

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM9 July 2014
10.00 - 11.30 am**Present:** Councillors Blencowe, Baigent, Sinnott & SmartPrincipal Planning Officer (Chair): Tony Collins
Planning Officer: Amit Patel
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe**For Applicant:**Applicant Representative: Justin Bainton, (Januarys)
Applicant Representative: Jonathan Collins (Architect for applicant).**For Petitioners (in objection):**Lead Petitioner: Deborah Griffin
Resident: Sue Wright
Resident: Matt Hartman**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****1 Introduction by the Chair**

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. Those present were informed that no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

2 Declarations of Interest

No declarations were declared.

3 14/0607/FUL

Committee: East Area Committee

Date: 9 July 2014

Application No: 14/0607/FUL

Site Address: 1 Great Eastern Street, Cambridge, CB1 3AB

Description: Conversion and extension of existing frontage building from office to 1no. flat and 1 studio flat; and erection of 4 studio flats to the rear (following demolition of existing outbuildings), together with associated infrastructure.

Applicant: Anglia Property Preservation

Agent: Justin Bainton, Januarys Consultant Surveyors

Address: York House, 7 Dukes Court, 54-62 Newmarket Road,
Cambridge, CB5 8DZ

Lead Petitioner: Deborah Griffin

Address: 5 Great Eastern Street, Cambridge, CB1 3AB

Case Officer: Amit Patel, Planning Officer

Text of Petition:

The proposed development is an overdevelopment of a constrained site. Six residential units are planned on a site of one small Victorian house. The proposed new building is more than double the volume of the existing buildings. This will be visible from Mill Road and detract from the character of the conservation area. The size of the development will also be detrimental to nos 3 & 5 in particular whose properties will be dominated by the large brick building creating a feeling of enclosure and oppression. Views of trees and skies from the windows and gardens of these properties will be depleted especially to the north and north-east where the building will extend twice as long as the existing buildings. As the current buildings to the west and south of nos 3 & 5 are lower and narrower, it is difficult to see how the applicants shadow drawings conclude that shadow conditions are broadly similar.

The new buildings will present large expanses of brick where in contrast with the largely wooden structures of the existing structures.

Do you think there are changes that could be made to overcome your concerns?

If Yes, please explain:

The development should be built within the volume of the existing buildings which will still allow the site to have four dwellings.

Case by Applicants:

1. Acknowledge the concerns of the local residents and aware of the issues raised by the petitioners which why the architect for the agent is present to address any concerns and answer queries.
2. The site frontage is currently occupied as offices by the applicant, Anglia Property Preservation (APP), with buildings at the rear used for storage.
3. The application would remove commercial use from this site and is for 4 studio flats at the rear of the site with a conversion and extension of the current building to 1 flat and 1 studio flat.
4. The application would restore the site to the original residential use and is a reduction to the appeal scheme which was for 6 studio apartments, a total of eight residential units.

5. APP has occupied the site for over 31 years as a family business and in order to continue trading require larger premises.
6. Income from the sale of the site is needed for the new premises or could face decline due to stagnation.
7. If the business remained on site the applicant would be forced to grow the business from the existing location but would not be financially viable to upgrade the site.
8. The applicant wishes to develop in an efficient manner whilst respecting the constraints of the site and is conscious to ensure that the impact on neighbouring properties is comparable with the existing building.
9. The Inspectorate's report of the appeal scheme did not state that the proposed development should be confined within the existing footprint or volume of the existing site and reported the environment of the neighbouring properties "would not change significantly worse".
10. The Inspectorate's report stated that the outlook of the courtyard should not be reduced.
11. The footprint of the proposed development has been moved 600m further back from the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street. The single storey element on the site overlooking the courtyard would also be removed.
12. The proposed development would be 1.9 meters away from No 3 Great East Street.
13. Unit four (the studio flat) of the proposed development has been stepped back from the boundary to allow a better relationship to the tree of Heaven. The tree was highlighted as an area of concern in the Inspectorate Reports. All units are now dual aspects so that the tree of Heaven will not impact the natural light into the properties on site, a previous area of concern.
14. Shadowing reports undertaken from the measurements of the proposed development compared to the existing shadowing that this will be no worse.
15. Unit four (the studio flat) has been stepped back of the boundary to allow a better relationship to the tree of Heaven. All units are dual aspects so that the tree of Heaven will not impact the natural light into the properties on site.
16. Adjacent to No 5 and the rear of the courtyard all built up areas will be removed.
17. The development would be of high quality materials.

Case by Petitioners:

18. The owner of No 3 Great Eastern Street has previously spoken before a Development Control Forum in 2011.
19. This is the fourth application for this site; one of which was dismissed on Appeal.
20. Acknowledged that there have been minor improvements in the present application but still represents over development of a small site.
21. The size of the proposed development is overbearing particularly for the neighbouring properties of No 3 & No 5 Great Eastern Street.
22. The proposed development negative impact on the small courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street.
23. Support the principal of returning the existing house at No 1 Great Eastern Street to its original residential use. But the current plan for an increase in the existing footprint to incorporate 2 flats and the proposed additional 4 studio apartments at the rear of the site would double the volume of the site.
24. Both No 3 and No 5 Great Eastern Street would suffer from an increased feeling of enclosure.
25. The development would exacerbate parking congestion and would impact on the entire street.
26. Proposed that the site of No 1 Great Eastern Street could include off street parking for the proposed development (not including the flats to the rear).
27. Questioned how the applicant is going to guarantee that the new residents do not have a car.
28. The proposed development is in a conservation area and the development will change the character of the street.
29. Contravenes the aims and objectives of policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10, 3/12, 3/14, 4/4, 4/11, 5/2, 8/2 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2006.
30. Contravenes Planning Policy Statement 3: criteria to be considered are whether [design is] well integrated and complements the local area in terms of: scale, density, layout and access and integrated car parking space.
31. Although the replacement building is 0.6m shorter than the existing building is stepped further back by 1.9m from the rear courtyard to No 3 Great Eastern Street; with a reduction in the eaves height of 150mm on the boundary of No 5 Great Eastern Street, compared to the Appeal scheme, there are still the following issues:
 - Along the northern boundary, fronting No 5 Great Eastern Street, the roof levels are 400mm above the mono-pitch ridge of the existing building but the roof line rises a further 2 metres to the south. This would have a

significant adverse impact on the light in the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street, as the area is so small.

- The application does not show the impact of more than doubling of the width of the building facing the gardens of No 3 and to the lesser extent No 5 Great Eastern Street.
32. The view from the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street would be replaced by a solid building.
33. The flat roof of the bathroom of No 3 Great Eastern Street is shared with the existing structure of No 1 Great Eastern Street which is proposed to be demolished and questioned what impact this would have.
34. The building currently facing No 3 Great Eastern Street is a wooden outbuilding, covered by vines for 6 to 8 months of the year. This would be replaced by a building twice the width and 1 metre higher to the south in white render which would have a significant adverse impact.
35. The shadow analysis does not make sense as this is not what is experienced in the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street.

Case Officers Comments:

36. The application was received on 23 April 2014.
37. Site notice was posted on 14 May 2014 and placed in the press on 16 May 2014.
38. Have received representation in objection from eight neighbouring properties, the main issues raised are as follows:
- Principle of the development
- Overdevelopment of the site
 - Lack of residential amenities
 - Out of character with the surrounding area
 - Out of scale with the neighbouring properties
 - Loss of trees
- Residential Amenities
- Loss of privacy
 - Increase in noise.
 - Sense of enclosure
- Highways issues
- Increase in traffic
 - Level car parking provided is inadequate.
39. Consultation responses as follows:
- Highways: Noted that the proposal does not provide off street car parking for the additional properties but will not have a significant impact on highway safety. Have recommended conditions
 - Environmental Health: Recommended conditions

- Urban Design Conservation Team: Recommended conditions

Questions and Comments to the Applicant & Petitioner:

40. Can the applicant of No 3 Great Eastern Street enter their property from the back?
41. What is the density of the proposed development?
42. What is the density of the proposed development compared to the current permitted development?
43. Has a bin storage area and cycle storage been incorporated in the development and how will relate to the space.
44. What is the size of the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street?
45. What does percentage of the courtyard would be covered by shadowing from the proposed development?
46. Would the new residents have right of access to the public car park?
47. Expressed concern that the white rendering of the new wall could reflect the sunlight into the garden of No 5 Great Eastern Street increasing the heat of the space.
48. Questioned whether the proposed developments take away the vision of sky if you stood in the courtyard and looked to the left and requested further information on this and suggested a sight vision.
49. Queried how would the emergency services gain access into the four flats at the back of the site and requested further details be made available?
50. Stated that it was difficult to gauge from picture to show how much light would be lost into the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street.
51. Queried if the applicant would consider providing additional land to No 3 Great Eastern Street to extend the size of the courtyard to reduce the feeling of enclosure.
52. Questioned if a compromise could not be met in extending the boundary of the courtyard to No 3 Great Eastern Street.

Response to the Questions and Comments:

53. The owner of No 3 Great Eastern Street cannot access the courtyard from the back.
54. There has never been access to the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street.
55. The density has not been considered and there is no obligation to do so under the National Planning Policy Framework or the Local Plan. However the Planning Officer would calculate this and e-mail the dimensions to the East Area Committee.
56. Shared pedestrian access will be provided into a courtyard area where there will be provision had been provided to store eight cycles, the bins

- on site will service all of the development. The intention is to build up to the border of the existing public car park.
57. The public car park is owned by Cambridge City Council and the new residents would not have right of access.
 58. The owner of No 3 Great Eastern Street states that the courtyard is less than 3 x 3 metres
 59. The agent will provide an enhanced version of the shadow study which will be placed on public access as cannot answer the question regarding the loss of light to the courtyard of No 3 Great Eastern Street.
 60. Agreed that there could be a condition to the materials and / or colour of the rendering. There is also an opportunity to plant trees behind the wall which would enhance the view from the courtyard.
 61. The access for emergency services would be gained through the car park. The design meets the current fire safety regulations but noted that further details had been requested.
 62. The extension of the courtyard had not been discussed but the applicant has focused on the Planning Inspectorate's comments from the appeal scheme to negate the issues raised.

Summing up by the Applicant:

63. Would take away the points of clarification to look at.
64. Would reflect on the points raised by the petitioners and discuss the issues further in consultation with Officers and the best way on how to take these issues forward.

Summing up by the Petitioners:

65. The proposed development is missed opportunity to improve and build on the existing character of the area in a bid to maximise profit from a constrained site.
66. Propose that the development is built on the foot print of the existing site.
67. Does not address the issue of the shared roof.
68. There is sufficient land on the site of the proposed site for car parking to be integrated into the scheme.
69. Reducing the number of flats proposed and integrating car parking within the application would reduce the following associated risks:
 - Access for emergency vehicles
 - On-street parking congestion
 - Access for disabled persons
 - Access for pedestrians
 - Reduction in the loss of light from proximity of proposed build to neighbouring property.

Final Comments of the Chair:

71. The Chair confirmed that the notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties and would be reported to the East Area Committee when the application is reported to them.

The meeting ended at 11.30 am

CHAIR