

PLANNING

3 July 2024
10.05 am - 5.50 pm

Present:

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

Also present Councillors: Ashton, Robertson and Young

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Area Team Leader (West): Michael Sexton

Senior Planner: Dominic Bush

Senior Planner: Phoebe Carter

Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet

Senior Planner (East) • Delivery: Melissa Reynolds

Planning Officer: Rachel Brightwell

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/41/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Carling.

24/42/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Lokhmotova	23/43/Plan	Personal: Knew the Architect socially. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	23/43/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Would speak as Ward Councillor and

		not participate in the discussion or decision making.
Councillor Bennett	23/48/Plan	Personal: Application was in her Ward. Had held discussions with Officers. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Gilderdale	23/51/Plan	Personal: Used to live at 68 Ramsden Square near application at 66 Ramsden Square. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	23/51/Plan	Personal: Sat on Housing Scrutiny Committee which considered council housing. Discretion unfettered.

24/43/Plan 23-04840-FUL Grafton House

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

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of new office building (use class E) and associated development, infrastructure and works.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to revised condition wording:

- i. On amendment sheet.

Condition 31 added to secure detail of plant enclosure.

Prior to installation of any external plant equipment, full details of the plant enclosure shown on Plant Enclosure Elevations, dwg no. 2655-P80-01, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of appearance, height and floor levels. The enclosure shall be installed prior to the occupation of the building and in accordance with agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the design of the plant enclosure was appropriate to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 61 and 62.

ii. In presentation.

- Condition 29 (external materials) to be deleted as replicates condition 6 (external materials).
- Condition 19 (ecology compliance) to be updated as follows:
 - All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in Preliminary Ecological Appraisal at Grafton House Offices, Cambridge by Applied Ecology Ltd (April 2023). Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57)
- Condition 31 (plant enclosure) to be added, as set out on the amendment sheet to secure full details of the plant enclosure appearance, and height.
 - Prior to installation of any external plant equipment, full details of the plant enclosure shown on Plant Enclosure Elevations, dwg no. 2655-P80-01, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of appearance, height and floor levels. The enclosure shall be installed prior to the occupation of the building and in accordance with agreed details. Reason: To ensure that the design of the plant enclosure is appropriate to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 61 and 62
- Condition 3 updated to include restriction change use of use to residential through prior approval change of use.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Maids Causeway:

- i. Concern about over development of site, scale/height, mass, dominant form so the design was out of character of the area.
- ii. The height and proposed materials did not compliment Grafton House. The first floor metal cladding had been replaced with a richer pallet of highly questionable buff-brick for the gable, and clay tiles for the flank walls and roof, which, according to Cambridge Past, Present and Future (and many others) did not complement the existing build form of Grafton house (gault brick and slate roof) or contribute to the local distinctiveness of the area.
- iii. The minor changes made no impact on the overall scale, massing and form of the building and it would still be completely out of place and

character in a heritage asset surrounded by listed and non-listed residential buildings on three sides. It remained an industrial unit looking, dominant and overpowering building.

- iv. Leaseholders purchased flats in Grafton House in good faith, based on the representations made by Camprop that the large garden would be developed into subterranean and ground floor flats with landscaped gardens as amenities, only to find that the eastern edge of the proposed office building encroached onto some of the western facing bedrooms, affecting privacy and light so proposed amenities were lost.
- v. The application had not sufficiently resolved the very substantive and numerous reasons for refusal of the previous application and should be refused again for the very same reasons.
- vi. If the Committee were minded to approve the application, requested that several conditions were added:
 - a. That Salmon Lane was not used for any form of vehicular or passenger access (construction or post- construction) as it would cause extensive damage and congestion. The door for Salmon Lane should not be used for access.
 - b. That the ivy-clad wall at the top end of Salmon Lane was not demolished, as the Objector had no confidence that it would be rebuilt sympathetically or at all.
 - c. The proposed plant room was moved so that it was significantly more than 4 meters from the nearest garden.
 - d. Because of area was substantially residential, that construction work did not commence before 8.30am and none at weekends. Also control of sites where contractors could park.
 - e. Checking the proportions in submitted drawings for accuracy.

