

**PLANNING**

25 April 2018  
10.00 am - 4.45 pm

**Present:**

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Hipkin (Chair), Smart (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Hart, Holt, Page-Croft and Tunnacliffe

**Officers:**

Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby  
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey  
Planner: Mary Collins  
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton  
Planner: Eloise Limmer  
Planner: Rob Brereton  
Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan  
Legal Advisor: Rebecca Williams  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

**County Officer:**

Lead Engineer for Development Control: Ian Dyer

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**18/80/Plan Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Nethsingha and Sarris. Councillor Page-Croft was present as the alternate.

**18/81/Plan Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

**18/82/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**18/83/Plan 17/1372/FUL - 291 Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for residential development containing 15 flats (comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 7 x 1-bed units), along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

The Senior Planner referred to the pre-committee amendments on the amendment sheet:

- Minor corrections to wording of conditions to remove typographical errors.
- Removal of the recommended public art condition 31

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from residents of Hills Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Suggested there were planning reasons to refuse the application.
- ii. Local Plan Policy 3/10 (sub-division of existing plots) was not mentioned in the Officer's report, although it was directly relevant.
  - a. Criterion A was not met due to impact on amenity, loss of privacy, overbearing, sense of enclosure and light pollution.
  - b. Criterion B was not met due to inadequate amenity space as 15 families would live on the proposed development.
  - c. Criterion C was not met due to as the development would detract from the character and appearance of the area. Also overlooking neighbouring properties and loss of privacy.
  - d. Criterion E was not met due to adverse effects on trees and wildlife
- iii. Expressed concern over loss of family home and proposed that affordable housing should have been required under the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008.
- iv. The Senior Planner's report asked Councillors to disregard Planning Policy 5/5.
- v. The Supplementary Planning Document was a material consideration which should be followed. It was the relevant document to consider until the 2014 draft document was adopted.

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

Councillor Price (Executive Councillor for Housing – City Council) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. There was great demand for affordable housing in the city.
- ii. The greatest need was for 1-2 bedroom homes.
- iii. The 2006 Local Plan and 2008 Supplementary Planning Document set 15 properties as the threshold at which housing developments are required to provide affordable housing. This would be amended to 11 in the new draft Local Plan.
- iv. The application proposed to replace 1 large home with 15 flats.
- v. Asked the Planning Committee to reject the application as it did not meet the requirements of policy 5/5 in the 2006 Local Plan or paragraph 30 in the Supplementary Planning Document to provide affordable housing.

Councillor T. Moore (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor - City Council) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Expressed concern about the impact of the development on congestion on the south part of the city and Ring Road.
- ii. A small change in traffic volumes could produce a disproportionate impact on network flow during busy times. Vehicles leaving the site could cause traffic flow issues for the whole of the south area, including Addenbrooke's Hospital.
- iii. Vehicles egress from the development would be hindered by existing traffic routes as they would have to cross traffic lanes.
- iv. The Highways Agency was not good at modelling the impact of developments on the road network as a whole, just on individual junctions.
- v. Requested further modelling of the impact of the development on the Hills Road / Long Road / Queen Edith's Way junction and southern road network.
- vi. The network was important for the economy and health (ie impact of pollution) of the city.
- vii. Queuing vehicles would exacerbate air quality issues.

Councillor Taylor (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor – County Council) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Traffic, accidents and parking were key issues for residents.
- ii. Addenbrooke's Hospital was located in the area, which already had heavy traffic, traffic flow and parking issues.
- iii. Cycleways had recently been built on Hills Road to reduce car numbers.
- iv. Hills Road had the highest traffic levels in south east Cambridgeshire.
- v. The Addenbrooke's junction was already at capacity. More companies were expected to relocate on the site in future and so add to congestion.
- vi. Referred to the Officer's report stating the application met planning policy criteria for traffic; the site was seen as sustainable due to bus and cycle links. It may do so in theory but Queen Edith's Ward had the highest level of car ownership in the city, so the application may have an unacceptable traffic impact contrary to indications from traffic modelling.
- vii. Referred to an application that was refused in 1990 due to traffic capacity issues. The situation had not changed.
- viii. A pedestrian crossing had not been included on the Queen Edith's Way section of the traffic junction due to the negative impact on traffic flow. T

The Chair asked for Officer advice on:

- i. How much consideration should be given to the ex ante Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document.
- ii. Traffic impact.

Officers answered:

- i. The Legal Advisor said:
  - a. Councillors should determine the planning application on current planning policy (ie 5/5 of the 2006 Local Plan) unless an exception could be demonstrated.
  - b. The policy was typically interpreted as net increase of housing, not gross.
  - c. The Supplementary Planning Document was guidance that sat behind the Local Plan.
  - d. It was a decision for Councillors how much weight they gave to the Supplementary Planning Document.
- ii. The Lead Engineer said:
  - a. The National Planning Policy Framework indicated that the Highways Agency should not object to applications unless a severe detrimental negative impact could be demonstrated.
  - b. The small increase in vehicles was not enough to demonstrate a reason to object to the application.

- c. The traffic model had a margin of error. Smaller numbers of vehicles had greater margin of error in the model.
- d. He was unaware of any modelling that could calculate the impact of vehicles from the application on the network as a whole.
- e. The Hills Road / Long Road / Queen Edith's junction was over capacity.
- f. Vehicles from the application would have to cross traffic lanes to egress the site, but this should happen safely.
- g. He could not advise that there would be a severe adverse impact or that the junction would operate unsafely and therefore had no objection to the proposal.

### The Committee:

Councillor Tunncliffe absented himself for the vote and part of the discussion on this item.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 0)** to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application. The Chair abstained.

- The Committee decided reasons for refusal should be voted on and recorded separately:
- Accepted **(by 5 votes to 0)**: Lack of affordable housing.
- Accepted **(by 5 votes to 0)**: Inadequate cycle parking arrangements.
- Accepted **(by 4 votes to 2)**: Inadequate visitor parking.
- Accepted **(by 4 votes to 1)**: Cramped living conditions.
- Lost **(by 2 votes to 3)**: Bland design.

The Committee were asked to consider if they wished to follow the adjourned decision making protocol or make a decision at this committee. They resolved **(by 4 votes to 2)** to make a decision at this committee.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 0)** to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation. The Chair abstained.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to delegate authority to Officers to prepare reasons for refusal based upon the lack of affordable housing, inadequate cycle parking arrangements, cramped living conditions and unacceptable design layout resulting in no provision of visitor parking.

**18/84/Plan 17/1757/FUL - 283 Queen Edith's Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a residential development comprising 6 x 2-bed and 4 x 1-bed units with access, car and cycle parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing dwelling.

The Senior Planner referred to paragraph 8.24 of her report and said a new travel plan condition was required.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Queens Edith Way.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Accepted more housing was needed in the city.
- ii. The site could be developed.
- iii. The current application design was unacceptable.
- iv. Expressed concern regarding height, mass, amenity and lack of parking provision for the expected number of residents (this could exacerbate existing issues, impact on street parking and lead to safety concerns about site access).

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

Councillor Blencowe proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a considerate contractor informative

This amendment was **carried nem con.**

#### 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 including additional condition below (reported verbally) and with inclusion of considerate contractors scheme informative.

No occupation of the development shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to

encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 8/2).

### **18/85/Plan 18/0086/FUL - 25 Hale Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of new single storey garden room ancillary to the main dwelling and replacement boundary wall following demolition of existing garden shed and timber fencing.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Clare Street.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. A number of nearby residents objected to the development.
- ii. Over development of site.
- iii. Previous applications had been rejected due to conservation issues.
- iv. New building would be very close to neighbours.
- v. Street scape would be changed by the loss of the break in the building line.
- vi. Neighbours would lose the views of the church.
- vii. Roof pitch was too steep.
- viii. Inconsistent comments from conservation officer.

Mr Jackson (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Sheil (Arbury Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee regarding the application as follows:

- i. Questioned if this was a garden room or a separate dwelling.
- ii. Building would be 1 and a half storeys high.
- iii. Could create more traffic and parking issues.
- iv. As this was not a, dwelling standard safety consultees were not consulted.
- v. If this was a garden room, why was a separate entrance needed.

- vi. Inconsistent response from conservation officers.
- vii. Fails to respond to context.
- viii. Overlooking of Clare Street.
- ix. Proximity to neighbours would be problematic.
- x. Errors and inconsistencies in report.

### 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 additional conditions regarding the removal of permitted development rights.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E 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 shall be inserted in the building without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12).

### **18/86/Plan 18/0127/S73 - 23 Baldock Way**

The Committee received a Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved drawings).

The application sought approval to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning 17/0792/FUL (demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a detached three bedroom residential unit) to allow infill of approved carport, relocation of the main entrance and a roof light to the flat roofs.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Baldock Way.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Loss of parking spaces.
- ii. Impact of increased cars in area.
- iii. Increased occupancy.
- iv. Verge parking already a problem.
- v. Contravenes emerging local plan.
- vi. No cycle storage.



- vii. Existing front gardens increasingly converted to hard standing for cars is detrimental to the area.

Mr McKeown (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.

**18/87/Plan 18/0092/FUL - 16 Thirleby Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a residential development consisting of four 1 x bedroom dwellings along with car and cycle parking and associated landscaping following demolition of existing buildings on site.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Thirleby Close.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Spoke on behalf of residents of Thirleby Close.
- ii. Overdevelopment of a small street.
- iii. Over dwelling small single units, mainly bungalows.
- iv. Narrow road with limited access for emergency services.
- v. Some residents often find their driveways blocked by parked cars.
- vi. Would result in increased noise.
- vii. Increased traffic.
- viii. Problematic parking.

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

Councillor Sheil (Arbury Ward Councillor) and addressed the Committee regarding the application as follows:

- i. Speaking on behalf of residents.
- ii. Overdevelopment.

- iii. Negative impact on the area.
- iv. Impact on resident amenities.
- v. Many local objections.
- vi. Thirleby Close is used as access other apartments.
- vii. Overlooking.
- viii. Overdevelopment.
- ix. Out of keeping with street scape of bungalows.
- x. Loss of privacy.

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.

**18/88/Plan 17/2261/FUL - 45 Nightingale Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of two detached, three storey, four bedroom family homes with single storey elements to the front and rear following demolition of existing detached house and garage.

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.

**18/89/Plan 18/0119/FUL - Pavillion, Chesterton Recreation Ground**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey extension to the existing pavilion with an external terrace. The existing building is 47m<sup>2</sup>; the new extension would provide 86m<sup>2</sup> of additional accommodation as well as 18m<sup>2</sup> of additional external covered storage. The proposed extension to the Pavilion would be mainly situated on the south-western end of the existing; overlooking the main sports facilities. The proposed facilities would include a new multi-purpose club room, an enlarged kitchen and internal and external storage facilities.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 and 1 abstention)** 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.

**18/90/Plan 18/0076/FUL - Field House, Conduit Head Road**

Councillor Holt advised the Committee that although the objector was known to her, she had no declarable interest in the application. She had visited the site and had express and opinion. However, she came to this Committee with an open mind

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for single storey and first floor side extensions with alterations to existing and erection of garden shed.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Speaking on behalf of neighbours.
- ii. Has sympathy with the needs of applicant's family.
- iii. Out of scale with other properties in area.
- iv. Too big for plot.
- v. Overbearing.
- vi. Overshadowing and loss of evening light.
- vii. Too close to neighbours.
- viii. Impact on nearby wildlife.
- ix. Disproportionate to scale of properties in the area.

Jay Heal (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** 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.

### **18/91/Plan 17/2231/FUL - 92 Norfolk Street**

Councillor Blencowe stated that he had no personal interest in the application but had visited the site and had met with the applicant. He further confirmed that the Committee would consider every application on its merits. Other retail units in the area had long term viability issues.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a rear roof extension to incorporate two dormer windows, alterations to the front façade and change of use of ground floor to provide two self-contained flats

Mr Proctor (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to reject the officer recommendation of refusal of the application.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to grant the application for planning permission contrary to the officer recommendation and delegated powers granted to prepare conditions for the following reasons:

- i. The committee does not accept that the loss of this retail unit would harm the vitality of this Local Centre.
- ii. There is insufficient evidence that the implementation of the Grafton SPD would enhance viability in this location.
- iii. The internal and external amenity space provided for future occupiers is considered adequate.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to delegate authority to officers to draft additional conditions.

Conditions added by delegated powers:

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

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 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. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

4. There should be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13).

5. No development shall commence until details of the location and facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6).

6. Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the refuse layout and bin provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter unless alternative arrangements are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate bin storage is provided. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 3/7).

7. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected between the rear garden of the hereby approved ground floor flat and the cycle and bin store facing the laneway to the rear of the site. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building is occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12).

### **18/92/Plan 17/2250/FUL - 20 Kinnaird Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of an existing garage and erection of a single new dwelling (and associated development).

Mr Pridgeon (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.

### **18/93/Plan 17/1615/FUL - 156-158 Mowbray Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing dwellings and outbuildings and construction of 2X2 bed semi-detached dwellings, 5x1 bed apartments including bin and cycle store.

Mr Burton (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 with additional condition regarding surface water drainage.

Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include an assessment of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

1) Information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

2) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16).

The meeting ended at 4.45 pm

**CHAIR**