
Application Number	16/0002/LBC	Agenda Item	
Date Received	25th January 2016	Officer	Mairead O'Sullivan
Target Date	21st March 2016		
Ward	Market		
Site	Lock House Jesus Green Victoria Avenue Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3BD		
Proposal	Erection of extensions and internal and external alterations.		
Applicant	Mr Simon Godfrey 18B Chesterton Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB4 3AX United Kingdom		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons: The proposed works respect the amenities of the listed building. The proposed development would preserve and enhance the Conservation Area.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 Lock House is a Grade II Listed Building that lies within the Central Conservation Area. It is located in Jesus Green, which is designated as a Protected Open Space (P&G 09 – Jesus Green). The adjacent lock and bridge are Grade II Listed structures. The building falls within Flood Zone 2.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application proposes the erection of extensions with internal and external alterations to the listed building. The extensions are single storey additions to the south/rear side of the building. The height of the boundary wall to the north and west is to be reduced with capping stones to be retained and re-

bedded. A gate is proposed to match existing. There are a number of new windows proposed on the east and west elevations. A bricked up opening in the east elevation is to be opened up with the addition of a half glazed door. Cycle hoops are proposed to the rear.

- 2.2 There is an associated planning application that also proposes change of the use of the building to A3 use (restaurant and cafe)

3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 The application site has an extensive site history. The relevant history is listed in the below table.

Reference	Description	Outcome
16/0001/FUL	Change of use from residential to commercial A3 use (restaurants and cafes), erection of extensions and internal and external alterations to the listed building.	Pending consideration

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1	Advertisement:	Yes
	Adjoining Owners:	Yes
	Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

- 5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

- 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/7 4/10 4/11

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95 Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
	<u>Area Guidelines</u> Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006) Jesus Green Conservation Plan (1998)

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.1 The development is acceptable subject to conditions. The additional windows proposed are acceptable. The rear catslide roof extensions will replace later extensions in the same location. Although it is deeper than existing it will terminate at the boundary line which is considered to be legible. Works to the boundary wall have been discussed with the Conservation Team. Sensitive alterations such as capping and the addition of a new gate will benefit the character of the place. The installation of lamp posts on the corner of the site is considered appropriate. The internal works are limited and acceptable. The removal of the stud partition walls is welcome. A number of conditions are recommended (conditions 3, 4 and 5)
- 6.2 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 Councillor Bick, Councillor Gillespie and Councillor Ratcliffe have commented on this application.
- 7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:
- ☐ Object to change from housing to restaurant
 - ☐ Concerned about access for deliveries
 - ☐ The council has been in dispute with premises on Midsummer Common for many years.
 - ☐ Support the position of the Jesus Green Association and Friends of Midsummer Common
 - ☐ Disappointed that the Jesus Green Association were not asked for comments
- 7.3 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting to the application:

- ☐ 9 Albert Street
- ☐ 52 Carlyle Road
- ☐ 60 Carlyle Road
- ☐ 49 De Freville Avenue
- ☐ 2 Eve House
- ☐ 11 Holland Street
- ☐ The Jesus Green Association x3
- ☐ 98 King Street
- ☐ 63 Maids Causeway
- ☐ 27 Nutters Close
- ☐ 5 Park Parade
- ☐ 7 Park Parade x3
- ☐ 5 Pretoria Road
- ☐ Richmond Terrace
- ☐ 30 Searle Street
- ☐ 19 Trafalgar Road
- ☐ No address given

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Housing

- ☐ Objects to the loss of housing
- ☐ Residential letting, particularly affordable ones, are in short supply
- ☐ Need for housing greater than need for another food outlet; there is a shortage of housing and no shortage of restaurants
- ☐ Loss of housing is contrary to local plan

Access/servicing

- ☐ No information is provided regarding access
- ☐ Concerned about access to the site
- ☐ Concerned there will be a large number of vehicles servicing the site similar to Midsummer Common
- ☐ Concerned about heavy vehicles on Jesus Green
- ☐ The councils permission would be needed to allow vehicles on Midsummer Common
- ☐ 1 Van per week to service the site is unrealistic
- ☐ Carrying supplies by bike/handcart is inadequate
- ☐ Using a boat to remove waste is impractical
- ☐ Will inevitably lead to more traffic on Jesus Green
- ☐ Increase in traffic on Jesus Green is a safety hazard
- ☐ Vehicles on Jesus Green will damage grass, trees and paths.