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

Councillor Porrer, Cambridge City Councillor, addressed the Committee speaking in objection of the application and concluded by asking the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to amend Condition 4:

- i. Reference Salmon Lane in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan.
- ii. Include an informative that contractors should inform residents about when they would access the site.

The amendments were **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

Councillor Lokhmotova proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to amend Condition 14: Prior to commencement of development the Applicant would had to demonstrate energy efficiency measures would meet BREEAM excellent requirements.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) 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, presentation (delete 29; amend 3 [removal of permitted development rights] and 19) and amendment sheet (new 31);
- ii. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to amend the following conditions:
 - a. Condition 4 to reference Salmon Lane in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan;
 - b. Condition 14: Prior to commencement of development the Applicant would have to demonstrate energy efficiency measures would meet BREEAM excellent requirements;
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission: Condition 4 to include an informative that contractors should inform residents about when they would access the site.

24/44/Plan 24-00245-REM 111-113 Queen Ediths Way

The Committee received a reserved matters application for approval of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning ref, 22/01411/OUT (Construction of detached bungalow on land to the rear of 111-113 Queen Edith's Way Cambridge).

The Planner updated his report by referring to condition wording on the amendment sheet (Condition 6 to be added).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Queen Edith's Way:

- i. The access route in question belonged to her. Outstanding concerns such as lighting had still not been addressed.
- ii. The Highways Authority objection had been removed on the assumption access was restricted to one car parking space and one car, but this was unlikely. If more than one car used the access route it would block neighbours also using it.
- iii. The Applicant only had access to his garage. If the garage was removed he would lose access to the new property.

Councillor Dryden proposed and Councillor Bennett seconded deferring the application to seek information:

- i. From the Highways Authority concerning access route in particular lighting and a tracking diagram of vehicle usage.
- ii. From Fire Service if they could attend the building.
- iii. From Access Officer.
- iv. Clarification on tree root area and impact on the design.
- v. Clarification on number of car parking spaces ie one or two.
- vi. This appeared to be an average size house in a restricted spot. Would a smaller house be more appropriate for the site?
- vii. Concern Local Plan Policies 52, 56, 58 and 59 were not met.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to defer the application.

24/45/Plan 22-05556-FUL 198 Queen Ediths Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of four dwellings and associated works.

The Area Manager (West) updated his report by referring to amendments in his presentation: Late representations from nos.200 and 236 Queen Ediths way, which did not introduce any new details that were not already covered in the report and recommended updates to conditions 5 (to include reference to hedge protection), 8 (to include a new paragraph relating to coppice regrowth within landscape details) and for officers to check no conflict between conditions 19 and 26 (for deliveries and collection to/from site).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from residents of Queen Ediths Way (spoken by their son):

- i. Having lived near the application site for thirty seven years, felt the vast development was an over development of site.
- ii. There was no consultation pre-application.
- iii. Expressed concern the ecology survey was undertaken after work started so it contained incorrect information.
- iv. No tree protection was in place.
- v. Expressed concern over parking provision for the site and access/egress.
- vi. Bike parking appeared to be in an inappropriate place.

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

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

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

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that Condition 8 should reference rearrangement of access to allow cargo bike access to parking in the rear garden.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 4 – and on the Chair's casting vote) 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 8 referencing rearrangement of access to allow cargo bike access to parking in the rear garden.

24/46/Plan 24-01360-FUL 237 Hills Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of a replacement dwelling and garage following the demolition of the existing dwelling.

The Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet. Amended wording of Condition 10 to remove the words added by the consultee requesting the condition.

10. Demolition, construction or delivery vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 3.5 tonnes shall only service the site between the hours of 09.30hrs -16.00hrs, Monday to Saturday.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81)

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation the application should be retrofitting compatible if a gas boiler were installed.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet, 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 include an additional condition the application should be retrofitting compatible if a gas boiler were installed.

24/47/Plan 24-01095-HFUL 65 Ferrars Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for part single storey and part two storey rear extension. Resubmission of 23/03778/HFUL.

The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf of Jenny Gawthrop Wood, speaking in a personal capacity as a local resident, not as a councillor. She addressed the Committee in objection of the application.

