

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

27 June 2012  
9.30 - 11.45 am

**Present:** Councillors Stuart (Chair), Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Brown, Dryden, Hipkin, Saunders and Tunnacliffe

**Other Councillors Present:** Councillors Todd-Jones and Ward

**Officers:** Angela Briggs (Planning Officer), Tony Collins (Principal Planning Officer), Patsy Dell (Head of Planning Services), Sarah Dyer (City Development Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Victoria Watts (Legal Advisor) and Toby Williams (Principal Planning Officer)

**Other Officers Present:** John Hicks (WSP) and Graham Hughes (Service Director, Growth & Infrastructure - County)

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**12/33/PLAN Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Marchant-Daisley

**12/34/PLAN Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Blencowe	12/36/PLANb	Personal: Graduate of CCAT (now Anglia Ruskin University)
Councillor Dryden	12/36/PLANb	Personal: Works at Crown Court. Councillor Dryden did not consider the application when it last came to Committee.  Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote

**12/35/PLAN Minutes**

The minutes of the 2 May 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 May 2012 will be approved at a future meeting.

## **12/36/PLAN      Planning Applications**

### **12/36/PLANa 11/0338/FUL: Intercell House, 1 Coldhams Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The Principal Planning Officer said that condition 2 of his report omitted the following text shown in capital letters:

No development shall commence until such time as details at a scale of 1:20 (including plans, elevations and sections of in THE BUILDING) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

The application sought approval for Redevelopment of Intercell House as a 127 bed hotel with restaurant and bar, car park and works to the Public Realm/Highway following demolition of Intercell House.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Ms Gilbert (on behalf of Riverside Area Residents Association, Petersfield Area Community Trust, plus Brunswick & North Kite Residents Association).

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Residents welcomed redevelopment in the area, but had concerns regarding the scale and mix of the development.
- (ii) The application was the second proposed hotel development in the area in 18 months. The application would put too many hotel rooms in one place. This would exacerbate traffic flow issues on a busy junction. Residents took issue with the Highways Authority comments in the Officer's report that the development would have little impact on

traffic levels. Residents felt this overlooked the cumulative impact on local roads.

- (iii) Suggested little traffic modelling had been undertaken, and this did not take into account cyclist needs.
- (iv) Referred to Design & Conservation Panel comments that a smaller development would be more appropriate for the site.
- (v) Suggested the application infringed Local Plan policy 6/3 concerning tourist accommodation.

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

Mr Hughes (Service Director, Growth & Infrastructure) addressed the Committee to clarify County Council comments concerning the application.

- (i) Traffic modelling had been undertaken. This projected that Saturday would generate the highest levels of traffic. The impact of this would be very low, and so was not a reason for refusal.
- (ii) It was a fundamental modelling principle to compare current (ie usage planning permission has been granted for) and future usage.
- (iii) All 3 proposed Coldhams Lane developments should lead to just a 4% increase in traffic on the road. Even if all traffic from the three developments proposed (hotel at 180-190 Newmarket Road, residential development at 9-15 Harvest Way, and the present application) were to access and leave the site via Coldham's Lane, which is a very unlikely scenario, the total increase in traffic on this section of Coldham's Lane during the peak hour of Saturday afternoon would be no more than 4%.
- (iv) The junction can cope with expected future traffic levels as modelled.
- (v) A significant funding contribution would be generated for the Eastern Corridor Transport Fund if the application went ahead. This would be considered by the East Area Committee.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment that a considerate construction condition should be included.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment that a condition to mitigate dust and mud should be included.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda and the following further amendments and additions:

1. In Condition 2, delete the words 'of IN' within the brackets. Text to read "No development shall commence until such time as details at a scale of 1:20 (including plans, elevations and sections of ~~IN~~ the building) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details."
2. Add Condition 18: No development (including demolition) shall take place until details of measures to prevent the spread of airborne dust and mud have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be maintained throughout the demolition and construction phases.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents, businesses, allotment-holders and road users. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 4/13 and 8/2)

3. Add additional INFORMATIVE: New development can sometimes cause inconvenience, disturbance and disruption to local residents, businesses and passers by. As a result the City Council runs a Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed at promoting high standards of care during construction. The City Council encourages the developer of the site, through its building contractor, to join the scheme and agree to comply with the model Code of Good Practice, in the interests of good neighbourliness. Information about the scheme can be obtained from The Considerate Contractor Project Officer in the Planning Department (Tel: 01223 457121).
4. Additional resolution:

**AUTHORITY** to officers to discharge Condition 3 is limited in the following manner. Officers are required to notify all members of Committee when the sample panel is installed. Officers have **AUTHORITY** to discharge condition 3 only if no member requests, within 21 days of the date of notification of the sample panel, that the

acceptability of the panel be brought to Committee for determination.

### Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: policies SS1, T1, T2, T9, T14, ENV7, ENG1;

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: policies P6/1, P9/8, P9/9;

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): policies 3/1, 3/4, 3/6, 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 3/13, 4/4, 4/13, 4/14, 6/3, 8/1, 8/2, 8/3, 8/6, 8/8, 8/9, 8/10, 8/16 and 10/1;

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

### Re-Ordering Agenda

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

### **12/36/PLANb 12/0489/FUL: Former Cambridge College For Further Education, 23 Young Street**

Councillor Dryden 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 construction of three new buildings within Use Class D1 for non-residential educational and training use, following demolition of all buildings on the site except the Ragged School.

Mr Bennet (Applicant's representative) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Stuart proposed an amendment to condition 18 concerning demolition.

This amendment was carried unanimously.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda and subject to the amendment of the Construction Management Plan condition to include consideration of the Nursery during the demolition of the existing buildings on site.

#### Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6, ENV7, CSR1, CSR2

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P6/1, P9/8, P9/9

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 3/13, 4/11, 4/12, 4/13, 4/14, 4/16, 5/10, 5/12, 5/15, 7/1, 7/2, 7/4, 7/8, 8/1, 8/2, 8/3, 8/4, 8/5, 8/6, 8/16, 8/18, 10/1

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 26 September 2012, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for, transport mitigation measures, public realm improvements, public art and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/12, 8/3 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010.

### **12/36/PLANc 12/0321/FUL: 190-192 Histon Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for proposed erection of 14 apartments (following the demolition of existing buildings) comprising 2 studio apartments, 11 x 1 bed flats and 1 x 2 bed flats along with cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Dr Spencer-Thomas (on behalf of Windsor Road Residents Association Committee).

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Expressed concern over lack of on-street parking. This would exacerbate existing traffic flow and parking issues.
- (ii) The greatest demand for parking was at night and the weekend. A survey has not been undertaken to test the impact of commuters on travel plan arrangements.

- (iii) Took issue with figures used to claim car journeys would be reduced.

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

Councillor Todd-Jones (Arbury Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the Committee about the application.

- (i) The current design was an improvement over previous iterations. Residents had raised no objections to Councillor Todd-Jones.
- (ii) A car free development was a good intention, but it was likely that residents would own cars and that they would park off site. This would exacerbate current traffic flow and parking issues.
- (iii) The Highways Authority had raised some concerns, but no specific objections.
- (iv) The nearest street car facility is 10 minutes walk from the application site. This may deter usage.
- (v) Conditions maybe required to manage Histon Road noise levels.
- (vi) Queried if the side gate was now level with the Histon Road frontage.
- (vii) Queried if noise reduction features (acoustic glaze panels) could be fitted to upper floor terraces.
- (viii) Referred to Design & Conservation Panel comments.

Councillor Ward (Arbury Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the Committee about the application.

- (i) Residents welcomed redevelopment of the site.
- (ii) Re-iterated residents had traffic flow and parking concerns. It was hoped the development would not exacerbate these.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to approve planning permission as per the agenda, subject to Section 106 agreement, to be completed by 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

#### Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved subject to conditions and the prior completion of a section 106 planning obligation (/a unilateral undertaking), because subject to those requirements it is considered to

conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: 6/1, 9/8 and 9/9

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/1, 3/4, 3/7, 3/8, 3/11, 3/12, 4/4, 4/13, 5/1, 5/14, 8/2, 8/6, 8/10 & 8/16

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

Unless prior agreement has been obtained from the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson of this Committee to extend the period for completion of the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development, if the Obligation has not been completed by 30th September 2012, or if Committee determine that the application be refused against officer recommendation of approval, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, life-long learning facilities, public art, waste facilities, waste management and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, and 10/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1 and P9/8 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010 and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

**12/37/PLAN      General Items**

**12/37/PLANa 11/0219/FUL: 9-15 Harvest Way**

The Committee received a request to confirm the decision made at the meeting of 16th November 2011, to grant planning permission for the proposal made under 11/0219/FUL.

The application sought confirmation of previous resolution to grant planning permission for 75 residential apartments, including 30 affordable units, 174m<sup>2</sup> of commercial space at ground floor level to be used for A1, A2, B1(a) or D1 (in the alternative), and associated infrastructure, at 9-15 Harvest Way (application number 11/0219/FUL)

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation to confirm the decision, made at the Planning Committee meeting of 16th November 2011, to grant planning permission for the proposal made under 11/0219/FUL, subject to conditions, and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement by 17th August 2012.

**12/37/PLANb CB1 Blue Phase Brick Sample Panel**

The Committee received a request to discharge CB1 Blue Phase (Blocks L1 to L4).

The application sought approval that condition 9 is discharged on the basis of the use of Freshfield Lane Dark Facings brick with natural buff mortar in the sample panel erected on site in May 2012.

The Committee:

**Resolved (unanimously)** to accept the officer recommendation that Condition 9 is discharged on the basis of the use of Freshfield Lane Dark Facings brick with natural buff mortar in the sample panel erected on site in May 2012.

The meeting ended at 11.45 am

**CHAIR**