

PLANNING

6 November 2024
10.10 am - 5.50 pm

Present:

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

Also present Councillors: Bick, Davey, Robertson and Tong.

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams
Area Team Leader: Michael Sexton
Historic Environment Team Leader: Christian Brady
Principal Planner: Charlotte Burton
Principal Planner: Dean Scrivener
Senior Arboricultural Officer: Matthew Magrath
Senior Planner: Dominic Bush
Senior Planner: Phoebe Carter
Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies
Planning Officer: Rachel Brightwell
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

Other Officers Present:

Cambridgeshire County Council: Benjamin Woolf

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/107/PlanApologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Bennett, (Councillor Howard attended as her Alternate).

Councillor Lokhmotova sent apologies as she would join the meeting late.

24/108/PlanDeclarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge

		Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Thornburrow	24/111/Plan	Personal: Referred to previous declarations made on previous iterations of the application. Discretion unfettered on this iteration as other Ward Councillors had liaised with residents about the application.
Councillors Gilderdale and Porrer	24/112/Plan	Personal: Involved some years ago as a Ward Councillor well before the pre-application stage. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Baigent	24/113/Plan	Personal: Was a socialist.
Councillor Thornburrow	24/113/Plan	Personal: General discussion with member of the public about this application. Discretion unfettered.

24/109/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 24 July and 19 September 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/110/PlanCommittee Recording

The Committee minutes list public speakers at Committee. Please view the recording of the meeting on [Cambridge City Council - YouTube](#) to see/hear more detail about statements from public speakers and Ward Councillors.

24/111/Plan24/0413/TTPO Sturton Street

Councillor Lokhmotova joined the meeting at the start of this item.

The Committee received an application to excavate a trench to severe roots of protected trees and install a root barrier to prevent future growth in the vicinity of 193 Sturton Street.

The Arboricultural Officer updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet which contained comments relevant to the specific topics addressed on the 28 October 2024 site visit.

Three local residents addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Jon Heuch (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Tong (Cambridge City Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and amenity value of the trees.

Councillor Robertson (Cambridge City Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and amenity value of the trees.

Councillor Davey (Cambridge City Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and amenity value of the trees.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 3) to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application to excavate a trench to severe roots of protected trees and install a root barrier in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

The Delivery Manager outlined minded to refuse reasons:

- i. The proposal requires development in the form of the excavation of a trench which would sever the roots of trees of outstanding, significant and special value, individually and as part of a group. These trees and the wider group of trees on St Matthew's Piece contribute significantly to public amenity, the urban forest and the character and appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area, where special attention must be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character and appearance.
- ii. The excavation and subsequent installation of a root barrier pose an unacceptable risk of harm to the health of the trees and there was no certainty that the root barrier would work as a solution to damage to the building 193 Sturton Street. The risk of harm to health was not

considered to outweigh the trees' amenity value (including but not limited to their visual, atmospheric, climate, biodiversity, historical and cultural benefits). A material loss of public amenity value, including harm to the Conservation Area, the urban forest and St Matthew's Piece - a highly valued protected open space in Petersfield ward with very limited open space – could arise from the works and result in a decline in the health of the trees and potentially their premature removal.

- iii. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policies 14, 55, 59, 61, 67 and 71, NPPF 2023 paras.131 and 174, NPPG guidance para. 090 Reference ID: 36 090-20140306 and para. 093 Reference ID: 36-093-20140306, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and other legislation, policies and guidance that seek to safeguard the environment.

Unanimously resolved to accept the minded to refuse reasons.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention) not to accept the Officer recommendation and to refuse the application for the reasons above.

24/112/Plan24/01588/FUL No.21 Hobson Street (Old Cinema Building)

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing buildings except for nos. 16 and 17 and 18 - 19 Sidney Street facades, and no. 16-17 street facing roof aspect and chimneys, for the provision of: Replacement retail units totalling 882m² (use class E (a) (b) (c) & (e)); 4,107m² of office space (use class E (g) (i), (ii)); 349m² of community space (use classes F1 and F2); a new shopfront to no.16-17 Sidney Street and alterations to roof and northern chimney, and public realm enhancement works.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to new information received 5 November:

- i. Letters of support for the application from third parties.
- ii. New visualisations that had not been consulted upon so were not taken into consideration.

A local resident addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

Mark Richer (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application

Councillor Bick (Cambridge City Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Martinelli (Cambridge City Councillor) about the application.

The Committee:

- i. **Unanimously resolved** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the following reasons:

1) By virtue of the excessive scale, height and mass of the proposed development, the proposal would result in an incongruous and inappropriate form of development which would not be well integrated within the existing skyline of Cambridge and would therefore result in significant visual harm upon the local area. As such, the proposal was not in accordance with Policy 40(a), Policy 60(a) and (c) and policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and would fail to satisfy the requirements of paras. 131-141 of the NPPF.

2) The proposal would result in the substantial demolition of existing buildings which contribute to the historic context of development within this part of the Conservation Area. The proposal would remove all historic reference and individual plot definition of these buildings and replace them with a development of significant mass and non-contextual form which would cause a high level of less than substantial harm upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The development was not considered to present significant public benefits which would outweigh the level of harm identified, and therefore the proposal was not in accordance with paragraphs 203, 205, 206, 208, and 213 of the NPPF, Policy 60 (b), Policy 61 and Policy 10(c) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Section 72 of the Listed Building and Conservation Area Act 1990.

3) The demolition proposed would result in the total loss of No. 21 Hobson Street (former cinema building). This building was a designated Building of Local Interest (BLI) and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area due to its iconic and rare architectural style within this part of Cambridge. The application suggests there was no viable use for the building however the marketing information provided was deficient in supporting this conclusion and relies on the evidence of deterioration and poor condition to justify its loss. These are not valid reasons to demolish this significant building and was not outweighed by the public benefits presented. The loss of this building and associated rare architectural references was therefore not justified and the proposal would result in a high level of less than substantial harm to heritage assets. As such, the proposal was not in accordance with paragraphs 202, 205, 206, 208, 209 and 213 of the NPPF, policies 61 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, and Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Act 1990.

4) The site was located within the setting of a number of heritage assets. The application lacks evidence within the submitted documents to justify the significant scale and non contextual form of development proposed to demonstrate that significant harm upon the settings of surrounding heritage assets would not arise. The proposal was therefore not in accordance with paragraphs 200, 201, 203, 205, 206, 208 and 213 of the NPPF, Policy 60(b) and Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Section 66 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Act 1990.

5) The application lacks sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in flooding within the site and surrounding areas, and was therefore not in accordance with Policy 32 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and NPPF para. 173.

- ii. In the event that planning permission was refused and appealed, delegated authority was sought by officers to remove / adjust from its case any reasons for refusal in the event that further information be forthcoming which, in the opinion of officers, overcome the harm identified.
- iii. Delegated authority was sought by officers to agree the terms of any S106 agreement on behalf of the Council (on a without prejudice basis) in respect of appeal proceedings.

24/113/Plan24/02695/FUL Wilbury, Latham Road

Councillors Dryden and Porrer 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 demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a replacement self-build dwelling.

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

- i. Two additional third-party objections had been received.
- ii. An objection statement had been received from Cllr Hauk.
- iii. Further information was provided regarding the sustainability principles of the scheme.
- iv. Proposed Location Plan provided.
- v. Amendments to paragraph 10.13 text in the Officer's report.

Three local residents addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. (Written statement of a Latham Road resident read by Committee Manager).

Ed Durrant (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee Manager read out a statement from Councillor Hauk (Cambridge City Councillor) which submitted comments on behalf of residents of the Latham Road area.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed and Councillor Lokhmotova seconded deferring the application to undertake a site visit.

The proposal was **lost by 2 votes to 3 with 2 abstentions**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 3 votes to 3 with 1 abstention – and on the Chair’s casting vote) to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

The Delivery Manager outlined minded to refuse reason:

- i. By virtue of the scale, massing, bulk and design of the proposal, it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Southacre Conservation Area, fail to preserve the setting of the nearby Listed Building no. 2 Latham Rd, the adjacent Building of Local Interest no. 1 Latham Rd and harmfully intrude upon the character and appearance of the green corridor along Trumpington Road appearing as an incongruous and indifferent development. The harm arising from the proposal would not be outweighed by its public benefits. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policies 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paras 206, 208 and 209 of the NPPF 2023.

Councillor Howard left the Committee during this item and did not return.

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1 with 1 abstention) to accept the minded to reason.

Resolved (by 3 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions) not to accept the Officer recommendation and to refuse the application for the reason listed above.

24/114/Plan23/03579/FUL 35 Milton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing houses and mixed use redevelopment of 4 semi-detached dwellings and 7 flats with ground floor commercial space, together with access, landscape, parking and associated infrastructure. Resubmission of 22/04306/FUL

A Gilbert Road resident addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. (Written statement read by Committee Manager).

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

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a new cycle parking condition to ensure cargo bikes could be accommodated.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Lokhmotova proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to revise informative 1 regarding Part O to highlight potential issues with Flat 1 (in particular overheating).

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report (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 draft and include the following an additional cycle parking condition to ensure cargo bikes could be accommodated;
- iii. to revise informative 1 regarding Part O to highlight potential issues with Flat 1 (in particular overheating).

24/115/Plan24/02574/FUL Land at 4 Cavendish Avenue

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 1 No. dwelling following demolition of the existing triple garage block together with a new vehicular access and parking to serve the existing dwelling.

Two Hills Avenue residents addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. (Written statement by one Objector read by Committee Manager).

Chris Anderson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requesting the Applicant be mindful of the impact of foundations on trees in properties adjacent to the site.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 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 subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) and an informative added to Condition 3 requesting the Applicant be mindful of the impact of foundations on trees in properties adjacent to the site.

24/116/Plan24/02896/FUL 246 Coldhams Road

The application was withdrawn.

The applicant wished to withdraw the application and no decision was made by the Planning Committee Members.

24/117/Plan24/00962/FUL Darwin Green 1 Parcel BDW5/6 Plots 312 and 313

Councillor Lokhmotova 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 amendments to Plots 312 and 313 and the parking for plots 314 and 315 of Darwin Green parcel 5/6.

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

- i. Update to paragraph 8.1.
- ii. Update to paragraph 9.80.
- iii. Amendments to Condition 6 – Piling.

A Cavesson Court resident addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. (Written statement read by Committee Manager).

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 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 Condition 6 as set out on the amendment sheet.

24/118/Plan24/03157/FUL 27 Hawkins Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a new dwelling along with single storey rear extension attached to No.27.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation: Condition 8 to include cycle parking details for the new property and 27 Hawkins Road to provide a third bike storage space for the new property.

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the amendment to Condition 8 to include cycle parking details for the new property and 27 Hawkins Road to achieve a third bike storage position for the new property.

24/119/PlanAppeals Information

The Committee noted the appeals list.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

CHAIR