PLANNING

7 February 2024
10.00 am - 5.46 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/11/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Dryden.

24/12/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Bennett	23/02685/FUL Grafton Centre	Use Grafton Centre Shopping Centre. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	23/02685/FUL Grafton Centre	Withdrew from the determination of the application in all respects other than speaking as a Ward Member
Councillor Thornburrow	23/03980/S73 Silver Street Public Toilets and 23/03902/S19LB Silver Street Public Toilets	Was Executive Councillor of Open Spaces at the time of application. Discretion unfettered.

24/13/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/14/Plan 23/02685/FUL Grafton Centre

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

The Committee received an application seeking planning permission for the repurposing of the Grafton Centre for the following:

i) Demolition of 11-12 Burleigh Street and Abbeygate House;
ii) Part demolition and alterations to the Grafton Centre, removal of existing facades, erection of new floorspace for life science use, new and replacement façades and shopfronts, provision of terraces at fourth floor level, installation of plant and enclosures;
iii) Redevelopment of existing bus turning head and redundant service area to provide new hotel and leisure quarter;
iv) New pedestrian access route from Christchurch Street to Burleigh Street, provision of cycle parking spaces, public realm and landscape improvements; and
v) Highway works to East Road providing new bus stops, pedestrian and cycle routes and other associated works.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to the Amendment Sheet:

i. Amendments to text.

The Committee received two representations in objection to the representation on behalf of the Friends of St Matthews Place.

The first representation was, as follows:

I am speaking on behalf of CPPF, Friends of St Matthew's Piece and individual objectors. I hope you have read the email from Friends of St Matthew's Piece explaining our six areas of concern. I will be speaking on the impact of the bulk and mass of the proposal on the skyline and the adjoining conservation areas. We are concerned that the report does not properly set out the impacts of the proposal's design, the large blocks reaching five storeys for over 100m across the width of the site and what impact this has on Cambridge's distinctive skyline, its listed buildings and the adjoining conservation areas. The report before you considers that harm to heritage setting only arises in respect of view 19 from Castle Mound. We disagree. View 20 from Coton Countryside Reserve shows the proposal breaking the skyline right next to turrets of Kings

College Chapel. The result will be to lose, to quote Policy 60, the few taller buildings which emerge as incidents above the prevailing lower buildings and trees. View 17 from Midsummer Common shows how the proposal will result in additional built form behind Christ Church and houses along the southern boundary of Midsummer Common The visualisations from Norfolk Street, across Staffordshire Gardens, from Adam and Eve Street, all on the edge of the Conservation Area, show how the hotel and five storey laboratories will loom over the two and three storey houses and flats. Your Conservation, Urban Design and Landscape Officers as well as Officers from Historic England have all objected to the proposal as being harmful to heritage assets. The Officers considered the revised plans reduce the impact from the upper end to between moderate to upper end of less than substantial harm on heritage assets. Historic England appear not to have commented on the revised plans but were looking for amendment which reduced the impact to that of low level of less than substantial harm. None of your Officers consider this has been achieved. The Planning Officer has disagreed with the specialist Conservation Officer and considers that the degree of harm is moderate rather than moderate to upper. This demonstrates how subjective this assessment is and which is why the Council employs specialist officers. You are then asked to weigh this harm against the public benefits. This is not the only development involving tall building, there is the Beehive, Coldham Lakes, Westbrook Centre, sites on the Science Park, northeast Cambridge, Cambridge East. I appreciate that you can only consider this application on its merits but we're asking you to put significant weight on the impact of the proposal on the skyline. If you don't it will be harder to negotiate on other developments and the skyline will be dominated by bulky amorphous buildings rather than the slim and elegant towers and turrets of the churches and chapels We therefore ask that you refuse this application on the grounds that it is contrary to policies 60 and 61 by adversely affecting the character and/or setting of Grade I and II listed buildings, the historic skyline they create and of the Conservation area and the lives of those who live nearby.

The second representation provided a written statement which was read out by the Committee Manager:

I am unable to speak at Wednesday's meeting but would like to ask that the following is considered and raised in the proceedings. Unfortunately, I have been unable to reach anyone from Democratic Services by telephone but have copied them on my email.

Firstly I'd like to say that I support redevelopment of the Grafton Centre - as it is a well-positioned, underutilised space. However, I feel that there has been

little consideration of how changes will impact the way that residents live in and utilise the local area and that the impact on them has not been taken into account.

My concerns and hence my objection largely pertain to the opening up of Christchurch Street and the plan to create a new entryway into the Grafton Centre at the end of Christchurch Street into the proposed square (Gold Lane). These plans will drive more visitors / traffic into the residential areas next to the Grafton Centre.

