

**PLANNING**

6 January 2016  
10.00 am - 5.10 pm

**Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Blencowe (Vice-Chair), Gawthrope, Hart, Hipkin, Pippas, C. Smart, Tunnacliffe and Holland

**Officers:**

City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer  
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
Principal Planner: Tony Collins  
Principal Planner: Lisa Lamb  
Principal Planner: Toby Williams  
Planner: Michael Hammond  
Planner: Sav Patel  
Planning Assistant: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Legal Advisor: Victoria Watts  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**16/1/PLAN Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Dryden. Councillor Hipkin gave apologies for the afternoon session of this Committee. Councillor Holland attended as the alternate for the afternoon session.

**16/2/PLAN Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Tunnacliffe	16/14/PLAN	Personal: Knows the parties concerned.
Councillor Pippas	16/16/PLAN	Personal: Knows parties concerned.
Councillor Smart	16/16/PLAN	Personal: Knows the parties concerned.

**16/3/PLAN Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 4 November 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

The minutes of the meeting held on the 2 December 2015 would be brought to the February meeting for approval.

**16/4/PLAN 14/1905/FUL 64 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed used development comprising 84 dwellings, circa 152m<sup>2</sup> A1-A3 commercial space, and associated access, car and cycle parking, and public realm enhancement

The Principal Planning Officer referred to the amended recommendation and the amended conditions contained within the Amendment Sheet.

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

- Representative on behalf of 20 residents of Severn Place.
- Representative of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

The Representative on behalf of 20 residents of Severn Place covered the following issues:

- i. Negative impact on the well-being of the residents of Severn Place.
- ii. Unbroken line of brick height.
- iii. Development would create the feeling of imprisonment.
- iv. Shadow surveys did not bear well for Severn Place.
- v. Disabled guests would have to park in the car park.
- vi. No parking for occupiers.
- vii. Site visit was recommended before members made a decision.

The Representative on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign covered the following issues:

- i. The development did not conform with the Council's supplementary planning document.

- ii. The Wests Garage planning application contributed £120,000 in s106 contributions, questioned why this proposed development did not have to provide the same level of contributions.
- iii. Transport assessment contained inconsistencies.
- iv. Vehicle junctions needed to be re-worked.
- v. Asked members to refuse the application.

Geraint John (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Bick (Market Ward Councillor), Councillor Gillespie (Market Ward Councillor) and Councillor Price (Executive Councillor for Housing) addressed the Committee about the application.

Councillor Bick's representation covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern that the development did not provide 40% affordable housing provision.
- ii. The 40% affordable housing provision policy was based on an established need and was contained within the local plan. The Council should not abandon this commitment.
- iii. Central Government had made development easier for developers although they still had to prove their viability case.
- iv. Questioned whether the case for viability had been proven.
- v. Requested that if the application was approved that a claw back provision was included in a s106 planning agreement.
- vi. Requested that a stand was made regarding affordable housing provision.

Councillor Gillespie's representation covered the following issues:

- i. Agreed with the points made by Councillor Bick.
- ii. Did not accept the viability assessment, affordable housing was needed in the City.
- iii. Did not like 8 storey buildings and did not want the skyline to be full of buildings, he wanted to be able to see the sky.
- iv. Additional traffic would be a problem.
- v. Reliance on cars took a step back from the Council commitment made at the Full Council meeting in October 2015.

Councillor Price's representation covered the following issues:

- i. Viability issues had been raised by Councillor Bick.

- ii. Block H had a dominant presence; the affordable housing did not appear to be tenure blind.
- iii. Unacceptable that Block H did not benefit from combined power.
- iv. Questioned whether Block H had photo voltaic cells.
- v. Questioned the parking arrangements for Block H.
- vi. The Housing Allocations Policy meant that flats could not be under-occupied therefore children would live in the flats and there was insufficient play area provision.
- vii. Cambridge was low risk for sales of properties; many properties were sold off plan.
- viii. A reduction in the provision of affordable housing was not acceptable given the pressure already on affordable housing.

Councillor Blencowe proposed an additional condition to the Officer's recommendation that the materials used on Block H were to be of a similar quality and design as those used for the rest of the development.

The Committee agreed to accept the addition of this condition to the recommendation.

The Committee voted that they were minded to go against the Officer's recommendation (and therefore refuse the application) by 6 votes to 1.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee of the Adjourned Decision Making Protocol.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved** not to accept the officer recommendation of approval, as the committee were minded to refuse the application, a decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred under the Adjourned Decision Protocol

Under the Council's agreed Adjourned Decisions Protocol this application will be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee to allow further discussion of reasons for refusal. The following matters may form the basis for detailed reasons for refusal.

1. The affordable housing block is by virtue of its external treatment which contrasts with the rest of the development, not 'tenure blind'.
2. Lack of amenity space/ play space to serve the affordable housing units and the development more generally.

