

PLANNING

11 June 2024
10.00 am - 6.28 pm

Present:

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

Officers present in person:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Senior Planner: Alice Young

Principal Planner (CIP and SCIP): Aaron Coe

Legal Adviser: Richard Pitt

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunncliffe

Principal Engineer Major Developments: Tam Parry (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Officers present virtually:

Principal Planner: Katie Christodoulides

Principal Planner: Dean Scrivener

Senior Planning Officer: Dominic Bush

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/28/Plan Apologies

No apologies were received.

24/29/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Bennett	24/31/Plan	Personal: Lived close to the application site. Would not participate as committee member and would instead speak as Ward Councillor.
Councillor Bennett	24/32/Plan	Personal: Lived close to the

		application site. Would not participate as committee member and would instead speak as Ward Councillor.
Councillor Bennett	24/38/Plan	Personal: Noted the application was in their ward but had not participated in any pre-meetings, discretion unfettered.
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Lokhmotova	24/32/Plan	Personal: Knew the practice that produced sustainability strategy for this application.
Councillor Lokhmotova	24/33/Plan	Personal: Knew the Applicant socially, had not discussed the application with them. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Lokhmotova	24/36/Plan	Personal: Noted the application was in their ward and had met with the Applicant on site. Would not take part in the discussion or decision for the application.

24/30/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/31/Plan 23-04849-FUL Bowls Club and Tennis Court

Councillor Bennett spoke as a Ward Councillor for this application and did not take part as a committee member in the discussion or decision making for the application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the replacement of the existing artificial pitch with a new multi-use games area (including tennis court), construction of new bowls green, erection of new pavilion and associated works.

The Principal Planner updated their report by referring to amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. Amended conditions:
 - Condition 3 (BNG), amended wording to secure 20% BNG.
 - Condition 6 (Phasing), deleted as this detail is secured by the Barnwell Local Centre redevelopment application (condition 59 of application reference 23/04687/FUL).
 - Condition 21 (Green roof), amended to secure the specification of the proposed green roof for the Bowls Club pavilion.
- ii. Additional conditions:
 - Condition 19, (cycle parking) amended to secure cycle parking details for the MUGA facility in addition to the Bowls Club.
 - Condition 20, additional condition to secure provision of car parking in accordance with the approved plans.
- iii. Appended Final List of Recommended Planning Conditions (which incorporated the amendments set out in i and ii).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from the Secretary of Abbey Bowls Club:

- i. Speaking on behalf of members of the Bowls Club who objected to the proposed application.
- ii. Had not been advised the applications were going to be submitted and there was no consultation with the Club regarding the final details of the plans; had found these online.
- iii. The Bowls Club had an ongoing contract with the Council to maintain the bowls green and had a specialist contractor to undertake the work. The Council paid a yearly grant to the Club which helped pay for the work. Therefore, the Club held an interest as to what was being planned for the bowl's green.
- iv. The application included the resurfacing of the existing MUGA and provided a considerably smaller bowl's facility compared to the existing facility.
- v. There was no additional land to supply the new tennis court and this in total with the bowls green would result in a loss of 2,300sqm of recreational land.
- vi. The bowls facility would be placed on the overflow carpark shown as open space in the Council's 2006 register. Parking associated with the facility could be designated but this was recently removed from the

- register. The developer was now proposing with this application to use the overflow car park as new open space.
- vii. The application failed to meet the requirements of Local Plan policies 67 and 73.
 - viii. The overall planning application for the proposed bowls green and pavilion would be smaller than the current bowls site.
 - ix. The Abbey Bowls Club rejected the site due to its size at a meeting in March 2023.
 - x. The Bowls Green consultant, Dales, had provided a proposed layout of the green with six rinks by three rinks, when six rinks by six rinks was required to make the equivalent space.
 - xi. The proposed layout was not large enough to accommodate the bowling green and pavilion; therefore equivalent or improved facilities were not being provided.
 - xii. At the start of the consultation, talks with the Council were about improving the facilities of the club, now everything had been compromised by trying to fit the facilities into a smaller site.
 - xiii. The proposed size of the playing green would be 200sqm smaller than the current green, a compromise that the Bowls Club did agree to with Council officers, but the proposed surrounding of the bowls green had not been agreed.
 - xiv. Local Plan Policy 73 stipulated that the loss of a sports facility would be permitted if it could be demonstrated that the facility could be replaced within the new development, or relocated to at least its existing scale, range, quality, and accessibility for its users. This had not been met by the proposed application.
 - xv. There would also be a loss of all the open space around the bowls green that provided a feeling of openness and wellbeing for the players during games.
 - xvi. Stated that the developer had agreed to provide a 1.2m wide footpath around the green, however this did not show on the proposed site plan on the northern most corner.
 - xvii. The current green had a 500mm grass strip surrounding it with a much wider path.
 - xviii. Equipment, scoreboards, pushers, and other equipment would have to be located on the proposed perimeter path during a game. This would be a safety issue to those trying to access the pavilion or viewing area once the game had started.
 - xix. The proposed site would be unusable by disabled players or disabled spectators; these issues had been raised with Officers and the developer at earlier meetings.

- xx. The proposed pavilion was larger than the current 70-year-old hut but failed to meet the needs of a modern bowls facility. Each changing room would fit ten players when a team could be up to twenty-four players. Ten players would be less than the standard number of players.
- xxi. At an earlier meeting with the developer, requirements for the pavilion had been discussed, a room with table and chairs to cater for fifty people was requested, with changing rooms, toilets, and kitchen. The Council's Recreation Officer agreed as this meant the pavilion could be used all year round by external groups as well. The size of the proposed pavilion would not accommodate the requirements outlined.
- xxii. The premium internal space in the pavilion was being used as external storage for the water tank room and the size of the pavilion is limited due to the size of the proposed location.

Ian Ross (Applicant's representative) and Paul Belton (Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

Councillor Bennett, Abbey Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Councillor Holloway, Executive Councillor for Community Safety, Homelessness and Wellbeing spoke in support of the application.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation (as set out on p22 of the agenda) for the planning application reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

Approve subject to:

- i. the Final List of Recommended Planning Conditions set out in an appendix to the Amendment Sheet and in addition:
 - 1. a variation to condition 5 to include reference to 'hedgerows' so that full details of the replacement planting was received before any hedgerows were removed.
 - 2. an additional condition to consider the type of materials used to negate overheating, with reference to the urban heat island effect.
 - 3. an additional informative to encourage the Applicant to provide, where appropriate, additional space for larger sized bikes on the site.

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 Final List of Recommended Planning Conditions in the Amendment Sheet and in addition:
 - a. a variation to condition 5 to reference hedgerows so that full details of the replacement planting was received before any hedgerows were removed;
 - b. an additional condition to consider the type of materials used to negate overheating, with reference to the urban heat island effect;
 - c. an additional informative to encourage the Applicant to provide, where appropriate, additional space for larger sized bikes.

24/32/Plan 23-04687-FUL East Barnwell

Councillor Bennett spoke as a Ward Councillor for this application and did not take part as a committee member in the discussion or decision making for the application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a redevelopment of the existing local centre to provide a new community centre, library, pre-school, shops and/ or café and/ or commercial space, 120 homes, car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works, following the demolition of existing buildings.

The Principal Planner updated their report by referring to amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. Deletions to the officer's report were struck through and additions were set out in bold.
 - a. Paragraph 11.104
The application site is adjacent to existing residential properties along **Newmarket Road, Barnwell Road, Malden Close, Rawlyn Close and Peverel Road** ~~Fanshawe Road~~. Policy 35, 50, 52, 53 and 58 seeks to preserve the amenity of neighbouring and / or future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing and through providing high quality internal and external spaces.
 - b. Paragraph 11.138, **(Additional contribution towards City Council infrastructure- indoor sports)**

Heads of Terms	Summary
City Council Infrastructure	
Indoor sports	£96,612.00 towards provision and improvement of Indoor Sports provision at Abbey Sports Complex

- ii. Amendment to condition 41. The preschool hours of use will be from 8.30am-5.30pm Monday to Friday. This has been considered acceptable by the City Council Environmental health officer.
- iii. Condition 60 as set out on page 89 of the agenda 'License agreement for the Bowls Club' is secured by application reference 23/04849/FUL. This condition has been deleted and replaced by a Phasing Plan condition.
- iv. A Final List of Planning Conditions was appended to the Amendment Sheet. The wording of various other conditions was updated to enable the development to be completed on a phased basis.
- v. Amendment to the officer recommendation (additional wording in bold):
 - a. Approve subject to:
 - The planning conditions as set out within the **updated list of conditions** and delegated authority to officers to amend and add conditions where required.
 - Satisfactory completion of a S106 agreement with delegated authority to officers to agree the final contribution amounts and minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out in the officer report.
 - **Referral to the Secretary of State to determine whether it is appropriate to call in the planning application.**

The Principal Planner also verbally updated their report regarding an additional section 106 transport contribution to Cambridgeshire County Council for £10,000 towards waiting restrictions along Rawlyn Close.