Christchurch Street is currently a relatively quiet street with a strong sense of community. Although we are already impacted (sometimes negatively) to a degree by current visitors to the Grafton this isn't on a scale equivalent to even 1/5th of the predicted footfall of people who will be based in the new development. It's likely to greatly impact the living situation and noise levels for the residents, both of the street and the flats.

Additionally there is little ‘after hours’ noise currently; any that we tend to experience is from rough sleepers or the occasional group making their way home after a night out.

Noise / Disturbance /Quality of life

By opening up Christchurch Street and creating the new entry to the Grafton at the end of the street you are also likely to adversely impact the noise levels and situation of residents of the street and the Christchurch flats and their quality of life within their homes. There are also residences directly above Gold Lane on the Christchurch Side and residences directly in line with the proposed entrance.

The new planned entryway comes out directly in line with the bedrooms of 4 Christchurch Street. Despite double glazing the sound is still loud in the house from passers-by. This is likely to be increased hugely by the proposed plans, and is likely to negatively impact on the residents quality of life, both in the home and in the garden. The proposed new entry route to the Grafton /Gold Lane will only be eight metres from the wall of the house and less from the boundary line.

Additionally people tend to congregate at entrances and often smoke at entrances - is it really appropriate to be relocating entrances to directly impact residential properties?

There are existing entrances on this side (Christchurch Street / Newmarket

Road) of the Grafton Centre that don't go directly under or lead out directly onto residential areas. Could more be made of those entrances or spaces to reduce impact on residents?

Noise / Disturbance /Quality of life/Traffic Generation (foot and cycle at the minimum)

I also have concerns around the plans for the 'square' and the proposed access to and from there and potential antisocial behaviours risks out of hours, the detail of this and how they plan to manage this hasn't been described. Will it be gated? Will access be restricted outside of usual office hours? How will noise and anti-social behaviour be managed?

I have had needles, small nitrous canisters and litter thrown over my garden wall on numerous occasions and there is often a lot of noise from people who are passing in various states of intoxication and I can imagine that the square / cut through from the Grafton is likely to increase this traffic into the residential area of Christchurch Flats / Christchurch Street and James Street.

Increased Traffic / Decreased Safety/Noise

Christchurch Street is a relatively narrow street and any increase in cycle / vehicular traffic is likely to have an impact on the residents particularly elderly / less able residents including those of Stanton House, an over 55s community on Christchurch Street.

Safety (involving cyclists) can already be a challenge on the walkthrough between Christchurch Street and the Grafton. We already have problems with cyclists and small motorised bikes often passing through at speed. They also regularly travel down the pavement.

There also appears to be an intention to remove pedestrian traffic down the side of Stanton House to be able to access the portion of Fitzroy Lane. What is the reason for this and has the risk to Stanton House residents been considered? They will then have to cross Christchurch Street to access the walkway on Fitzroy Lane putting them at additional risk and increasing traffic through the walkthrough.

What will be done to manage this traffic? Is there an opportunity to move the gateway away from the pavement so that it is aligned with the 'drop curb' and away from the 'pedestrian pavement' and residents' front doors?

The planned 'cycle hub' is also proposed for this (Christchurch Street / Newmarket Road) side, driving more traffic through these routes. The 'hub'

being on this side drives more cyclists to the ‘residential side’. What are the plans to manage safety, traffic and noise?

Increased Traffic /Noise

I have also found it difficult to easily access detailed plans which indicate these significant changes and where cycle parking is to be located as that is likely to have a negative impact if located near to residential areas in terms of noise, traffic etc. Not all cyclists behave in a careful/respectful way and many travel quietly (not using bells etc) and at speed which is challenging in residential areas particularly those with an older demographic.

We also have a number of cars/ vans which drive down the street at speed while dropping people off for shopping / making deliverie or trying to get to the short stay and just using the street as a turnaround as they’ve taken a wrong turn. This is likely to increase with the ‘cut through’ to Burleigh Street (Gold Lane) being introduced at the end of Christchurch Street.

I don't understand the reasoning for not using Wellington Street or Fitzroy Lane, which are non-residential streets as main access points and factoring those into the redesign. What is the rationale for changing and impacting a quiet residential street in this way and impacting residents’ quality of life? Additionally, using existing entrances would have a lesser impact on residences and are not directly adjacent to residential properties Could the existing entrance near Decathlon be repurposed if an entrance to the ‘square’ is required, this doesn’t pass ‘under’ the flats and at least opens into an unoccupied space and not directly onto houses?

Noise

Sound bounces around the buildings and travels down the back of the properties on Christchurch Street. The volume / occasion of this is likely to increase with increased foot traffic.

Additionally what noise will be produced by the heating/cooling and power provisions for the expanded space of the Grafton Centre? How will this be managed?