- ☐ If permission is granted ask that there is a ban on vehicles/limited/monitored vehicular access and no customer vehicular access
- ☐ Will bring more cyclists who will need somewhere to park their bikes
- ☐ More traffic on an already congested bridge
- ☐ Servicing must not be allowed from footbridge

Design

- ☐ There is no mention of signage
- ☐ Cannot see reason to lower concrete wall
- ☐ Contrary to local plan as harmful to character
- ☐ Has potential to protect and enhance but concerned about a number of areas a) brick lintels should match existing b) new concrete caps unlikely to blend c) lamppost should be subject to condition d) should agree with council to work existing trees/hedge into landscaping to the rear

Waste

- ☐ How is rubbish to be stored
- ☐ Concerned about removal of waste by boat
- ☐ Concerned about vermin

Other

- ☐ Disappointed that the Jesus Green Association, residents of the Lockhouse and residents of Park Parade were not consulted
- ☐ The proposal under occupies the building/upper floors not used
- ☐ It is an iconic building
- ☐ The path outside the Lockhouse is narrow and would be a safety hazard given its proximity to the Lock
- ☐ Entrance to the café located on a sharp bend which is a safety hazard
- ☐ Planning permission is sought from a company whose ownership is not clear
- ☐ Concerned that the building could be sold once consent given
- ☐ Danger a larger enterprise could move in
- ☐ There may be a conflict of interest with the council if expansion is considered or owners change
- ☐ A tea room would be more appropriate and incidental to Jesus Green
- ☐ If the building was owned by the council change of use could be less easily exploited
- ☐ The Jesus Green Association have been working toward a comprehensive plan for the area immediately by the footbridge

- ☐ The Conservators have chosen to ignore the cottages larger context
- ☐ The Rouse Ball Pavilion is a significant building and is the place for a café.
- ☐ If the application is granted the future of the Rouse Ball Pavilion is prejudiced
- ☐ Would use public land
- ☐ Needs to be an overall coherent plan for the use of buildings on Jesus Green

7.5 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations supporting the application:

- ☐ 22 Albert Street
- ☐ 19 Brunswick Terrace
- ☐ 29 Clarendon Street
- ☐ 31 De Freville Avenue
- ☐ 12 George Street
- ☐ 9 Glisson Road
- ☐ 18 Hertford Street
- ☐ 78 Kimberley Road
- ☐ 26 Magrath Avenue
- ☐ 378 Milton Road

7.6 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design

- ☐ Building appears dismal and dilapidated
- ☐ Happy with small scale and footprint of the proposal
- ☐ Will be an addition and improvement to a gloomy corner

Amenity

- ☐ There is a lack of amenity for existing residents
- ☐ Current building offers little amenity

Other

- ☐ The building is currently poorly run
- ☐ Idea of converting Rouse Pavilion difficult to justify when it is used as a changing room and although the public toilets are not very modern they are an important service.
- ☐ Will result in a loss of a residential unit but there are major developments to compensate for this
- ☐ Not to be a high end venture like Midsummer Common

- ☐ Would benefit local area and residents as well as visitors to the swimming pool and playground
- ☐ Very few dining options/similar facilities in immediate area
- ☐ More choice of restaurants will benefit the public
- ☐ The application was made by local people who will enhance and preserve the Lock house
- ☐ Will enrich Jesus Green
- ☐ Envision patrons will arrive by foot and bike
- ☐ Area is very busy with no amenities (except kiosk)
- ☐ Will be a catalyst to improve the area.

7.7 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 The accompanying planning report (16/0001/FUL) considers the material planning issues raised in relation to this proposal. For this listed building application, the only issues that need to be considered relate to the alterations to the listed building itself.

8.2 The application proposes a number of additional windows. While these will change the appearance, and to some extent the meaning of the building, as it was original built to be single aspect, the Conservation Officer considers these additions to be acceptable. Conditions are imposed to ensure that all joinery to the windows and brickwork to the window jambs shall match existing.

8.3 Two extensions are proposed to the rear elevation. These are to replace later extensions in the same location. The proposed new extensions are to be deeper than those which they replace. However these elements terminate at the line of the boundary wall. The Conservation Officer considers that these will be legible.

8.4 The boundary wall is to be lowered but retained which is welcome. The Conservation Officer considers the approach of capping to be a sensitive manner of protecting the wall.

8.5 The introduction of lamp posts on the corners of the building is considered acceptable. A condition is recommended to control the appearance of these poles.

- 8.6 The proposed internal works are minor. A number of additional doors are proposed and a number of stud walls are to be removed. The Conservation Officer considers these elements to be acceptable.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The Conservation Officer is satisfied with the proposed works subject to condition. The proposed works respect the amenities of the listed building and would preserve and enhance the Conservation Area.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by section 51(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. All new brickwork to window and door jambs shall match exactly the historic work nearby in terms of bond, mortar mix design, joint thickness, pointing technique, brick dimension, colour and texture, etc.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building and the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/10 and 4/11)

4. All new window and door joinery shall match exactly the existing in every respect including material, style, moulding detail and workmanship unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building and the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/10 and 4/11)

5. A sample of the new capping to the concrete boundary walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and retained on site until completion of the works. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building and the special interest of the Conservation Area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policies 4/10 and 4/11)