PLANNING 28 March 2018
10.00 am - 5.30 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Hipkin (Chair), Smart (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Holt, Nethsingha, Sarris and Tunnacliffe

Officers:
City Development Manager: Sarah Dyer
Principal Planner: Sav Patel
Principal Planner: Toby Williams
Senior Planner: Michael Hammond
Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies
Planning Enforcement Officer: John Shuttlewood
Planner: Rob Brereton
Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
Legal Advisor: Rebecca Williams
Planner: Sophia Dudding
Mary Collins: Senior Application Support Officer
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/57/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Hart.

18/58/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Cllr Hipkin	18/60/Plan	Member of the City Council which is one partner in the applicant joint venture.
Cllr Sarris	18/63/Plan	Employee of Cambridge University

Councillor Smart noted the Chair of Planning Committee's declaration of interest would apply to all Councillors.

18/59/Plan Minutes

Minutes of the previous meeting will be considered at the next meeting.

18/60/Plan 17/2245/FUL - Mill Road Depot, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 182 dwellings (including50% affordable housing), 51sqm of floor-space consisting of Use Class B1 (Business) or D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) - in the alternative, basement car park (101 spaces), surface water pumping station, open space (including play area), alterations to the junction with Mill Road, together with associated external works including cycle parking and landscaping.

The Principal Planner referred to the amendments contained within the amendment sheet and also updated the Committee on the following issue:

i. The Lead Local Flood Authority commented that the scheme was unacceptable for reasons set out in original consultation response and because the

The City Development Manager updated the Committee on the following issues:

i. The County Council Transport Assessment Team accepted the issue with car parking trips associated with the scheme and asked for the travel monitoring plan to be extended from 5 to 10 years. The trip rates were acceptable for affordable housing. The travel plan would be secured through a s106 agreement.
ii. The County Council had requested that the Chisholm Trail element of the application was physically provided on site and a contribution of £190,847 provided. Delegated powers to progress this were also requested.

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

- Residents of Kingston Street
- Representative of Petersfield Area Community Trust

- Residents of Golding Road

The representations made by residents of Kingston Street covered the following issues:

i. Supported the principle of development but building B09 remained of significant concern, it had 3 storeys and the Supplementary Planning Guidance provided for a tight 2 storey boundary for the site.
ii. The scale and mass of building B09 affected their residential amenity.
iii. A statement building could be provided in a different way through public art or the Kingston Mews houses could be extended by another house.
iv. The ground floor of building B09 was too small for a community use.
v. Requested that building B09 was removed from the development.
vi. If building B09 was not removed requested that the hours of use was reduced and no music could be played in the building.
vii. Expressed concern regarding the site access junction and commented that the junction analysis was not good.

The representation by the representative of Petersfield Area Community Trust covered the following issues:

i. Expressed concern regarding traffic and the open space.
ii. Requested replacement facilities for existing users of the site particularly the Cambridge Women's Resource Centre.

The representations by residents of Golding Road covered the following issues:

i. Commented that the application was premature as a second planning application was to follow for the site which had the library on it.
ii. Felt the community was being let down as the whole site was not being considered under one planning application.
iii. Had requested further information on the access off Mill Road and had not been provided with it.
iv. Referred to draft local plan policy 23 which required regard to be had to listed buildings and commented that the application did not comply with policy.
v. Commented that the Mill Road access did not make provision for local plan policy 23.
vi. Referred to s66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

vii. Commented that there was no provision for disabled parking.
viii. The Chisholm Trail was a transport use and this land should not be included within the public open space calculation.

Andy Thompson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Price (Executive Councillor for Housing) addressed the committee and raised the following points:

i. This was the first major scheme to build council housing following the devolution funding scheme.
ii. The application provided 10% affordable housing above the local plan requirements and would provide much needed social rent housing.
iii. There were 2500 individuals in housing need awaiting accommodation.
iv. Needed to keep people on low incomes living in the city.
v. The site was a major brownfield site in the city.
vi. The application sought to deliver high quality housing and maximise the provision of private and social rented homes.
vii. Requested that the application was not deferred as it would lead to a delay in the delivery of affordable housing and commented that there had been extensive consultation with many of the comments being incorporated into the application.

Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and raised the following points:

i. Fully supported the application and had been involved with the application since the project began.
ii. Commented that to provide 182 homes had required an air of realism.

The Director of Planning and Economic Development and the Legal Advisor gave advice on the status of the Mill Road Supplementary Planning Document.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 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 and the amendments contained in the amendment sheet.

Chair and Spokes of the Committee to be notified of the detail of community facility obligations contained in the s106 agreement.