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

- i. Lived in a property overlooking Barnwell Bowling Green.
- ii. Appreciated the urgent need for new housing and vital community facilities the area.
- iii. But objected to the scale of the high rise and high density of fifty-four dwellings on roughly a half acre site, when fifty dwellings on one acre would be considered high density.
- iv. The proposed flats would be substandard as they were only single aspect, these would be unhealthy for the occupiers in hot weather.

- v. According to the noise impact assessment, site one would be wholly dominated by noise being adjacent to the busy Barnwell junction and its traffic pollution. Would also be exposed to light pollution at night.
- vi. The proposed flats should be triple glazed with heavy duty curtains.
- vii. It was possible that site one would be in danger of flooding, over the past year in heavy rain a torrent of water had gushed down into the Malden Close leaving residents and those next to the Bowling Green ankle deep in water.
- viii. According to the Flood Authority there was a dominant gradient from Newmarket Road down the steep steps by the tennis court.
- ix. The proposed high-rise flats were out of character with the domestic low-rise architecture of East Barnwell, defined as a garden suburb.
- x. Described the design of the new flats as plain and boringly beige, which looked like offices rather than homes. Questioned how long it would be before the flats would look run down.
- xi. A small green piazza would be provided for the amenity and recreation of the new residents, but this would face Barnwell Road, suffer from traffic pollution and would not be a safe play space for the children from the flats.
- xii. The buildings on site one could be realigned to provide an inner more secluded space, a green piazza away from the road.
- xiii. With the proposed application local services would be placed under extra strain with more residents to serve. The health centre already oversubscribed, the city 3 bus services had deteriorated, with no direct access to Addenbrookes.
- xiv. There were no plans for local shops while site two was under construction.
- xv. Site one had been described as 'brownfield' in the planning application but was 90% green apart from a small pavilion and shelter in the well-used tennis court.
- xvi. When purchasing their property, their solicitors provided a map showing the bowling green to be a protected site. When recently approached for advice, the solicitors refused as they were acting on behalf of the developers.
- xvii. On a personal note, the site one plans show an electricity substation directly behind the shared hedge with the bowling green, this would be 4m away from their property when the minimum safe distance was 8m. This could make a humming noise which could disturb the peace of the garden. Asked if the substation could be relocated safely elsewhere on site one.
- xviii. In summary the plans for site one should go back to the drawing board for the benefit of both present and future residents.

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

- i. Was a resident of Rawlyn Close.
- ii. Speaking with neighbours it was apparent that no one wanted to stop the modernisation of the East Barnwell Centre but it was very apparent that many people shared common objections to the current proposal.
- iii. Many residents had chosen to live in the area because of the open space associated with site one, a status afforded with its current protection. The planned proposals stripped much of this status.
- iv. While the proposed application did indicate areas of open space across the sites, no amount of superior landscaping would make up for the vast area of protected space that the local centre would lose.
- v. The distance to the proposed new bowling green and tennis court at the Abbey Sports Complex at 500m was outside the scope of Local Plan policy 67. The land already had protected open space status regardless of the current use.
- vi. With only small pockets of open space planned on the sites and relocated large areas outside of the scope of the planning rules the proposal failed to sufficiently re-provide and protect the status of the open space.
- vii. The application outlined a range of buildings between three to six storey's. This was not in keeping with the character of the existing surroundings, architecture, and landscape of the area.
- viii. There were currently no residential buildings over four storeys within the ward including those on the new Marleigh development.
- ix. Neighbours all agreed that the proposed development was over whelming, overdeveloped and the buildings were too high. The ward did not need to be landmarked with buildings of this size and nature.
- x. The proposed buildings towered over the local roads, adjoining private gardens and would take away the privacy from the neighbourhood.
- xi. Many residents wanted the building heights reduced to protect their privacy.
- xii. Parking had been assessed at certain times of the day that was not conclusive with the actual use of the roads. It was assessed twice at night which did not reflect the use of Rawlyn Close and Rawlyn Road. This data needed to be readdressed and undertaken at times that did reflect when the roads were fully used.
- xiii. With the new development on site one, there was a fear of increased traffic and parking in the area, no matter how the sites would be managed. Believed there was insufficient parking spaces on site one and site two.

