applicant brought the hall he talked in terms of eventually creating a retirement home in the grounds while the resurrection of the Hall continued. Residents would periodically be invited to attend community events.
- vi. When Waitrose was developed there was an opportunity to view Anstey Hall from the side expanded by the development of Trumpington Meadows.
- vii. Trumpington, a multicultural village, made good use of the heritage of its building and modern community facilities. Anstey Hall as a retirement village could add to community life as well as creating new homes for older people.
- viii. There was public access to the grounds, the historic building, the swimming pool and café area offering mutual benefits for new residents and the rest of Trumpington. Residents of Anstey Hall would be welcome to join local community projects.
- ix. Asked the Committee to go against Officer recommendation and approve the application.

The Committee:

Councillor Porrer proposed that the second reason for refusal (paragraph 9.191) should be spilt so that the material considerations are clearer with the specific wording delegated to Officers. This was carried nem con.

Councillor Bennett proposed to defer the application in order to secure further information for Members to consider, which was seconded by Councillor Flaubert.

The proposal was lost by 2 votes in favour to 6 against.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report and the Amendment Sheet and with delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes to further consider the second reason for refusal with a view to amending it to accord with the Committee's resolution concerning its phrasing.

23/84/Plan 20-01427-LBC Anstey Hall

The Development Management and Planning Compliance Manager advised the Committee this item concerned only the listed building matters pertinent to the previous application.

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent.

The application sought approval for the demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and the erection of an orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link. Reconfiguration of wall to restore historic access onto Maris Lane.

The Amendment Sheet contained amendments to the Officer's report.

John Adrian de Bruyne (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

County Councillor Slatter (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Disagreed with the Case Officer that there was a lack of public benefit from the application. Benefit had been felt with the transformation of the Hall made by the current owner.

- ii. Noted a form of agreement regarding community access had been mentioned but considered that this needed to be spelt out.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer report and the Amendment Sheet.

23/85/Plan 22-05304-FUL 286 Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of 1 no. replacement two storey dwelling.

The Senior Planning Officer updated the report by referring to the Amendment Sheet in relation to alterations to several paragraphs within the Officer report.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from 294 and 282 Cherry Hinton Road.

The representation covered the following:

- i. Supported development on the site but objected to the design.
- ii. The kitchen / diner window of 294 Cherry Hinton faced 220 degrees southwest to the development and would be overshadowed.
- iii. The BRE assessment of internal light, distribution of daylight measured by the skyline view, as concluded by the base energy report submitted, proved that there would be a reduction of light by 31% in the kitchen diner of 294 Cherry Hinton Road. This would cause loss of light within the room and failed BRE guidance.
- iv. Near by doors would not allow direct light into the kitchen or light from a southwest direction. These areas would be unchanged adjacent to the kitchen and could not compensate for the 31% loss of daylight distribution. This would reduce the amenity of the kitchen diner, which was contrary to Local Plan policy 57.
- v. It was inappropriate to assume that a formal dining room previously used as an accessible bedroom could always be for dining. The room did not compensate for the loss of light in the kitchen diner.
- vi. With regards to 282 Cherry Hinton Road, the Officer's report incorrectly stated that the kitchen windows of the habitable kitchen were directly adjacent to the current house. Only one window was overshadowed, the

other provided light to the rear of the habitable kitchen. This rear window of the habitable room did not pass the 45-degree angle test which was not shown on the current plans. It was unlikely to pass BRE guidance, yet unlike for 294 Cherry Hinton Road, the applicants had not provided a day light study.