18/61/Plan 18/0002/FUL - Romsey Labour Club, Mill Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Mixed use development comprising a Day Nursery at ground floor and 37 self-contained 1xbed student rooms at the rear and on the upper floors along with a vehicle drop-off zone, disabled car parking space,
cycle parking and associated landscaping.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

i. There had been 102 letters of objection, Past Present and Future had objected to the application and 60 residents had signed a petition for refusal of the application.
ii. The Council had not received any letters of support for the whole proposal.
iii. The unique façade of the existing building was part of Cambridge's working class history.
iv. The existing building currently provided facilities for the Tsunami Recreational Club; the proposed development would result in the loss of recreational facilities.
v. The existing building was a building of interest and any alterations should be carried out in a sympathetic manner.
vi. The development was not welcomed by the community.
vii. The application was contrary to the local plan.
viii. Requested that the Committee refused the application.

Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application and raised the following points:

i. Commented that working men had built the existing building.
ii. Advice on this application contradicted advice given on the previous planning application heard by the Planning Committee (Mill Road Depot application).
iii. Commented that there were a lot of houses in Romsey ward that had been converted into student accommodation, the area did not need any further student accommodation.

iv. There were four significant buildings at the Romsey Road, Coleridge Road and Mill Road junction one of which was the Romsey Labour Club. These buildings provided a picture of what the area was like over 100 years ago.
v. This was the first building in the Conservation Area and was a key site and was the sole of Romsey ward area.
vi. Once the building was gone it was irreplaceable.

Colin Brown (Applicant's Agent) 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 and a s106 agreement.

18/62/Plan 17/2214/FUL - Land at Anstey Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of 56 no. affordable apartments, car parking and associated landscaping

The Principal Planner referred to the amendments contained within the amendment sheet.

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

- Resident of Paget Road
- Resident of Lingrey Court

The representations covered the following issues:

i. Requested angled windows to protect resident's privacy.
ii. The previous development had individuals that lived in bungalows with no cars, the new development proposed houses therefore concerns were raised about new residents parking their cars outside properties and causing problems for existing residents to access their houses.
iii. Requested that the eastern part of Anstey Way was widened to 5m in width.

iv. Commented that the density of the development had increased.
v. Referred to the pedestrian route to community facilities.
vi. Commented that the design of the proposed development was unattractive.

Steven Longstaff (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Price (Executive Councillor for Housing) addressed the Committee and made the following points:

i. The site had originally been approved for redevelopment by the Housing Scrutiny Committee 2 years ago but the Government had changed rents which meant that the development was unable to be brought forward.
ii. The development would be 100% affordable housing.

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 and the completion of a S106 agreement.

18/63/Plan 17/1896/FUL - Land to the West of JJ Thomson Avenue

Councillor Sarris declared a personal interest and did not take part in the discussion or vote on the application.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a mixed use building 4907 sq m in total, comprising 3411 sq of D1 academic floor space on the first and second floors; 1421 sq m of A3 (Café and restaurant) space on the ground floor; 75 sq m of A1 (retail) on the ground floor; all associated infrastructure, including drainage, service yard area, utilities, landscape and cycle parking; modifications to JJ Thomson Avenue to provide disabled car parking and a substation building.

The Principal Planner referred to the amendments contained within the amendment sheet.

Mr Milliner (Applicant's Agent) 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 and the amendments contained within the amendment sheet.

18/64/Plan 17/2037/FUL - 87 East Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing workshop and erection of 34 no. student studios above an A1 (65sqm) and an A1/A2/A3 unit (110sqm) with associated cycle and bin storage.

The Planning Officer referred to the amendments to the trigger point of some of the conditions contained within the amendment sheet.

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 and the amendments to conditions 11 and 20 contained within the amendment sheet.

18/65/Plan 17/2230/S73 - Former Milton County Primary School

The Committee received a Section 73 application to vary conditions.

The application sought approval for Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission ref: 16/2098/S73 to allow changes from a two storey side extension to dwelling on Plot A to a three storey side extension.
Reduction in height of the walls separating each of the terrace spaces on the second floor of all 5 houses.

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.

18/66/Plan 17/2225/FUL - 572 Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of part one storey part two storey rear extension, construction of bike and bin store and new surfacing of front garden. Subdivision of property into 3 x 1-bed apartments.

The committee noted the amendment sheet.

Angus Jackson (Applicant's Agent) 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.

18/67/Plan 17/2198/FUL - Annexe, 29 Garden Walk

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey extension and alterations to existing annexe to allow change of use to separate dwelling, with provision of bin and cycle store for both properties.

The Senior Application Support Officers amended the application as follows:

Amendment to the wording of condition 6 to also remove permitted development rights for any openings in the ground floor south elevation of the building to protect the amenities of the occupier of 27 Garden Walk.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A and C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no further windows or openings shall be inserted at or above first floor level in any

elevation of the dwelling, or at ground floor on the southern elevation of the dwelling without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/10 and 3/14).