Landscaping / Nature Conservation

The 'instant hedging' proposed for planting is likely to be used as a rubbish receptacle in the way that much of the hedging/shrubbery on Christchurch Street is often is used by passers-by / people in vehicles and on occasion shoplifters.

Summary

In summary, I have concerns about the quality of life impacts for local residents from increased noise, cycle traffic and foot traffic from the proposed location of Gold's Lane and don't believe that these impacts have been appropriately considered.

I have additional concerns about the square and Gold Lane being open at all times and the potential for anti-social behaviour and noise at night.

It appears that many of the designs have been made from an appearance perspective and not a practical perspective with consideration to the existing residents and I believe that both of these should be considered together.

Many of the residents in the local area have lived here a long time and enjoy living here - and the impact of the proposed changes on their quality of life should not be underestimated.

I have more personal concerns about the proximity of the proposed 'Gold Lane' to my property and how it will impact my son and I in our home.

I and many of the residents of Christchurch Street are open to discussing our concerns in person if you should so wish.

Mr O'Boyle (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Davy, Cambridge City Councillor addressed the Committee speaking in objection of the application.

Councillor Tong, Cambridge City Councillor addressed the Committee speaking in objection of the application.

Councillor Bick, Cambridge City Councillor (Ward Member), addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer, Cambridge City Councillor (Ward Member), addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved 4-1 (1 abstention) 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 with delegated authority to Officers in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes to include the following additional conditions:

a. an amendment to condition 34 to include for a management plan for anti-social behaviour in respect of all land within the applicant's ownership;

b. amendment to condition 35 providing for the monitoring/management and discouraging casual drop-off/ pick up arrangements for employees arriving by car in the surrounding streets, particularly those north of the Grafton Centre;; and to include informatives on the planning permission in respect of:

ii. jobs for all, heads of terms. Seek to encourage local employment to the site in the interest of minimizing vehicle trips on the network;

iii. highlighting the desirability for the approved travel plan to ensure there were no special privileges which secure/provides car parking within the retained Graton Car Park;

iv. advocating that discussions with City Council officers take place for which endeavour to secure retention of the shop mobility facility; and .

v. regarding water in use and a review at regular intervals.

24/15/Plan 23/03653/S73 Aylesborough Close

Councillor Porrer returned to the meeting prior to this and the remainder items on the Agenda.

The Committee received a Section 73 application seeking to vary condition 2 (Approved drawings) to amend the approved refuse strategy of ref: 22/1995/FUL.

The Committee:

Resolved 5-1 (1 abstention) to defer application. Members requested further information be brought back to a future meeting regarding underground bin scheme as used in another scheme based in Girton.

24/16/Plan 22/05352/FUL Land rear of 18 Adams Road

Item withdrawn at applicants request.

24/17/Plan 23/03389/FUL 54 and 54A Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received an application which seeks retrospective permission for the addition of a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension following the demolition of a rear extension as well as the retention of a barber's premises and the retention of 1 No Studio Flat. The proposal also seeks to change of use of the site from a HMO (Use Class C4) to create a flexible use (Class use Class E and F1) which would result in artist's studio, a communal gallery space, office use, educational use and retail use.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to:

i. Verbal update to Committee.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the representation on behalf of a member of Cherry Hinton and Rathmore Road Residents' Association.

I am making this statement on behalf of the committee of Cherry Hinton and Rathmore Road Residents' Association which looks after the private lane at the back of houses and two business premises. Also, on behalf of the owner and residents of 52 Cherry Hinton Road which shares a boundary with 54 and 54A Cherry Hinton Road.

We are very disappointed that the views of nearby residents regarding proposal 23/03389/FUL have not been accommodated.
The building and parking are immediately adjacent to residents who will be impacted by any changes in use or hours. Recent approval for a block of flats at 56A Cherry Hinton Road just a few metres from the gallery will increase the number of local residents who will be affected.

We have three main objections to the planning proposal: (1) scope of business activity, now and in the future; (2) hours of business; and (3) parking arrangements.

Number 1 - scope of business activity: the gallery front door is inside the private lane and doesn't have an entrance on Cherry Hinton Road. Class E(a) is broad and allows any type of retail activity other than the sale of hot food. Therefore, a future tenant in this property could conduct any type of retail

activity and would also benefit eight free parking spaces and long hours of operation. We therefore request, if possible:

- retail activities be restricted to the sale of artworks;
- retail, educational/social activities be limited to within the building itself and not take place in the parking area and private lane.

Number 2 – hours of business: W3e are very concerned about the proposed long hours of business. In 2020 planning approval prohibited activity on Sundays and Bank holidays. There were to be shorter hours on Saturdays and no business after 6pm. The approval acknowledged the potential loss of privacy and therefore restricted the use and hours.

- Why is it now necessary for a commercial gallery to operate until 10pm on Monday to Saturday? Why on Bank holidays? No other galleries in Cambridge have such long hours. All local evening classes finish by 9pm.
- There will inevitably be noise and traffic movements when people leave the gallery in the evenings.
- Hours longer than those of the established barber's shop tenant mean residents can't easily close the gates to the private lane. We fear the area will become over-spill parking for the night-time economy in the area with an increase in associated anti-social activity.

We request that the permitted hours of business exclude Sundays and Bank holidays and that the business close earlier than 10pm on weekdays and Saturdays.

Number 3 – parking arrangements: it isn't yet clear what the parking arrangements will be. Unresolved issues include provision of cycle racks, a marked disabled space and an EV changing point. These would be helpful to understand so residents can try to prevent an increase in through traffic in the private lane.

Mr Pile (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Griffin, Cambridge City Councillor (Ward Member), addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation, viz:

i. Amend the wording of condition 3 (permitted use hours) to allow for the hours as specified for a temporary one year period.

The amendments were **carried 5-2.**

The Committee:

ii. **Resolved unanimously** 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:

a. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to include the following additional conditions.

iii. amended wording of condition 3 to allow for the specified hours detailed in the draft condition to be for a temporary one year period;

iv. a condition in relation to bin storage; and

v. including an informative in relation to solar panels.

24/18/Plan 23/03980/S73 Silver Street Public Toilets

The Committee received an application seeking Section 73 permission to vary condition 2 (Approved drawings) of ref: 19/1167/FUL (Refurbishment of existing basement toilets and associated works) to include the provision of a new guard rail to the basement stairs and the erection of a replacement wheelchair accessible WC and kiosk (following demolition of the existing wheelchair accessible WC structure) to move the building by 0.9m to avoid clashing with an existing pipe.

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 the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report.

24/19/Plan 23/03902/S19LB Silver Street Public Toilets

The Committee received an application seeking Section 19 to vary condition 2 (Approved drawings) of ref: 19/1350/LBC (Refurbishment of existing basement toilets and associated works) to include the provision of a new guard rail to the basement stairs and the erection of a replacement wheelchair accessible WC and kiosk (following demolition of the existing wheelchair accessible WC structure) to move the building by 0.9m to avoid clashing with an existing pipe.

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. Verbal update at Committee.

24/20/Plan 23/03759/FUL 42 Birdwood Road, Cambridge

The Committee received a full planning application seeking to demolish an existing double garage at the rear of the garden of No. 42 Birdwood Road and erect a single-storey 1 bedroom dwelling in its place.

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. a condition requiring Biodiversity Net Gain to be delivered on site;
iii. a condition requesting details of cycle parking and that if covered by a roof for it to be a green roof; and
iv. an informative in relation to the foundation design to take into account on and off-site trees.

24/21/Plan 23/03317/S73 50 Burleigh Street

The Committee received an Section 73 application to vary conditions 2 (External Area) and 3 (Hours of operation) of planning permission 18/1491/S73 (Section 73 application to vary condition 4 of permission APP/Q0505/A/07/2052528 (Change of use from retail to Adult Amusement Centre) to extend the opening hours until 11pm Monday to Saturday and until 8pm on Sunday) to vary condition 3 to allow the premises to operate from 9am to 2am on Monday to Saturday and from 11am to 2am on Sunday and to vary condition 2 to restrict the use of the rear of the premises from 8pm to 2am Monday to Sunday, noting that this outdoor space is not in use past 8pm.

The Committee:

The Committee voted on the Officer recommendation to approve the application and voted; in favour 0 against 1 and with five abstentions..

The Legal Advisor stated that leaves the Committee in a neutral position, therefore application had neither been approved nor rejected.

Councillor Porrer proposed a vote to defer. It was not seconded therefore it did not pass.

Members resolved on a vote of 2 in favour 2 against and 2 abstentions to refuse the application to extend hours of operation to 2am.

The reason/s for refusal were approved, 5 in favour 0 against 1 abstention.

One reason for refusal authorised by Members to encapsulate the following concerns:

i. Noise
ii. Character
iii. Possibility of Crime

The precise wording for reason/s for refusal delegated to Officers to draft in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

24/22/Plan 23/04342/S73 45 Leete Road, Cambridge

The Committee received a Section 73 to vary condition 2 (Approved plans) of planning permission 23/00455/FUL (Change of use to large 7 bed HMO (7 persons) sui generis. Rebuild and extend existing garage to bedroom 7 including change to pitch roof, and two storey rear extension. (First floor rear

extension, bedroom 6, previously approved under 20/01261/FUL)) adjustments to accommodate different site boundary and changes to the internal layout.

Mr Jackson (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

i. **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 the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report.

24/23/Plan CCC Appeals Report (24.01.2024)

Report noted.

The meeting ended at 5.46 pm

CHAIR