- vii. The Officer's report also incorrectly stated that the proposal would be no closer to 282 Cherry Hinton at ground floor. Currently just one small bay window was 1.7metres from 282 Cherry Hinton Road's boundary.
- viii. The plan showed the building would be 1.1metres from the ground floor boundary and 1.6 metres at first floor, a length of 15 metres approximately overbearing and overshadowing both kitchen windows, reducing the amenity of habitable rooms in 282 Cherry Hinton Road, which was not in accordance with Local Plan policy 57.
- ix. Welcomed the condition of obscured glass to all east and west facing windows.
- x. The application would reduce the amenity of the adjacent properties, which was contrary to Local Plan policy 57.
- xi. Light studies had not been carried out for 282 Cherry Hinton Road's habitable kitchen.
- xii. The design failed BRE guidance for the habitable kitchen of 294 Cherry Hinton Road's habitable kitchen.
- xiii. Asked the Committee not to approve the application until the design was reduced in size so that the kitchen windows of 282 Cherry Hinton Road passed BRE guidance.
- xiv. The first floor should be reduced to be more in keeping with the rear extent of the adjacent properties alleviating overbearing and loss of light. All of which could be achieved without loss of amenity to the application site as believed there was an excessively large non-habitable hallway and gallery plan which could be reduced.
- xv. A good person should treat their neighbour as they wished to be treated. Sunlight was needed for residents.
- xvi. The proposed design would overshadow and steal light from the neighbouring properties; yet the applicant advised that the double storey would not pass the original house.
- xvii. Had a right to sunlight.

Mr Michael Fleming, MKE Architecture and Mr Paul Giesberg (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Griffin (Coleridge Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Was pleased that a derelict building would be replaced with a well-designed, modern, sustainable house.
- ii. Had visited both of the objectors properties and considered that the objectors had legitimate concerns regarding light and asked the Committee to take this into consideration when making their decision.

Councillor Porrer proposed and Councillor Bennett seconded the proposal that an additional condition be added to any planning permission restricting permitted development to the new build, Classes A, B and C

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 as amended within the Amendment Sheet subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted; and
- ii. an additional condition to remove permitted development rights in respect of Classes A, B and C with delegated authority to Officers to draft the wording of the condition.

23/86/Plan 22-04976-FUL 26 Barton Road

Councillor Flaubert left the meeting before the consideration of this item.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the change of use from student accommodation (Class C2) to a children's nursery (Class E(f)) and minor external works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application:

- i. The top floor of 2 Grange Road did not only consist of bedrooms.
- ii. Their property was bounded on two sides by Barton Road. Their boundary was threatened by the application.
- iii. The application would cause a significant impact of noise. Referred to the Sweco noise report where noise recordings had been taken outside Owlstone Croft when eight children were playing outside and twelve children were playing under cover. Noise impact was unacceptable.
- iv. Questioned how the outdoor area would be able to be restricted to eight children.

- v. There would be a significant adverse effect if the development went ahead.

Robert Griggs (Applicant's Representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Development Management and Planning Compliance Manager advised Members that conditions 1 and 2 were the same in the Officer's report and that condition 1 should be altered to the standard 3-year commencement condition.

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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the amendment to condition 1 identified by the Development Management and Planning Compliance Manager resulting in applying the standard 3-year commencement condition.

23/87/Plan 22-04891-HFUL 25 Devonshire Road

Councillor Dryden left the meeting before the consideration of this item.

The Committee received an application for a householder planning application.

The application sought approval for a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension and the addition of rooflights.

The Senior Planner updated the report by referring to additional third-party representations which had been received on 5/9/23 and 6/9/23. It was noted that one of the representations received on 5/9/23 had been included on the Amendment Sheet and the Planning Officer read this out to the Committee. The Planning Officer verbally updated the Committee regarding the second and third, third-party representations received on the 5/9/23 and 6/9/23. The second representation critiqued the Officer's report on the basis that it lacked assessment of material considerations. It raised concerns regarding the proposal's impact on the character of the area, the conservation area which is a designated heritage asset, ecology and handling of the application by the Local Planning Authority. By the third representation the objector wished to talk to visual materials when exercising their speaking rights.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application:

- i. Was not against sympathetic policy compliant extension to 25 Devonshire Road. Extensions should sit behind established building line. Avoiding harm to neighbouring amenity and adverse impacts on the Conservation Area.
- ii. Referred to other extensions by neighbouring properties and that these were built behind the building line.
- iii. Disagreed with the Officer's statement of the planning balance.
- iv. Considered the application should be refused due to poor quality and non-contextual design which caused unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity and Conservation Area. Absence of public benefit as required by the NPPF.
- v. Noted cumulative impact of two extensions on the next door property in terms of height, bulk, mass, scale and design. These were overbearing, failed to be subservient and had a visually dominating impact on neighbouring properties.
- vi. Afternoon and evening light would be blocked all year round.
- vii. Noted there was only one rear first floor extension in the road which had been approved in 2015.
- viii. Development was contrary to Local Plan policies 58 and 61.

Elizabeth Banks (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Referred to the presentation / photographs / drawings the objector asked to show the Committee.
- ii. Application proposed extension to ground floor and first floor level. At ground floor this would project another 2.25m into the garden. The height of the extension was 2.7m however the ground was lower at 24 Devonshire Road so this would have more of a dominant effect on them, taking light from them.
- iii. Noted the glass structure at first floor level was constructed without planning permission but as this was largely constructed out of glass it allowed more light through it.
- iv. The effect of the proposed first floor structure being constructed out of brick would reduce the light going into the garden of 24 Devonshire Road.

- v. The proposed extension would be outside of the building line and detrimental to the Conservation Area.
- vi. Gardens at Devonshire Road were short, did not think such a large extension should be permitted.
- vii. Noted that no drawings accompanied the daylight assessment report.
- viii. Considered the application failed to comply with Local Plan Policy 58. The extension was too large; the light study was inadequate, and a site visit should have been carried out.

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

23/88/Plan 23-01039-FUL 45 Highworth Avenue

Councillor Carling withdrew from the Committee and spoke as Ward Councillor for this item.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for residential redevelopment comprising two detached dwellings to the rear with garages on the site frontage along with cycle parking and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing buildings on site. The application was a resubmission of application number 22/05407/FUL.

The Planning Officer updated the report by referring to amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet. This included the removal of paragraph 9.2 of the Officer's report; an amendment to condition 18; an additional permitted development rights removal condition. An additional representation from the owner/occupier of 6 Hurst Park Avenue was detailed.

The Committee received two representations in objection to the application. The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Noted the Committee had previously refused an application on this site with a subsequent appeal having been dismissed. Questioned why a Statement of Case was not submitted by the Council.

- ii. The current application had a greater footprint for the dwellings. An increase from 312sqm to 390 sqm.
- iii. Queried assumptions used for the biodiversity baseline.
- iv. Advised that the new proposal would have an even greater impact on the six houses whose amenity would be affected by the overbearing nature of the two houses.
- v. The proposed design was ugly and out of character with the surrounding street which is predominantly 1920's and 30's houses. The angled roof pitches make the proposed buildings extremely tall compared to the existing dwelling.
- vi. The previous two planning applications were refused by Committee on the basis that they were starkly out of keeping with the verdant rear garden environment and that the scale bulk and form was inappropriate. Considered the current application did nothing to mitigate that judgement and had made the situation worse.
- vii. Noted three of the reasons the previous application was refused and advised why these were relevant now.
 - a. Firstly the proposed scale, bulk and form of the dwellings at the rear of the site would appear as inappropriate back-land development, The proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area contrary to Local Plan policies 52, 55 and 57.
 - b. Secondly, the excessive length, height, form and bulk of the northwest facing elevation and its return would result in a significant overbearing impact upon the rear garden of No.51 contrary to Local Plan policies 52, 55, 56 and 57.
 - c. Thirdly, due to the limited gap between the rear gardens of 43 and 47 Highworth Avenue and the proposed dwellings, and by virtue of the proposed scale, bulk and form of the dwellings, the proposal would result in an unacceptable sense of overbearing upon the rear gardens of 43 and 47 Highworth Avenue. Contrary to the above policies.
- viii. These reasons were still relevant because the developer proposed to increase the footprint of the buildings by a further 25%.
- ix. The most concerning issue was the matter of ingress and egress faced by the emergency services due to the construction of a garage/office block at the front of the site. Building Regulations fire safety policy 13.1 stated that "access for a pumping appliance should be provided to within 45m of all points inside the dwellinghouse". It was almost 60 metres to the rear of the dwellings while emergency vehicle access would be restricted to the roadside. The extra time needed by the fire and rescue

service to deploy extension hoses meant an increased risk of loss of life, despite any provision of mitigation measures.

- x. Asked the Committee to refuse the application.

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

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

- i. The application was overdevelopment of the site at the expense of local residents.
- ii. Felt previous reasons for refusal which were not upheld by the Planning Inspector should not be cast aside as the current application was so different to the previous application.
- iii. The footprint of the application had increased by 25%. The proposed new dwellings were out of character compared to the existing dwellings in the street and obliterated the current green space on the site.
- iv. The application was contrary to Local Plan policies 52, 57 and 55.
- v. Referred to clearance of vegetation on site before the application was submitted which would affect the calculation for biodiversity.
- vi. Referred to previous reason for refusal five which centred around biodiversity. Noted the garden provided a biodiversity corridor. Asked the Committee to note that the size of the dwellings had increased. Removal of the vegetation had not been considered. Eighty-two residents had objected to the application.

The Committee:

A vote was taken on the Officer's recommendation to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the Officer's report as amended by the Amendment Sheet with delegated authority to Officers for minor amendments to conditions.

The vote on the Officer's recommendation was lost by 1 vote in favour to 3 against with 1 abstention.

The Development Management and Planning Compliance Manager provided Members with a draft reason for refusal reflecting the concerns expressed by Members in debate for rejecting the Officer's recommendation, viz

- i. The proposed scale, bulk, excessive footprint and form of the dwellings at the rear of the site would be over and above the dismissed appeal scheme 21/01476/FUL and would appear as inappropriate back-land

development, starkly out of keeping with the verdant rear garden environment in which the properties would be located. Additionally, the front garage and office block would represent poor design and fail to assimilate successfully into the street scene. The proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and therefore contrary to Policies 52, 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

The Committee approved the reason for refusal by 4 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention and delegated authority to Officers to finalise the wording of the reason for refusal with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokes.

23/89/Plan 22-05070-FUL Land to the Rear of 208 and 210 Queen Edith's Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

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

The Planner updated the Officer report by referring to updated wording for condition 30 as set out in the Amendment Sheet and a further representation requesting clarification on the width of the access.

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 as updated within the Amendment Sheet.

23/90/Plan 22-05599-FUL 132 Hobart Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission for the change of use from Class C4 (HMO) to sui generis large (HMO) (7no. bedrooms - 7no. occupants) and the erection of an outbuilding in the rear yard.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) 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 with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as

drafted including an amendment to condition 9 to ensure that the resident of the outbuilding had unrestricted access at all times to the communal spaces of the main building.

23/91/Plan 23-00600-S73 Calverley's Brewery, 23A Unit 1, Hooper Street

Councillor Baigent left the meeting before the consideration of this item.

The Committee received a S73 application to vary conditions 2 (noise management plan) and 3 (external areas) of ref: 20/02619/S73 (S73 to vary condition 5 of ref: 19/0902/FUL (Change of use from existing automobile repair shop (vacant unit) to a mixed use Class B2 (micro-brewery) and Class A4 (drinking establishment) and installation of cycle storage facilities) to vary condition no.2 to read as: "Operation of the premises to be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted/approved Noise Management Plan" and to vary condition no.3 to read as: The external seating area for patrons shall be strictly limited to the 17.5sq m seating area as shown by the blue line within approved drawing number P101, including accessing this seating area from inside. This external seating area shall only be used by patrons during the following hours: Tuesday to Thursday: 16:00-21:00, Friday: 16:00-22:00 and Saturday: 12:00-22:00"

Sam Calverley (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Noted the Committee had deferred the application to see whether a condition regarding noise was appropriate and could be agreed but was aware this was not possible.
- ii. Noted residents had attended the previous Committee some exercising their speaking rights raising concerns about noise if patrons were able to sit outside.

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

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

CHAIR