- i. Was pleased this amended application was two rather than three story, including bin and cycle storage at the front of the house.
- ii. Still had concerns about overlooking, loss of privacy, size, massing, reduced garden size and loss of existing amenity with this development. This was a two-bedroom terraced family home, recently purchased from the City Council, in an estate of similarly sized terraced homes.
- iii. Neighbours were concerned that the proposal to turn this small, family, 2-bed, mid-terraced, suburban house into a three-bedroom (two double, one single) 5 person dwelling; could be used in future as a 4 or 5 bedroom property, with up to 10 people with consequent loss of amenity, noise and parking pressure. Recognised future use was not a planning issue (9.31) but loss of amenity was.
- iv. Was concerned with loss of privacy. The first-floor extension window (3.3, 9.22, 9.26) faced directly towards Objector's bedroom windows and overlooked her garden. Currently an ash tree at the end of her garden provided privacy [and a conifer tree for 13 Perse Way]. She could not guarantee the lifetime of the tree so asked that the first-floor extension window had obscured glass and restricted opening.
- v. The first-floor extension's pitched roof (9.9, 9.19) added to the mass, size and was overbearing, but was set in and did not increase the ridge line, so more in keeping than a flat roof and easier to manage. Please consider a hipped roof to reduce massing.
- vi. The size of the ground floor extension (3.2), 6x5 metres, substantially increased the footprint of the existing house (almost doubling the ground-floor size) and was the same size as the rejected planning application. This greatly reduced the garden size with loss of biodiversity and amenity.
- vii. Would find it acceptable if the extension was smaller in depth, especially when combined with the massing from the first-floor extension. Unlike 61 Ferrars Way, the end house (9.10), this was a much smaller plot, mid-terrace, affecting the massing impact of the extensions.
- viii. Asked that the green roof requirement (9.8) was enforced and, if possible, no further permitted development (for example, garden room with services and bed) was allowed as this would eat into the remaining garden amenity. There had been recent biodiversity loss with the front garden block-paved and patio laid to both ends of the back garden.

- ix. Internal layout, whole life living: Was concerned about future use and number of occupants. Were the rooms accessible for wheelchairs? Bedroom sizes were not shown. All bedrooms were en-suites. There was no family bathroom (or bath).
- x. Bike and bin stores (3.4, 9.52) needed to be sufficiently large for more occupants and fully accessible when cars/vans were parked on the front standing.
- xi. Plans (9.56): There was a semi-detached brick out-house with a party roof and wall shared with 63 Ferrars Way. This was omitted from the site plan and existing floor-plan, but was on the proposed floor plans. How would this be retained? It certainly existed.
- xii. Construction (9.27) and access: Access was currently allowed through the neighbour's covered passageway which was only 1m wide. Additional traffic, vehicles and access needed to be managed along with noise. Ferrars Way was already under parking pressure. Asked for a strong construction management plan (9.27-9.30) to ensure that noise, dust, disturbance and traffic was kept to a minimum, if this the application was passed. There were several vulnerable neighbours who needed warning when noisy and dusty work was undertaken.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

24/48/Plan 24-01532-FUL Coldhams Common, Sport Pitch

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for replacement of a 2G Artificial Turf Pitch (2G ATP) with a 3G Artificial Turf Pitch (3G ATP) with associated works including replacement artificial turf sports surface, additional fencing, replacement lighting, improved hard-standing areas, and supplementary storage containers.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to revised conditions on the amendment sheet:

- construction or demolition work;
- artificial lighting.

Ian Ross (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including revised conditions on the amendment sheet.

24/49/Plan Re-Ordering Agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes would follow the order of the published agenda.

24/50/Plan 23-03741-FUL 261 Mill Road

Councillors Dryden, Gilderdale and Lokhmotova left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for change of use of a takeaway to 1no. apartment.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to grant the application for change of use in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

24/51/Plan 24-01743-FUL Ramsden Square

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for addition of external wall insulation to the solid wall constructed parts of the building, along with the replacement of the UPVC double glazed.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to updated condition wording on the amendment sheet.

Amendment to the condition 3 (Materials) to read:

No development shall take place above ground level until details of the colour of render to be used in the construction of the development had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Ramsden Square:

- i. Supported the overall aims of the external insulation project, objected to the use of external render in this planning application.
- ii. All the houses in Ramsden Square had a consistent light yellow Cambridge gault brick and lime mortar construction, all dating from the late 1920s. The square had a special, harmonious and historically significant look and feel as a result.
- iii. All houses had the same colour materials, render was not appropriate. Brick faced insulation systems were preferred offering a brick slip or brick-effect finish and available in suitable colours.
- iv. In point 8.3 of the Officer's report, the Planning Officer stated: "It is acknowledged that the change of material will alter the external appearance of the buildings and character of the street scene, which is predominantly brick. However, Officers consider that with 37 dwellings being rendered it is considered that the external alterations will have little visual impact on the street scene". Many Ramsden Square residents strongly disagreed.
- v. 37 dwellings represented nearly 30% of all the properties in Ramsden Square, so the Objector rejected the notion that the use of render would have little visual impact. The loss of the brick appearance on these properties would be a major and permanent visual harm to the square, that destroyed its aesthetic uniformity.

- vi. Any short term cost saving accrued by using a lower-cost render approach was likely to be offset by ongoing maintenance costs required to keep it in good condition, as it would deteriorate far faster than a brick-faced solution. Other Council owned properties in various parts of the city (Ashfield Road / Eastfield / Edinburgh Road) that had had externally rendered wall insulation installed recently were already showing deterioration to the render finish (discolouration, mould and staining), which demonstrated that this was not a sustainable solution. A brick-faced external wall insulation solution would not only look better, but would also require less maintenance and therefore be more cost effective in the long run.
- vii. It was currently hard to distinguish council owned from other properties in Ramsden Square, which had a harmonious atmosphere as a result. Clearly identifying council properties with poor quality rendering in this way could harm the atmosphere.
- viii. The use of render in other areas did not mean it was appropriate in all districts. Some allowance should be made for local variation in approach depending on the architectural character of each neighbourhood. The impact would be particularly jarring where render was used on a semi-detached property where the other half retained its Cambridge gault bricks.
- ix. Previous work carried out by the Council on its properties in Ramsden Square was done to a high standard. The ground floor rear bathroom extensions constructed by the Council many years ago were completed using Cambridge light yellow gault bricks and also using Flemish bricklaying bond to match the existing structure. The Objector did not see why the Council's design criteria for this current insulation project should not aspire to those same high quality standards.
- x. Noted the Grafton House application discussed earlier in 3 July Planning Committee required appropriate materials to be used. As Ramsden Square had the same harmonious gault brick look for 100 years, requested this continued for the 37 properties affected by 24/01743/FUL.
- xi. Referenced photos included in this submission, taken from the website of the Insulated Render and Cladding Association (INCA - <https://www.inca-ltd.org.uk/project/enfield-project/>), the recognised trade association for the External Wall Insulation industry in the UK. The scheme completed for the London Borough of Enfield insulated almost identical semi-

detached properties to those in Ramsden Square with a brick slip weathering finish and won first prize in the 2023 INCA Awards for Environmental Impact. It was therefore viable for Councils to install high quality and visually appealing brick-faced External Wall Insulation to semi-detached properties, in a way that blended in sympathetically with the neighbouring dwellings. A solution of this type would be vastly preferable over the render-finish proposed.

- xii. Was not objecting to the External Wall Insulation project per se. Environmental measures were important, but equally so was the visual aspect of the built environment. We shouldn't be trading off one against the other and abandoning the distinctive architectural character and heritage of local communities. We should be aiming for excellence in both.
- xiii. Believed other Ramsden Square residents would have come forward to object to the current render-finish plan if the full ramifications of what was being proposed in 24/01743/FUL had been made clearer to them.

James Purkiss (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf of Councillor Hossain (Ward Councillor) in objection to the application.

Councillor Bennett proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that any proposed render colour scheme be informed by consultation with all Ramsden Square residents.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that proposed work should avoid disturbing nesting birds.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- ii. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to amend Condition 3:
 - a. (amendment sheet) amendment to materials;
 - b. (in addition to amendment sheet) render colour scheme to be informed by consultation of all Ramsden Square residents;
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission to avoid disturbing nesting birds.

24/52/Plan 24-01362-LBC 1 Maris Lane

Councillors Dryden, Gilderdale and Lokhmotova left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for demolition of the single brick garage sited within the curtilage of Maris House (List entry number 1101728).

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1) to grant the application for listed building consent 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).

24/53/Plan Appeals Information

The Committee noted the appeals list.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

CHAIR