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

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Loss of privacy due to overlooking.
ii. Loss on amenity and daylight.
iii. Site includes unauthorised previous development for which retrospective planning permission was refused.
iv. Window would overlook neighbours properties.
v. Overdevelopment of property.
vi. Lack of parking provision.

Githa St John (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor O'Reilly (Arbury Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Although this site is not in Arbury, it would impact on nearby properties which fall within Arbury Ward.
ii. Would overlook neighbours.
iii. Outbuilding had previously been converted into living space without permission.
iv. Road was narrow and parking was already difficult.
v. Would harm amenity of neighbours.
vi. Impact of garden development.
vii. Illegal existing development would set a precedent for neighbours.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) 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.

18/68/Plan 17/2078/FUL - 67 Norfolk Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The Committee noted a change to the text of the proposed reason for refusal to make the significance of the SPD a little clearer. The proposed text is as follows:

The conversion of 67 Norfolk Street from retail to residential would further fragment the unique character and identity of this Local Centre. The Grafton Centre immediately to the west of Norfolk Street is anticipated to receive significant investment following the Council's approval of the Grafton Area of Major Change – Masterplan and Guidance in Feb 2018. The application fails to consider the unit in this context or demonstrate that its viability would not be enhanced as a result. As such the loss of the unit is contrary to Policy 6/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), Paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and National Planning Practice Guidance (2014).

The application sought approval for Change of Use from retail to residential flat including external alterations

Ben Pridgon (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the application:

i. Stated that they had supported a previous decision to reject the change of use application as the applicant had not demonstrated that the current retail use of the site was unviable.
ii. Suggested that the application for consideration today contained the required viability information.
iii. Supported the view that foot fall in this area was unlikely to provide a sufficient customer base to support a retail unit.
iv. Stated that the variety of uses such as residential and retail added to the character of the area.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to reject the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to grant the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

The Committee previously refused the application due to insufficient evidence regarding viability. It was the view of the Committee that the applicant had now demonstrated good reason for the loss of this unit.

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to delegate authority regarding conditions to officers.

18/69/Plan 17/2015/FUL - 1 Vinery Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Change of use and ground and first floor side and rear extension, replacement of existing conservatory and sheds with a Nail Bar (Use Class Sui Generis).

The Planner amended the text of the application as follow:

i. In section 2.1, full planning consent is sought for ground floor extension should be revised to ground floor reconfiguration.

ii. In section 7.2, from the representation of 174 Vinery Road, light loss is not part of the concern and therefore should be removed from the text.

iii. In section 8.22 Condition 10 should be changed to condition 9.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Would increase pressure on on-street parking.
ii. Staff as well as customers would use the street for parking.
iii. Would increase car trips in a narrow street.
iv. Shop working hours would overlap with school drop off and would impact on traffic in the area.

Diep Tran (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

<u>The Committee:</u>

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.

18/70/Plan 17/1533/FUL - 4 Green End Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Sub-division of existing detached 5 Bedroom house to form 1 No. 3 Bedroom House and 1 No. 2 Bedroom House both with associated amenity space and parking and canopy to the front and side elevation.

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.

18/71/Plan 17/2227/FUL - 184 Gwydir Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for Change of use to 184 Gwydir Street from private dwelling house (C3) to David Parr House visitor centre (D1) on ground floor and three bedroom private residential flat(C3) on first and second floor.

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.

18/72/Plan TPO 23/2017 - 2 Capstan Close

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) NO. 23/2017 that relates to a 2 Capstan Close.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm the TPO that was the subject of the application.

18/73/Plan TPO 24/2017 - 21 Clarkson Road

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) NO. 24/2017 that relates to a 21 Clarkson Road.

The Committee received representations in objection to the TPO from the owner of a neighbouring property.

The representation covered the following issues:

i. Tree was within 3 meters of the property.
ii. Tree roots had already damaged drains.
iii. When the tree was in leaf the upper floors of property were in shadow.
iv. Concerned about impact of roots on extension.
v. Tree not yet mature and problem will get worse.

The Committee received representations in objection to the TPO from the owner of the property.

i. Values mature trees.
ii. Has planted a number of large trees at the property.
iii. Loss of this tree would have limited impact on the visual appearance of the street.
iv. Has the support of immediate neighbours.
v. Shares concerns about future damage to property.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm the TPO that was the subject of the application.

18/74/Plan TPO 25/2017 - Kings College School, West Road

The Committee received an application to confirm, not to confirm, or confirm subject to modifications the Tree Preservation Order NO. 25/2017 that relates to a Kings College School, West Road.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to accept the officer recommendation and grant permission to confirm the TPO that was the subject of the application.

18/75/Plan Planning Enforcement Update

The Committee received a report from the City Development Manager regarding Planning Enforcement Updates and a review of officer delegations.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to

I. note the information contained in the report and;
II. approve the delegations in relation to decision making on planning enforcement matters set out in 8.1 of the Officer's report.

The meeting ended at 5.30 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank