

PLANNING COMMITTEE4 April 2012
9.30 am - 3.45 pm

Present: Councillors Stuart (Chair), Tunnacliffe (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Brown, Hipkin, Marchant-Daisley, Saunders and Tucker

Councillor Marchant-Daisley left after the vote on item 12/20/PLANc

Officers: Tony Collins (Principal Planning Officer), Cara de la Mare (Legal Advisor), Patsy Dell (Head of Planning Services), Sarah Dyer (City Development Manager), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Amy Lack (Planning Officer) and Catherine Linford (Planning Officer)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

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 to take item 12/20/PLANd (11/1534/FUL: St Colettes Preparatory School) first. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

12/16/PLAN Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden and Znajek.

12/17/PLAN Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Saunders	12/20/PLANa, 12/20/PLANb & 12/20/PLANE	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Blencowe	12/20/PLANc,	Personal: Chairman of Cambridge Football Club, an organisation affiliated with the Applicant.

Councillor Boyce (speaking as Ward Councillor)	12/20/PLANc,	Personal: Director of Cambridge Sports Hall Trust.
Councillor Brown	12/20/PLANc, 12/20/PLANd, 12/20/PLANE & 12/20/PLANf	Personal: Application located close to Councillor Brown's house.
Councillor Reiner (speaking as Ward Councillor)	12/20/PLANE	Personal: Travels through Coe Fen to drop off children at nursery.

12/18/PLAN Minutes

The minutes of the 7 March 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

12/19/PLAN National Planning Policy Framework

The committee received an oral report from the City Development Manager regarding the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The City Development Manager advised:

- (i) The NPPF was published 27 March 2012.
- (ii) Members were provided with a note from the City Council Policy Team entitled Key Headlines from the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (iii) The Committee needed to be aware of the NPPF and take the guidance that it provides into account.
- (iv) The effect of the NPPF is to replace existing government guidance in the form of the Planning Policy Guidance, Planning Policy Statements, Circular 05/2005, which relates to Planning Obligations and other government guidance documents. This guidance is

- replaced by the NPPF, which sets out the Governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
- (v) The NPPF does not replace the Development Plan which comprises the Cambridge Local Plan, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan and the East of England Plan.
 - (vi) At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.
 - (vii) Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF or where specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.
 - (viii) It is the opinion of officers that the development plan is neither absent nor silent in relation to the policies against which the applications on this Agenda need to be assessed. The development plan is also not out-of-date in this regard. For this reason officers are confident that the development plan can be relied on for decision making purposes and it is not necessary to rely on the NPPF alone.
 - (ix) Officers have reviewed their recommendations in the light of the guidance provided by the NPPF. In each case a table was produced on the Amendment Sheet that demonstrates the relationship between previous government guidance and the NPPF guidance.

12/20/PLAN Planning Applications

12/20/PLANa 11/1538/S73: Station Area Redevelopment Land Between Cambridge Station And Hills Road - Blocks M3 And M4 Of The CB1 Station Area Masterplan

The committee received an application for minor material amendments to the outline permission (08/0266/OUT) (the cb1 masterplan outline application).

The application sought approval for an alteration to conditions 4 and 5 to enable adjustments to be made to the footprints of Blocks M3 and M4 only and to enable the construction of a basement in both blocks M3 and M4.

Mr Derbyshire (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve the changes as minor material amendments to the approved parameter plans subject to the following amendment to Condition 5:

The development should be carried out in accordance with the approved Development Proposal Parameter Plans refs RSHP_100_X_P_PP10, REV C, RSHP_0003_P_PMP, REVD, RSHP_0004_P_PMP, REVD, RSHP_0005_P_PMP, REVD, RSHP_0006_P_PMP, REVD, RSHP_0007_P_PMP, REVD, RSHP_0008_P_PMP, REVD, RSHP_0009_P_PMP, REVD, 217382/EAD/SK1020 REV P10, A10231 D1001 P2 Site Plan, A10231 D1099 P5 Proposed Basement Plan, A10231 D1100 P5 Proposed Ground Floor Plan in respect of Blocks M3 and M4 only.

12/20/PLANb 11/1537/REM: Station Area Redevelopment Land Between Cambridge Station And Hills Road - Blocks M3 And M4 Of The CB1 Station Area Masterplan

The committee received a reserved matters submission for phase 1B of the CB1 masterplan, comprising blocks M3 and M4.

The application sought approval for 232 student units along with associated facilities, part of an access road (including the installation of the bollards), a substation and landscaping.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to accept the officer recommendation to approve reserved matters subject to the following amendment:

Additional condition 19 - Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the location of the bollards hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, prior to commencement of either block hereby approved, with the exception of below ground works. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 8/2).