- xiv. Requested that the Planning Committee reviewed the protected open space status on both sites, the height of the buildings, vehicle parking and the traffic flow in the areas of the sites.

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

Councillor Bennett addressed the Committee as an Abbey Ward Councillor speaking in objection to the application.

Councillor Bird, Executive Councillor for Housing spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer requested a deferral of the application but as the proposal had no seconder the motion failed.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of the Officer's recommendation (as amended in the Amendment Sheet) for the planning application reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

Approve subject to:

- i. The planning conditions as set out within the Final List of Planning Conditions appended to the Amendment Sheet (with delegated authority to officers to amend and add conditions where required) and in addition:
 1. an amendment to condition 10 to encourage sustainable transport modes;
 2. an amendment to condition 11 to include reference to the urban heat island effect in the consideration of those materials;
 3. an amendment to condition 58 in relation to letter boxes to remove the wording 'otherwise agreed';
 4. an amendment to condition 61 to encourage the new location of commercial premises and associated signage to be put in place;
 5. an additional condition to demonstrate the proposal as designed to passivhaus principles would not lead to overheating in future climate modelling scenarios, with associated measures including measures for future adaptation, such as vertical shading to be put in place particularly for the single aspect units on site (in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes);
 6. an additional condition regarding the location of the substation; the final location to be agreed, notwithstanding the plans;
 7. an additional informative for the Applicant to liaise with the Greater Cambridge Partnership regarding the cycle lane protection measures

- that could be brought forward as Barnwell Road improvement scheme;
8. an additional informative in relation to car club spaces on site;
 9. an additional informative to encourage storage for the community and library facilities internally within those spaces.
 10. an additional informative in relation to M42 and M43 units to encourage the flexible use and modelling for the adaptations of those units for future use; and the
 - ii. Satisfactory completion of a S106 agreement with delegated authority to officers to agree the final contribution amounts and minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out in the officer report plus the additional section 106 contribution to Cambridgeshire County Council regarding Transport for £10,000 towards waiting restrictions along Rawlyn Close; and
 - iii. Referral to the Secretary of State to determine whether it was appropriate to call in the planning application.

The Committee:

Resolved by (7 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to approve the planning application subject to:

- i. The planning conditions as set out within the Final List of Planning Conditions appended to the Amendment Sheet (with delegated authority to officers to amend and add conditions where required) and in addition:
 - a. an amendment to condition 10 to encourage sustainable transport modes; and
 - b. an amendment to condition 11 to include reference to the urban heat island effect in the consideration of those materials; and
 - c. an amendment to condition 58 in relation to letter boxes to remove the wording 'otherwise agreed'; and
 - d. an amendment to condition 61 to encourage the new location of commercial premises and associated signage to be put in place; and
 - e. an additional condition to demonstrate the proposal as designed to passivhaus principles would not lead to overheating in future climate modelling scenarios, with associated measures including measures for future adaptation, such as vertical shading to be put in place particularly for the single aspect units on site (in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes); and
 - f. an additional condition regarding the location of the substation; the final location to be agreed, notwithstanding the plans; and
 - g. an additional informative for the Applicant to liaise with the Greater Cambridge Partnership regarding the cycle lane protection

- measures that could be brought forward as Barnwell Road improvement scheme; and
- h. an additional informative in relation to car club spaces on site; and
 - i. an additional informative to encourage storage for the community and library facilities internally within those spaces; and
 - j. an additional informative in relation to M42 and M43 units to encourage the flexible use and modelling for the adaptations of those units for future use; and
- ii. Satisfactory completion of a S106 agreement with delegated authority to officers to agree the final contribution amounts and minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out in the officer report plus the additional section 106 contribution to Cambridgeshire County Council regarding Transport for £10,000 towards waiting restrictions along Rawlyn Close; and
 - iii. Referral to the Secretary of State to determine whether it was appropriate to call in the planning application.