3. The height of Block G in the context of the height of surrounding buildings.
4. The scheme does not deliver 40% affordable housing.
5. That the renewable energy provisions do not extend to the affordable housing units.
6. That the development is contrary to the Eastern Gateway Supplementary Planning Document on the basis that it does not provide 'connectivity' with the surrounding parts to the SPD area.

The Officer recommendation of approval was subject to the completion of a section 106 Agreement to secure off site mitigation of development impacts. In the event of a refusal of planning permission, a refusal reason to the lack of a legal agreement to secure these mitigation measures will also be recommended.

### **16/5/PLAN 15/1369/FUL Report - 149B Histon Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 23 residential units (use class C3) to be arranged in two blocks comprising a mix of studio and 1 & 2 bed flats including 40% affordable housing, two car parking spaces, cycle parking and associated hard and soft landscaping.

The Senior Planning Officer referred to the amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet and also verbally updated the Committee on the following issues:

- i. The County Council as Local Lead Flood Authority had removed their objection regarding drainage.
- ii. Revised elevations had been received regarding paragraph 2 of the Officer's report.
- iii. Comments were still awaited regarding the s106 agreement in relation to education and informal open space facilities.
- iv. Block B was proposed to be entirely affordable housing.

#### 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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers as amended on the Amendment Sheet.

### **16/6/PLAN 15/0519/OUT Report - 295 - 301 Histon Road**

The Committee received an application for outline planning permission.

The application sought approval for outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the demolition of all structures on site and development of 27 dwellings.

The Senior Planning Officer referred to the amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet.

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

- Resident of Carisbrooke Road.
- Representative on behalf of the Squash Club.

The representation by the resident of Carisbrooke Road covered the following issues:

- i. The actual extent of the resident's property was omitted from 24 drawings which meant the impact on the property had not been fully taken into consideration.
- ii. Significant impact on amenity and their home.
- iii. Revised drawings regarding traffic calming measures were only submitted the day before the Committee meeting.
- iv. Took issue with paragraph 6 of the Officer's report.
- v. Traffic would double.
- vi. Concerns regarding noise and vibrations.

The representation on behalf of the Squash Club covered the following issues:

- i. Objection to the loss of a sports and squash facility.
- ii. The application was inconsistent with local and national policy.
- iii. Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the development was not sustainable.

Colin Campbell (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers as amended on the Amendment Sheet.

**16/7/PLAN 15/1728/FUL Report - 11 Lichfield Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a change of use of three bedroomed semi-detached dwelling to HMO (8 rooms). Part two storey part single storey rear extension (following demolition of garage) and roof extension incorporating rear dormer.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Lichfield Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Shadow study suggests light and sun would be lost.
- ii. Dormer windows unacceptable.
- iii. Loss of privacy for neighbours.
- iv. Ugly and poor design.
- v. Overbearing and dominant design.
- vi. Over development.
- vii. Out of character with the rest of the area.
- viii. Area predominantly older people and a house full of young people would bring noise and disturbance.

Councillor Herbert addressed the Committee regarding the application and made the following comments:

- i. Suggested that important information available on the planning portal had not been included in the committee report.
- ii. Bulk and shadowing diagram was not included in the pack.
- iii. Mass of building would impact on neighbours.

- iv. Area is not in a conservation zone but has a character and was important.
- v. Scale of a corner side would be dominant to the street scape.
- vi. Comparison to a 6 person permitted development was not helpful.
- vii. Proposal was out of keeping with the area.
- viii. Information on bus route was misleading as the buses were infrequent and inadequate.
- ix. Comments of Council's own Landscape Architect had been ignored.

The Committee agreed *Nem Com* that an informative would be added regarding the upkeep of open spaces.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 2)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

INFORMATIVE: In submitting information to discharge 3 the applicant is advised that details of the maintenance schedule for all external spaces shall be provided as part of the Management Plan.

**16/8/PLAN 15/1308/FUL Report - 94 Milton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use from C3 domestic dwelling house to 10 person house in multiple occupation and 2 studio flats.

The Committee agreed the addition of a Management plan. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.



**16/9/PLAN 15/1466/FUL Report - 73-73A Tenison Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use of an existing building to either a B1 office use or, in the alternative continuation of D1 use.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

Adam Davis (Applicant's Agent) and Liz Wainwright (future tenant of the site) 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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**16/10/PLAN 15/1468/FUL Report - 17 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a house in multiple occupation for 8 persons (Sui Generis).

The Committee suggested the addition of a Management plan. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

Planning Committee required the imposition of an additional condition, No. 5, to require a Management Plan to be agreed prior to use. Accordingly, Condition 5 has been inserted into the decision which otherwise follows the Officer's recommendation:

- New Condition 5:

Within three months of the date of this permission, or prior to the first occupation of the building if the building is vacant at the time of the permission being issued, a Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Management Plan shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 4/13).