12/20/PLANc 11/0008/FUL: Cambridge City Football Ground, Milton Road

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a proposed residential development of 148 dwellings incorporating affordable housing, open space and landscaping, car and cycle parking and access work.

The committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Mr Baugh
- Ms Blair

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) Residents had signed a number of petitions regarding the development.
- (ii) Residents felt there should be no change of use for the football ground without prior public consultation.
- (iii) The application would lead to a loss of sport and recreational facilities. This will exacerbate the existing issue of little provision in the area because sports/recreation areas had been redeveloped as housing areas and not replaced.
- (iv) The alternative (off site) facilities proposed to receive commuted sums in lieu of open space provision on site were located too far away to be acceptable alternatives. Improving/changing these would not benefit residents close to the football ground site.
- (v) Raised the following concerns regarding the application:
 - a. The nature of the development (scale and massing).
 - b. Inadequate provision of open space onsite.
 - c. The enclosed nature of the site would preclude integration with the existing community.

Mr Lainchbury (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

Max Boyce (West Chesterton Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the committee about the application. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Queried if section 106 funding could be used to address (replace) a lack of sports/open space provision on-site. Suggested Chesterton Community College was better suited to off-site open space provision

than Chesterton Recreation Ground and Logan's Meadow as suggested in the Officer's report.

- (ii) Took issue with the traffic flow impact assessment predicting that football club and residential traffic flow figures were comparable.
- (iii) Asked for condition 25 concerning road adoption to be strengthened.
- (iv) The permeability constraints of the site would lead the development to become a gated community (without a gate) in practice. Queried if this contravened the Council's policy to encourage successful communities.

Kevin Wilkins (West Chesterton Ward Councillor – County Council) addressed the committee about the application. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Supported and re-iterated concerns that the site would become isolated, therefore it would be challenging for it to become a successful community.
- (ii) The proposal for commuted sums did not help the viability of a community created in this location.

Gerri Bird (East Chesterton Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the committee about the application. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) East Chesterton residents were concerned over the loss of community facilities and lack of consultation regarding the application.
- (ii) St Andrew's Recreation Ground, Chesterton Recreation Ground and Logan's Meadow would be affected by the development. Any proposed change of use should not go ahead without public consultation to ascertain resident's needs.
- (iii) The application would lead to a loss of sports facilities if it went ahead.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 3) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

1. The proposal fails to provide appropriate open space on site, contrary to policies 3/7 and 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. The proposal involves the loss of open space of recreational importance, which would not be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere, contrary to policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
3. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, transport mitigation measures, affordable housing, public realm improvements, public art, waste facilities and monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 3/8, 3/12, 5/5, 5/14, 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 Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008, the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010, the Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation 2010, and the Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2003.

12/20/PLAND 11/1534/FUL: St Colettes Preparatory School

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for proposed erection of 6 x 5 bed houses, 1 x 4 bed house and 1 x 3 bed house, internal access road, car and cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping.

The committee received a representation in objection to the application from the following:

- Dr Harter

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Concerns expressed at the 15 February 2012 Development Control Forum remained unaddressed.
- (ii) It had not been demonstrated there was a lack of interest in the site for educational use.
- (iii) The proposal would cause a loss of amenities for local properties.

- (iv) The application would overlook and overshadow neighbours.
- (v) The accuracy of application shadow projections was queried. It was suggested these were too conservative in their estimate of impact on neighbours, particularly in mid-winter.
- (vi) Concern over loss of trees.

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

Nichola Harrison (Petersfield Ward County Councillor) addressed the committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) The current design was an improvement over previous iterations, but still raised concerns regarding overlooking, overshadowing and over development of site.
- (ii) Sought confirmation of accuracy regarding references to distances between the common boundary, access road and other features.
- (iii) Sought protection of boundary trees through conditions if the application went ahead.
- (iv) Referred to Local Plan Policy 5/11 and queried if this had been satisfied, specifically regarding marketing material. Expressions of interests to buy the site from the Applicant had been made by several organisations. Policy 5/11 precluded the Applicant from holding onto the land for residential use when other buyers wished to purchase it for community/educational purposes. It was suggested the City Council should have proactively overseen this process to ensure it was robustly and transparently carried out. Councillor Harrison was not satisfied this had occurred.
- (v) It was suggested the educational use of the land had been suspended rather than abandoned.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (unanimously) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