24/33/Plan 23-02294-FUL Edward House, 8 Albion Row

Councillor Dryden left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

Councillor Gilderdale was not present for the consideration of this application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of a 15 bed care home and construction of a replacement building with 16 No. 1 bedroom Almshouses apartments.

The Principal Planner updated their report by referring to the amendment contained within the Amendment Sheet:

- i. Deletions to the officer report are struck through and additions are set out in bold.

Paragraph 8.74

No.2 Albion Row 8.74 No.2 Albion Row lies to the northeast of the site and forms an end of terrace property. No side elevation windows lie within this neighbouring property facing the site however there are windows in the front and rear elevations and a small, enclosed garden. The proposal would extend closer to the common boundary

with the Albion Yard access road by 2 metre and would extend along the whole of the boundary, also being approximately 2 metres higher than the existing lean-to structure. The proposal would not result in any significant loss of light or be visually overbearing **or result in any loss of privacy**. ~~A condition shall be added to any consent granted to obscureglaze any first floor elevation windows in the north east (Albion Yard Elevation).~~

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation (as set out on p134 of the agenda) for the planning application reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

Approve subject to:

- i. The planning conditions as set out in the Officer's report with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to Officers with the addition of:
 - a. An additional green roof condition for the flat roof; and
 - b. An additional condition for the first and second floor amenity arrangements and how it could be utilised by future occupants.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 with 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; and
- ii. an additional green roof condition for the flat roof with delegated authority to Officers to draft the condition; and
- iii. an additional condition for the first and second floor amenity arrangements and how it could be utilised by future occupants with delegated authority to Officers to draft the condition in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

24/34/Plan 24-00943-FUL Clayton Hotel

Councillor Gilderdale was not present for the consideration of this application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of an extension to the rear of the hotel to provide 30 additional guest rooms plus other associated works (Re-submission of 23/01706/FUL).

The Committee Manager read out a statement in objection to the application written by Jones Lang LaSalle Limited:

- i. The statement was submitted on behalf of Railways Pension Nominees Limited ('Railpen') who owned 21 Station Road, which was immediately to the west of the site, occupied by Microsoft Research Cambridge, and to the east of the site One Station Square, occupied by Amazon Development Centre.
- ii. Neither Railpen nor any of their representatives were consulted by the Council through a letter dated 15 March 2024 to which a written response was provided on 8 April.
- iii. The Applicant prepared a response dealing specifically with the matters raised in their response, dated 17 May and uploaded by the Council on 22 May. They were not aware of this document being published but provided the following response.
- iv. As set out in Point 2's report dated 17 May, the proposed extension to the hotel would have a significant impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight in the amenity area to the rear of 21 Station Road. The report assumed that the space was used most during summer months and because during the height of summer the area benefited from good levels of sunlight, there could be little objection from the occupiers of the space.
- v. This was not the case. In fact, access to sunlight was more important during spring and autumn months when opportunities to enjoy fresh air and sunlight were fewer. During the summer months when sunlight was most intense, those choosing to sit outside were more likely to seek shade at and around midday.
- vi. Employees of their client's tenants used the outdoor space regularly during these months during lunch breaks and to work outside when the weather permitted. The loss of direct sunlight from a substantial area of the amenity space (44%) during the spring and summer to almost zero (3%) was not acceptable and had only been considered as an afterthought.
- vii. The hotel was developed after 21 Station Road was developed and already had a significant impact on the availability of daylight and sunlight. To reduce the availability of sunlight further to the sole benefit of the hotel operator was not appropriate.
- viii. Continued to object to the scheme as proposed as it did not comply with BRE Guidance and Policies 35, 50 and 58 of the development plan.

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

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation (as set out on p167 of the agenda) for the planning application reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

Approve subject to:

- i. the planning conditions as set out in the officer's report with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers; and
- ii. an amendment to condition 19 to secure an addition to the cycle parking scheme, a lighting strategy for the under-croft area in the interest of safety of users.

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. an amendment to condition 19 to secure an addition to the cycle parking scheme, a lighting strategy for the under-croft area in the interest of safety of users.

24/35/Plan 23-02127-FUL Mayflower House

Councillor Gilderdale returned to the meeting and participated as a committee member in the consideration of this application.

Councillor Carling left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of (i) 8 no. flats (4 no. studios, 2 no. one bed & 2 no. two bed flats) on the eighth floor on Mayflower House with removal of Electronic Communications Apparatus on the roof (ii) bin-store for proposed flats occupying one existing car parking bay (iii) bespoke structure to cover 20 no. existing cycle bays (iv) structures to cover 32 no. additional cycle bays.

The Principal Planner updated their report by referring to details contained in the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. an extension of time for the determination of the application to 14 June 2024; and
- ii. new photos which had been received from a third party, these had been uploaded to the application file for public viewing. It was noted that the photos were unverified.

The Committee Manager read out a representation in objection to the application on behalf of a local resident:

- i. Was a leaseholder of one of the flats within Mayflower House and strongly objected to the erection of 8 new flats above the existing flats. The development raised significant concerns that would impact existing residents and the surrounding community.
- ii. The structural integrity of the existing building would pose a major concern. Adding more flats would compromise the safety and stability of the existing structure that could put existing residents' lives at risk. The additional weight and construction work may lead to unforeseen damage and significant disruptions.
- iii. There was asbestos in the roof of the building - therefore any building works involving the roof would be a serious and major health hazard to all residents within Mayflower House.
- iv. The construction process itself would bring prolonged noise, dust and health hazards that would severely affect the day to day lives of all the residents. This area was chosen for its peace and quiet, and the proposed development would undermine that.
- v. The addition of more residents within the complex would strain already limited resources and amenities in the area. More residents would mean greater demand for car park spaces, cycle park spaces, use of the paths and garden, increased use of waste disposal areas and lifts among other required services, which were already stretched thin. There would also be far more noise and disruptions from any new floors above. This would inevitably lead to a decline in the quality of life for everyone in the neighbourhood.
- vi. The lift was not adequate for the existing residents and would not cope with the addition of more residents within the building. The lift was small, old, and broke down often even in its current state. More residents would result in even more incidents of the lift being broken, major inconveniences and the costs associated with fixing it.
- vii. The impacts on the service charge and heating bills would have a negative effect on the existing residents.

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

- i. Represented the other fourteen objections made.
- ii. Policy 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan stated that extensions would only be permitted if they did not unacceptably overlook, overshadow, or visually dominate neighbouring properties.
- iii. Mayflower House standing at seven storeys was already the tallest building in the area.
- iv. The design was not in keeping and the size would be completely out of proportion with the surrounding properties, particularly for the low-rise homes in the conservation area to the north of the building.
- v. The existing building of seven storeys gained permission at a time when local planning did not give full consideration to city impact. Now that Local Plan policies 58 and 60 were in place, questioned if a building on the scale of Mayflower House would be approved if presented to the Committee today.
- vi. Adding another floor to this unsympathetic and oppressing building would only further dominate the area.
- vii. Mayflower House lay to the south of Humberstone Road, the developer's light assessments looked only at the equinox, the height of summer and height of winter, but there was a subtlety in the extent to which this affected the houses in the winter months when light was limited.
- viii. Based on calculations undertaken, the additional floor would have a significant effect on the winter light and meant that for a couple of months of the year there wouldn't be light getting into the houses.
- ix. Additionally, the fourteen overhanging balconies would cut light from the apartments on the floors below and it would be likely there would be an increase in outdoor noise for those living in Mayflower House.
- x. The balconies on the north side of Mayflower House would provide the occupiers with unobstructed views into the bedrooms, bathrooms, and gardens of Humberstone Road properties.
- xi. The roof as submitted in the developer's visual assessment had been cut and did not show the view into the bedrooms of houses on Humberstone Road.
- xii. The view from Mayflower House towards Humberstone Road showed a free view between the second floor of Humberstone Road and Mayflower's current roof.
- xiii. Allowing an additional floor with a free view would be inconsistent with previous council decisions. Where applications for windows made by residents on Humberstone Road had been turned down because of the effect on Mayflower residents.

- xiv. Local Plan Policy 58 stated that any extension needed to retain sufficient amenity space for bin storage, vehicle access and car parking. Residents in Mayflower House raised concerns over amenities which were already stretched. There was already a lift which was overused, as was the laundry room.
- xv. Mayflower House was originally designed as a hotel with less need for parking and provided only 68 parking spaces between 192 flats. At 2.8 flats per parking space this was a third of the current Cambridge parking standards. Only 1 of the 68 spaces was a disabled parking space. Guest parking spaces was also not provided at recommended levels of 1 space per 4 units.
- xvi. Expressed concern with the proposals that there would be more demand for parking.
- xvii. Adding another 8 apartments would increase the traffic levels.
- xviii. Any tall building needed to be a high-quality addition.
- xix. In summary the proposed development was detrimental in several ways:
 - a. overlooking and dominating its Humberstone Road neighbours; and
 - b. affecting amenity and increasing noise to Mayflower neighbours.

Mr Muir and Mr Grimshaw (Applicant's Representatives) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer proposed, and Councillor Thornburrow seconded deferring the application for the following reasons:

- i. there had been no response from the telecoms companies regarding alternative provision and would like more information regarding alternative provision. Was aware from previous experience in their ward that a certain height for equipment was necessary for telecoms equipment range; and
- ii. requested information regarding the area which would lose 5G coverage as the loss of telecoms was a material planning consideration; and
- iii. requested more information regarding the single aspect homes and how they would be ventilated and any sustainability measures which could be added; and
- iv. requested an overheating risk assessment prior to making a decision on the application;
- v. expressed concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the amenity of existing tenants.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) to defer the application for the reasons stated above.

24/36/Plan 23-04434-FUL 15 High Street Trumpington

Councillor Gilderdale left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

Councillor Lokhmotova did not take part as a committee member in the discussion or decision making for this application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of a new dwelling following the demolition of the existing dwelling.

The Senior Planner updated their report by referring to details contained within the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. two additional third-party representations in objection to the application had been received and were publicly available. One representation raised a previously raised material consideration and the other provided 3D visuals which were unverified. Officer's view was that the representations did not impact the officer recommendation; and
- ii. a correction to the officer's report at paragraph 7.1 (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined) - Representations have been received from ~~three~~ four neighbouring properties.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application:

- i. The proposal ignored the neighbourly harmony of two bungalows, Menai and 15 High Street as enjoyed by the occupants for several decades.
- ii. The bungalows were screened from two storey buildings by 100ft tall trees at the east and north with no overlooking. This left Menai only receiving good sunlight from the south.
- iii. Due to the proximity, bulk, and scale of the proposed building this would result in the loss of Menai's only visual amenity space by overshadowing and creating a feeling of enclosure.
- iv. The developer described the future occupants as being greeted by a vista through the garden and sky. The proposed development would have the opposite effect for the residents of Menai.
- v. Referred to caselaw which stated that no-one had a right to a particular view, however the Landscape Institutes 2019 Technical Guidance on residential visual amenity emphasized the overall quality, experience and

outlook of gardens and outside domestic spaces available to occupants of residential properties.

- vi. In England and Wales, any building which had had uninterrupted light through its windows can claim a right to light. They had lived in Menai for 24 years. The proposed building would place a jarring, light obstructing mass of brick wall in front of their south facing bedroom and living room.
- vii. The developer's design statements did not clearly represent the impact of the proposed building on Menai. The developer's Shadow Study showed non-existent trees. The impact on Menai in winter was not shown. Pictures had been sent to the Case Officer.
- viii. The back windows of the proposed development would overlook their outdoor amenity space; pictures had been sent to the Case Officer.
- ix. Referred to caselaw setting out drainage easement rights and the burden imposed on the servient land.
- x. Replacing one bathroom without a bath and a small ensuite with four large bathrooms and bath was an excessive use of easement rights.
- xi. Urged the developer to plan their drainage access via Trumpington High Street for any new development on the site.
- xii. Referred to restrictive covenants on Land Registry title CB44309, which prevented the erection of a building until plans /specifications were submitted to the Transferor and approved in writing.
- xiii. Asked for the application to be rejected.
- xiv. Would not oppose a modern one storey family bungalow on the site.

Daniel Nicholls (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation (as set out on p236 of the agenda) for the planning application reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

To approve subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers with the addition of a condition with regards to a first floor blinker being installed to the rear facing first floor bedroom window adjacent to Menai.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions) 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) with the addition of a condition with regards to a first floor blinker being installed to the rear facing first floor bedroom window adjacent to Menai.

24/37/Plan 24-00245-REM 111-113 Queen Ediths Way

The application was deferred.

24/38/Plan 24-00658-FUL 36 Peverel Road

The application was deferred.

24/39/Plan 23-03741-FUL 261 Mill Road

The application was deferred.

24/40/Plan Appeals Information

The report was deferred.

The meeting ended at 6.28 pm

CHAIR