### **16/11/PLAN      15/1474/FUL Report - 19 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a house in multiple occupation for 8 persons (Sui Generis).

The Committee suggested the addition of a Management plan. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

#### 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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

- **New Condition 5:**

Within three months of the date of this permission, or prior to the first occupation of the building if the building is vacant at the time of the permission being issued, a Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Management Plan shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 4/13).

### **16/12/PLAN      15/1479/FUL Report - 29 Newmarket Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for retrospective change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a house in multiple occupation for 8 persons (Sui Generis).

The Committee suggested the addition of a Management plan. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

Planning Committee required the imposition of an additional condition, No. 5, to require a Management Plan to be agreed prior to use. Accordingly, Condition 5 has been inserted into the decision which otherwise follows the Officer's recommendation:

- New Condition 5:

Within three months of the date of this permission, or prior to the first occupation of the building if the building is vacant at the time of the permission being issued, a Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Management Plan shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 4/13).

**16/13/PLAN      15/1627/FUL Report - 2 Drayton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a new dwelling

Richard Ball (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

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

**16/14/PLAN      15/1710/FUL Report - 89 And 91 De Freville Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for proposed single storey dwelling on land behind 89- 91 De Freville Avenue, including the removal of existing hard standing, and removal of a tree.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Kimberley Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Locals do not object to the proposal to build on this site.
- ii. Current proposals would impact on the amenity value of the area.
- iii. Non-compliant with Policy 3.10, as it would be overbearing.
- iv. Build line is within 1 metre of neighbours.
- v. Would create a feeling of enclosure.
- vi. Neighbours fear future extension to this proposal.
- vii. Loss of light.
- viii. Dominance.
- ix. Detrimental impact on terrace.
- x. Parking proposals unacceptable.

Richard Owers (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillr Austin (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Speaking on behalf of local residents.
- ii. Tree not in a conservation area but is valued by the community and can be seen from some distance away.
- iii. Tree aids local drainage.
- iv. Tree would dominate the site in future and would need future protection from over pruning.
- v. New fence has already disturbed the root system.

- vi. Access route was an unmade road but is already well used as a second access route had been lost.
- vii. Pinch point would be created.
- viii. Pressures on parking would result in unsafe access route.

Councillor Smart proposed additional condition to remove all future permitted development rights to the Officer's recommendations. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

The Committee suggested an informative be added regarding considerate contractor. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

Subject to revised conditions as set out above and an additional condition to withdraw permitted development rights for extensions and the Considerate Contractors informative.

**16/15/PLAN      15/1589/FUL Report - 23 Baldock Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a pair of two-bedroom residential units.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Glebe Road.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. This was the third attempt to develop this site.
- ii. Current bungalow meets a housing need and was in keeping with the area.
- iii. Overdevelopment.
- iv. Lack of parking and amenity space.
- v. Would occupy the entire footprint of the site.

- vi. Use of balcony a concern to neighbours.
- vii. Risk of flooding.
- viii. Overlooking from balcony.
- ix. Properties would suffer from damp.
- x. Accessibility would be an issue.

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

Councillor Moore (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and circulated images of the development. The Chair reminded members to use caution regarding this information as the Planning Department had not had the opportunity to approve them

Councillor Moore made the following comments:

- i. Height of the building would allow sight into the bedrooms.
- ii. Would result in overlooking.
- iii. Build line would be close to boundary. Does not address previous concerns regarding the development of this site.
- iv. North facing basements would suffer from poor light.
- v. Small utility space.
- vi. Would not fulfil amenity criteria.
- vii. Would be a flood risk.

The Committee suggested an informative be added regarding a Car Club. This was agreed *Nem Con*.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

**16/16/PLAN      15/1623/FUL Report - 64 Glebe Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of single storey dwelling and erection of 5 new dwellings.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet updates.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Compromised safety of children using the pavement.
- ii. Overlooking.
- iii. Dominance.
- iv. Drag distance required to get bins to the pavement.
- v. Overlooking of Templemore Close.

Garth Hanlon (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Moore (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and made the following comments:

- i. Shares concerns about child safety.
- ii. Junction was complicated and dangerous.
- iii. Area used for rat running.
- iv. Development would limit sight lines.
- v. A revised design of the driveway would improve safety.
- vi. Contractor deliveries would further compromise pavement safety.

The Planning Officer suggested an informative regarding considerate contractors and management of site deliveries during the constriction period. The Committee agreed this *Nem Con*.

A further condition regarding materials used for the driveway surface to improve safety was suggested. The Committee agreed this *Nem Con*.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

In submitting information to discharge condition 17 it is recommended that the hard landscaping details shall include a contrasting material within the driveway to alert drivers to the need to slow down when exiting the development.

**16/17/PLAN      15/1705/FUL Report - 86 Mill Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the installation of extract duct and external alterations.

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 report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

The meeting ended at 5.10 pm

**CHAIR**