1. Because of the overbearing sense of enclosure that will be created by

the development and experienced by the occupiers of 9-31 Tenison Avenue and 68 and 85 Highsett, and because of the overshadowing of the rear gardens, balconies, roof terraces and ground floor rooms of 9-31 Tenison Avenue during Winter months, the application would result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of those houses and would be in conflict with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008), and policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the community use to be lost on the site is either to be replaced within the development, relocated to another premises of equal accessibility for its users, or no longer required. As the marketing strategy was inadequate, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the site is not required for educational use or community use in the longer term. For both these reasons the proposal is in conflict with policy 5/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
3. The layout of the proposed development and the scale and design of the proposed development is not compatible with the character of the surrounding area. The development does not result in creation of an attractive built frontage which positively enhances the townscape or the Conservation Area of which it forms part. The development does not provide an appropriate balance between public and private space to achieve a good relationship between buildings, routes and spaces. In so doing, the development fails to provide a positive sense of place and represents overdevelopment of the site, contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/11 and 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
4. The development fails to make adequate provision for on site informal open space contrary to policy 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
5. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public open space, community development facilities, education and life-long learning facilities, or public art, in accordance with policies 3/7, 3/8, 5/14, and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and

as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010, and the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011).

12/20/PLANE 11/0988/FUL: Doubletree By Hilton, Granta Place, Mill Lane

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing single storey leisure centre, and erection of a three storey extension to provide 31 additional bedrooms and a new leisure centre.

The committee received representations in objection to the application from the following:

- Professor Harris (representing Residents' Association of Old Newnham)
- Mr Bell (representing Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

The representations covered the following issues:

- (i) The application would have a negative impact on green spaces.
- (ii) Suggested the application contravened Local Plan policies 3/2, 3/9 and 4/2.
- (iii) Raised the following concerns:
 - a. Site access and general traffic safety. This would exacerbate current issues.
 - b. Objected to the proposed design, particularly the scale, height and massing.
 - c. The application would have a negative impact on the Conservation Area, plus historic and natural environment. The design would not fit into the character of the area.

Mr Savin (Applicant's Agent) addressed the committee in support of the application.

Rod Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the committee about the application. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) The open space comprising of Coe Fen and Sheep's Green should be protected as they provide a unique contrast between urban and rural areas.
- (ii) The current Pavilion structure suits its context.

- (iii) The proposed application would not fit into the character of the area, but would dominate the skyline. The proposed (tree) screen would not mask bulky buildings planned in the application.

Andrea Reiner (Market Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the committee about the application. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Coe Fen and Sheep's Green were well used green spaces.
- (ii) Suggested the development was inappropriate for the area under Local Plan policies 3/2, 4/2 and 4/11 due to its scale, height and bulk.
- (iii) Suggested policy 6/3 supported the development, but this had to be balanced against the need to protect green space. It was hoped the protection of a large area of green space was prioritised over an application for 31 hotel rooms.

Sian Reid (Newnham Ward Councillor – City Council) addressed the committee about the application. The representation covered the following issues:

- (i) Invited the Committee to reject a building that required screening, and detracted from the openness and visual permeability of Coe Fen and Sheep's Green.
- (ii) Suggested the principle of protecting open space was more important than providing 31 hotel rooms.
- (iii) Noted paragraph 6.16 of the Officer's report stated "The proposal is not considered to maintain or enhance the character of these green spaces and is therefore considered contrary to policy 3/2 and 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan".
- (iv) Felt the decision would have city wide significance.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension to the hotel is unacceptable by virtue of its height, scale, mass and bulk, the material of its construction and its position on the site. The overall design of the extension is fussy and

lacks coherence and it does not relate well to the existing building or the site context. The development would also have an adverse impact upon the City of Cambridge Conservation Area no.1 of which the site forms part and the Cambridge Green Belt, which lies adjacent to the site. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan (2008) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/14, 4/1 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and to guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for transport mitigation measures, public art, or monitoring in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/7, 8/3 and 10/1, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policies P6/1, P9/8 and P9/9 and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010 and Public Art Supplementary Planning Document 2010.

12/20/PLANf 11/0975/CAC: Doubletree By Hilton, Granta Place, Mill Lane

The committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing single storey leisure centre.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 1) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Resolved (by 4 votes to 0) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendations for the following reasons:

By reason of its location and scale the building makes a modest, but positive contribution to the character and appearance of the City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). Since the proposed replacement development is considered to be in conflict with development plan policy and would not bring substantial benefits to the community, demolition of the building is not justified. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), and guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The meeting ended at 3.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank