

Public Document Pack

Planning	Plan/1	Wednesday, 29 August 2018
----------	--------	---------------------------

PLANNING

29 August 2018
10.00 am - 2.35 pm

Present:

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

Officers:

Interim Planning Delivery Manager: Eileen Paterson
Principal Planner: Nigel Blazeby
Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey
Senior Planner: Charlotte Burton
Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan
Legal Advisor: Rebecca Williams
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin
Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/126/PlanApologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Nethsingha.

Councillor Hipkin left after the consideration of item 18/2163/FUL.

18/127/PlanDeclarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

18/128/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

18/129/Plan18/0806/FUL - 291 Hills Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a residential development containing 14 flats comprising 8 x 2-bed units and 6 x 1-bed units, along with access, car parking and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing buildings.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Suggested there were sound material considerations to refuse the application. (As below.)
- ii. Avoidance of affordable housing provision by dropping the number of units on-site from 15 to 14 to avoid the threshold.
- iii. Cramped accommodation and lack of usable amenity space.
- iv. Noise concerns.
- v. Failure to provide a high quality living environment.
- vi. The application should be assessed against policies in the new National Planning Policy Framework and emerging Local Plan, even if these were not signed off by the Planning Inspector.

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

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Objected to the lack of affordable housing provided on-site. This was a concern about the previous application too.
- ii. Thanked the Applicant for responding in some way to the points made at the earlier Development Control Forum.
- iii. Queried why the Applicant had used minimum space standards for rooms if the Applicant was keen to provide high quality/affordable housing where possible. Queried if units were crammed onto the site (to get maximum numbers).

Councillor Pippas (Queen Edith's Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Hills Road is a gateway to the city.
- ii. Suggested the application was contrary to policies in the emerging Local Plan.
- iii. Residents and local councillors had identified 10 ways where they believed the application did not meet (new) Local Plan policies eg amenity space and responding to context.
- iv. Cambridge is an attractive city due to its architecture, this needed to be protected.
- v. Concern over demolition and replacement of the existing building. This should be kept and reconfigured internally for re-use.

The Chair re-iterated points made by the Senior Planning Officer in her introduction:

- i. This was a new application that should be considered on its own merits.
- ii. The 4 reasons for refusal given for the last application were material considerations.
- iii. The Committee were obliged under planning law to consider the application under the current Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework, as the emerging ones were not adopted.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) 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 delegated authority to agree the wording of the S106 Agreement.

18/130/Plan17/1815/FUL - 143-147 Newmarket Road and 149 Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

As applications for *143-147 Newmarket Road* and *149 Newmarket Road* and *Abbey Church* impacted on each other, the Committee were advised to listen to the Planner's introductory report on both, listen to public speakers on both, then deliberate on both applications before voting separately on each.

The application sought approval for the demolition of No.149 Newmarket Road and existing garage structures, the erection of new buildings producing a total of 11 residential units (an increase of 10), the formation of a cafe space (use class A3) on the ground floor of Logic House, brick and tile tinting to Logic House and associated infrastructure and works.

The Planner updated her report by referring to text amendments and pre-committee amendments to recommendation on the amendment sheet. The Planner said the report contained a typographical error, there were 2 windows not 1 at the rear of the property.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Circulated a handout of pictures (already in the public domain) listing residents' concerns.
- ii. The application would have an overbearing impact on the Conservation Area and Beche Road residents.
- iii. The application would have a negative impact on green space and the grade II listed Abbey Church.
- iv. Residents were concerned that the Logic House Applicant broke an agreement to do a joint scheme with Abbey Church. By taking their own application forward, the Logic House development would block the Church's.
- v. Suggested the uncoordinated development of the area was contrary to Local Plan policy 3/6.

The Appointed Person on the Parish Church Council of Christ Church representation covered the following issues:

- i. Objected to the application process rather than the design itself.
- ii. The Abbey Church was a key historic building his organisation wanted to bring back into use.
- iii. The Church was working with this site's Applicant on a joint scheme, but the Applicant had broken the joint working arrangement.
- iv. The Church would prefer a joint working arrangement in future.

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

Councillor Johnson (Abbey Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Re-iterated residents' comments that the application would impact on residents of Beche Road and Abbey Road.
- ii. The Developer broke joint working arrangements with the Church.
- iii. Asked the Committee to defer considering the application to give the Church more time to revise their application or re-instate joint working arrangements with this site's developer.
- iv. Suggested the application could be refused due to:
 - a. Impact of uncoordinated development on Beche Road/Church (Local Plan policy 3/6).
 - b. Harm to a historic building (Local Plan policy 3/10).
 - c. Negative impact on public amenity:
 - i. Loss of post office.
 - ii. Lack of acceptable space.
 - iii. Lack of light.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application.

The Chair decided that possible reasons for refusal should be voted on and recorded separately:

- i. Scale, mass and height of the application prejudiced the development of the Abbey Church site.

Agreed unanimously to accept as a reason for refusal.

- ii. Impact of sense of enclosure and overbearing on Beche Road.

Agreed by 6 votes to 0 to accept as a reason for refusal.

- iii. Scale, design, massing and streetscape did not enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

Agreed by 7 votes to 1 to accept as a reason for refusal.

(Reason (iii) was originally agreed without streetscene reference, so Committee voted 6-2 to annul the reason then re-voted 6-1 to include the streetscene reference.)

- iv. Poor quality of living and amenity space.

Agreed by 7 votes to 1 to accept as a reason for refusal.

Agreed by 6 votes to 1 to accept the reasons for refusal as listed above.

Resolved (by 7 votes to 1) to refuse the application contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. By virtue of its scale, mass, and height adjacent to the boundary with the pan handle strip of land which forms part of the Abbey Church site, the proposal would prejudice the future development potential on the adjacent site and would therefore be contrary to Policy 3/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
2. By virtue of its scale, mass, height, and proximity to the northern boundary of the site, the proposal would have an unacceptable enclosing, overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking impact on the gardens of dwellings in Beche Road to the north, which are approximately 3.5m lower than the application site. The proposal would therefore harm the amenities of occupiers of the adjacent dwellings contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/7 and 3/12.
3. By virtue of the scale, massing and design of the buildings, the development would have a detrimental impact on the streetscene of this part of Newmarket Road and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Abbey Church. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 4/10 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).
4. The proposed development, by virtue of the overly cramped and small internal living spaces within the dwellings and the poor quality of external amenity space for all of the units, would fail to provide a satisfactory quality of living environment and standard of amenity for future occupiers. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) which seeks to provide high quality living environments within new developments.

18/131/Plan17/2163/FUL - Abbey Church, St Andrew The Less, Newmarket Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of 3 dwellings on a strip of land to the east of the site which runs adjacent to 149 Newmarket Road. The development proposed is made up of 1 no. two bedroom dwelling (unit 3G) and 2 no. one bedroom dwellings (units 1G and 2G).

The Appointed Person on the Parish Church Council of Christ Church addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report.

18/132/Plan18/0765/FUL - Garage Block, Markham Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing garages and erection of 5 no. affordable apartments with associated car parking.

The Committee noted that the planning application had been submitted by Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) which is a joint venture company set up by Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnership.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident speaking on behalf of residents of Markham Close flats.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Welcomed the fact that concerns regarding safeguarding had been addressed.
- ii. Raised concerns regarding the loss of the parking provided by the garages that would be lost.
- iii. Alternative garage provision was over half a mile away.
- iv. Pressure on on-street parking would increase both from the increase in housing units and the loss of the garages.
- v. Inadequate consideration had been given to the needs and concerns of the existing community.

Stephen Longstaff (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.

18/133/Plan18/0758/FUL - 57 Hartington Grove

Withdrawn from the agenda and not discussed.

18/134/Plan18/0827/FUL - 108 Grantchester Meadows

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of a two storey house and construction of a new dwelling.

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

Some members of the committee had concerns regarding the visual impact of the PV panels when viewed from the riverside and Grantchester Meadows.

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 2.35 pm

CHAIR