

# Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Tuesday, 11 June 2019

## PLANNING

11 June 2019

10.05 am - 6.00 pm

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent, Green, Lord, Page-Croft, Sargeant and Thornburrow

### Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Principal Planner: Lorraine Casey

Principal Planner: Tony Collins

Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy

Senior Planner: Mairead O'Sullivan

Senior Planning Officer: Lewis Tomlinson

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 19/72/Plan Election of Vice Chair

In appointments to Chairs and Vice Chairs agreed by Council on 22 May 2019, the incorrect Councillor was included in the report. Planning Committee agreed to the appointment of Councillor Sargeant as Vice Chair of this Committee for 2019/20.

### 19/73/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor McQueen. Councillor Thornburrow attended as the Alternate.

Councillor Tunnacliffe asked for the minutes to record the Committee's thanks to Councillor Hipkin for his work on the Planning Committee as a Member and Chair.

### 19/74/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
------	------	----------

Councillor Page-Croft	19/76/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial. Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Baigent	19/77/Plan	Personal: Lives near Cromwell Road.
Councillor Green on behalf of Committee Members		Personal: Application made by Cambridge Investment Partnership.  (Established in January 2017, CIP is a joint venture between Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnerships.)
Councillor Sargeant	19/79/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial. Spoke as a Ward Councillor. Withdrew from discussion and room, and did not vote.

### 19/75/Plan Minutes

The minutes of meetings held on 3 April and 24 April 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 19/76/Plan 18/0806/FUL - 291 Hills Road

Cllr Page-Croft vacated the room and took no part in proceedings whilst this item was determined by the Committee.

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 Senior Planner updated his report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to: (a) the prior completion of a s106 Agreement to secure planning obligations as identified in paragraphs 8.73 to 8.75 of the 29th August 2018 report; and (b) delegated authority to pursue a viability review mechanism to secure a commuted financial contribution for off-site affordable housing provision, if required, as identified in paragraph 6.7 of the 11th June 2019 report (c) and the following conditions: In the event that the application is refused, and an Appeal is lodged against the decision to refuse this application, delegated authority is sought to allow officers to negotiate and complete the Planning Obligation required in connection with this development

The Senior Planner proposing new conditions/informative referring to:

- i. Boundary treatment.
- ii. Hedgehog friendly fences.
- iii. Electric vehicle charging points.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Referred to the extract of the site plan he circulated at committee.
- ii. Referred to concerns and comments regarding the basement access ramp gradient made by Councillor Thornburrow at the 29 August 2018 Planning Committee. The design had been reconfigured but was still impractical:
  - a. The ramp would not be covered along its entire length.
  - b. There would be no delivery vehicle area due to ramp.
  - c. Residents' had on-going concerns.

Mr Griffiths (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Advised the Committee that Councillor Page-Croft had taken no part in campaigning about this planning item. Any information to the contrary was erroneous.
- ii. Expressed concern about the (lack of any) affordable housing provision.
- iii. Expressed concern about the type of accommodation provided through this scheme. The City needed the right type of accommodation.
- iv. Referred to P47 (paragraph 6.6) of the agenda pack and sought clarification on the proposed clawback clause. This clause would ensure

that if the development delivers more revenue than predicted by the viability assessment, the applicant would be required under the terms of a planning obligation to pay a financial contribution to the Council for the delivery of affordable housing off-site.

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, amendment sheet and subject to additional boundary treatment and EV charging point conditions, and an informative regarding hedgehogs.

**19/77/Plan 19/0288/FUL - Development Land at 75 Cromwell Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 295 dwellings including 40% affordable housing; a nursery and community facility (D1), access, car and cycle parking, including basement car park, play equipment and landscaping, substation and associated works.

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

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The area needed housing.
- ii. Expressed concern regarding the size of the development and the stress it would place on local infrastructure.
  - a. Would exacerbate existing traffic flow and access issues.
  - b. Impact on demand for local GP surgery services.
- iii. Proposed development would impact on existing neighbours:
  - a. Overlooking homes and gardens.
  - b. Overbearing.
  - c. Loss of light.
- iv. Queried if the boundary wall would be removed between proposed and existing properties. Plans were unclear. Requested the wall be retained.
- v. Suggested the plans were inaccurate and did not reflect reality. Nor did the model available for inspection by members of the committee and public.

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

Councillor Robertson (Petersfield Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The application was a vital part of the City Council's scheme to provide affordable housing for residents.
- ii. The site had been purchased on the open market, but the City Council was still able to provide affordable housing as it was designed in.
- iii. Open space was provided because of underground parking facilities which freed up space for housing and open areas at ground level.
- iv. The intention was to be an exemplar site.
- v. The site was a commercial depot for Ridgeon's, it could now be used for housing so neighbouring residents should experience similar or fewer traffic levels to what they were used to.

The Committee adjourned 11:55am until noon to view a model of the proposed development. The Principal Planner said the model was a representation and did not have the same weight as the plans and drawings which accompany the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include hedgehog friendly fences to be included in condition 32. (Suggested to Principal Planner pre-committee).

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

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 plus amended condition.

Condition 32 should now read as follows:

No development above ground level shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials, type of boundary treatments to be erected and provision for hedgehog dispersal. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and retained thereafter. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented (Cambridge Local Plan 2018; Policies 55, 57 and 59).

### **19/78/Plan 18/1993/FUL - Land Between 21 And 29 Barton Road (including 27 Barton Road And Croft Gardens)**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the redevelopment of the site for new college accommodation. The proposal includes demolition of 1-12 Croft Gardens and the existing storage and garage buildings on site. No 27 Barton Road is the only building proposed to be retained on site. The site is proposed to be redeveloped to include 3 crescent buildings which form a set piece. The two buildings which run perpendicular to the road are proposed to be graduate family accommodation. The block to the south is proposed to be graduate rooms. A further building is proposed to the front of the site adjacent to 29 Barton Road. This would also provide graduate rooms.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to details on the amendment sheet:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

Conditions are to be amended as follows:

18. Prior to occupation of the development, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Boundary treatments to adjoining gardens should include sufficient gaps (150mm X 150mm) to allow access for hedgehogs. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy and to ensure it allows movement of hedgehogs (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57, 59 and 70).

25. Trigger now prior to occupation.

33. Prior to occupation a plan shall be provided detailing the full extent of the woodland area to the rear of the site. This agreed area of the site shall not be available as amenity space and shall only be accessed for upkeep and maintenance purposes. Details of the means of controlling access (for example a fence and gate) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: to prevent noise, disturbance and loss of privacy to 4C Millington Road (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57).

The Senior Planner proposing a new condition restricting the accommodation to King's College and sought delegated powers to confirm the wording after Committee.

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

- The Co-Chair of the South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum.
- A local resident.
- Mr Dadge (Agent for local residents who were objecting).

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. The National Planning Policy Framework was clear on the need for consultation. The South Newnham Neighbourhood had been excluded, which was an injustice.
- ii. The building did not protect or enhance the area so the application should be refused.
- iii. The Applicant's report was based on old information from the 1980s. The Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) were not in good condition.
- iv. The existing site was a haven for wildlife.
- v. Expressed concern about:

- a. Noise and disturbance to neighbours as the new building would only be 15m away from neighbours.
- b. The application would be too high, overbearing and out of scale with the area.
- c. Loss of privacy.

Dr Carne (representing King's College (Applicant)) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Cantrill ((Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The existing buildings had contributed to the West Cambridge Conservation Area as evidenced in various ways:
  - a. Buildings were given BLI status.
  - b. Historic England had requested the existing building be retained on-site.
  - c. The current buildings were not in good condition or maintained by the owner (Kings College).
- ii. The new scheme would not contribute to the character of the area.
  - a. Overdevelopment of the site had compromised the scheme. Intensification of the site (through the proposal) meant there was too much on it. The Applicant was trying to fit in more buildings and open space than the site could accommodate.
  - b. Expressed concern about building height and massing.
  - c. The new design would not meet the standard of the old one.
  - d. Trees and residential amenity were also factors to consider.

Councillor Green proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation by deleting condition 33.

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 3**.

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to require effective Proctoral parking control to avoid spill-out parking into the neighbouring streets.

The Senior Planner agreed to amend condition wording to limit Proctoral parking approval to 8 cars.

The Committee:

Members sought clarification on whether affordable housing should be provided as part of the application. The Development Manager recommended deferring the application so officers could investigate whether affordable housing should be provided. A report would be brought back to Committee in future.

**Unanimously resolved** to defer the application.

**19/79/Plan 18/1245/FUL - Former Hamilton Lodge Hotel 156 - 160 Chesterton Road And Land Rear Of 162 Chesterton Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the construction of two blocks with basement car park comprising 46 serviced apartments (Sui Generis use); 32 x studio units and 14 x one bed units. Hard and soft landscaping including a garden room, and cycle and refuse storage associated with the use are proposed.

The Senior Planner updated her report to say the Applicant had clarified that flats 20 and 27 were suitable for wheelchair users.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Sandy Lane.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Had no objections to the design of the application.
- ii. Expressed concern about traffic and parking in the area:
  - a. The application would exacerbate existing issues.
  - b. Several BnBs plus AirBnBs were already in the area.
  - c. Sandy Lane was not designed to service the number of vehicles already using it. The application could lead to more. It would be hard to control and monitor.

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

Councillor Sargeant (West Chesterton Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The developer had got into difficulties by moving away from student accommodation to another use. This could lead to higher car usage.

- ii. Took issue with details in the Applicant's Transport Statement.
  - a. Any cars not parking on-site would put pressure on neighbouring areas.
  - b. Making a comparison between the serviced apartments in this application and local apart-hotels was not a suitable comparison. Apart-hotels generally provided more car parking spaces.
  - c. Details about bus routes servicing the area around the application were erroneous, so public transport links were not as listed in the Transport Statement.
- iii. Sandy Lane was not a suitable area for overflow parking.

### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 3 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.

### **19/80/Plan 18/1930/FUL - Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the redevelopment of site to form expansion of Pembroke College comprising repurposing of existing buildings, demolition and erection of new buildings for a mix of uses comprising 94no. student residential units, 1478sqm B1 College office floorspace, 1773sqm D1 teaching space, 1004sqm D2 College leisure and community floorspace, 363sqm commercial A1, A2, A3, A4 retail, food and drink floorspace; and ancillary uses comprising landscaping and hard surfacing, formation of new courtesy crossing at Trumpington Street, highways, vehicular and cycle parking, and associated works and infrastructure.

After the presentation from the Principal Planning Officer Councillor Tunnacliffe proposed the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Lord:

- The application be deferred and considered after a Members' guided site visit had taken place.

On a show of hands the proposal was **lost by 3 votes to 4 Votes**.

The Committee received representation in objection to the application a representative of Camcycle.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Disagreed with the proposal of an informal crossing in front of Pembroke College; this area was already difficult for pedestrians and cyclists especially when crossing Trumpington Street.
- ii. An informal crossing would not improve the situation but a Zebra crossing would.
- iii. The most recent design still creates a serious hazard for those cycling down Trumpington Street.
- iv. Vehicle drivers could squeeze cyclists up against the bollards which do not have a cycling bypass; to get through a bus driver must pull out into the oncoming lane and sweep to back left to straighten out. Both of these movements were potentially hazardous.
- v. The highway was very narrow on Trumpington Street and when vehicles were queuing to the Grand Arcade Car Park; the queue could go past the bollards which would impact on the south bound buses.
- vi. An informal crossing was not good enough and could create further hazards unless changes were made to the street layout which gave increased priority to pedestrians and cyclists.
- vii. A formal crossing should be considered as there were three nearby examples in the same Conservation Area; a zebra crossing was therefore a possibility.
- viii. Further discussion should take place regarding the plans for the northern part of the site which included Silver Street; proposals to change the priority of the junction around would improve pedestrian and cyclists' safety.
- ix. With regards to proposed condition 48, the Committee should consider changing the word 'informal' to 'a revised street design which included a safe and convenient pedestrian crossing'. Delete the reference to 'drawing plan' and 'crossing' and leave the text 'approved design'.
- x. With regard to the pre-committee amendment to the recommendations (No 2) to grant office delegation; the Committee should provide specific guidance to the design containing the bollards placed in the carriage way.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of St Mary's Lane.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. The properties were the only non-university properties adjoining the site.
- ii. Thirty comments on the application had been raised by residents of St Mary's Lane but would highlight six with the Committee.
- iii. The properties on St Mary's Lane were delicate; most were over 300 hundred years old, listed and some of single skin whose boundaries went right up to the existing boundary wall with some of the properties attached to the boundary wall.
- iv. As the proposed plans built right up to the boundary wall there was a serious risk of damage to the properties during the development.
- v. While the bollards on the proposed development had been put into place the properties had been shaking.
- vi. Maintenance on the properties would be made more difficult; access to the rear access to the properties would be lost with a reduction in parking for maintenance vehicles.
- vii. The application had suggested a reduction of 40% of natural light and there has been an offer of compensation which has not been taken forward.
- viii. Windows on the new building directly faced into the properties bedroom and workrooms.
- ix. Stated that Pembroke College had a history of not managing their sites well. The College were responsible for a property in the Lane where there had been four incidents of anti-social behaviour in the last twelve months.
- x. No response had been received from Pembroke College in response to the thirty comments made.
- xi. Would have a detrimental impact on the community; one resident had already moved out due to the risk of noise, another had been told they could only rent to students and a third had had their property devalued by 20%.
- xii. The view was emerging that the Lane would only survive as student housing rather than private living accommodation.
- xiii. Requested that the Committee considered the longer term future of the Lane.

Lord Smith (Master of Pembroke College) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

County Councillor Harrison (Market Ward) addressed the Committee about the application.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Welcomed the development and understood the importance but was concerned to hear the issues raised by the resident on St Mary's Lane.
- ii. The issue of the pedestrian crossing seemed to have become a bigger issue than it should be.
- iii. It was the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council to set out clear requirement in terms of what highway crossing was necessary.
- iv. The City Council conservation officers had been opposed to a formal pedestrian crossing on the site but they were all over the city.
- v. There should not be a situation where pedestrian safety was sacrificed and the College agreeing to a five year safety review to resolve the issue of the crossing.
- vi. The issue of pedestrian safety was a very important component of the development for the both the public and students; safety was vital and had to be dealt with immediately.
- vii. The matter seemed to have become complicated for the simple reason the conservation officers did not like pedestrian crossings.
- viii. Expressed support for Camcycle's proposal that the option of a form of pedestrian crossing should be kept open; a zebra crossing would be adequate.
- ix. The north side of the junction should also be changed to a zebra crossing so that they matched which would have minimal visual impact.
- x. The cycling officer did not welcome an informal pedestrian crossing but this information was not in the report to the Committee.
- xi. The safety audit could show that an informal safety crossing was not a safe option.
- xii. Requested the Committee amended proposed condition 48 so it would be easy to move to a formal crossing if identified.
- xiii. As cycle parking on site would be accessed from Mill Lane, this would increase the number of cyclists from Pembroke Street to Mill Lane and back and again; a possible mitigation as suggested by Camcycle would be to switch priority so the traffic priority was into Pembroke Street. County Council officers had suggested both advantages and disadvantages to this proposal.
- xiv. Suggested a new condition be included to carry out an evaluation of highway management options which could improve cycle safety on the junction which would read as follows:

“An assessment should be made for potential highways management measures to improve cycle safety at the Mill Lane, Trumpington Street, Pembroke Junction and any recommended measures shall be implemented

Councillor Sargeant proposed an amendment to proposed condition 48 to bring it in line with the recommendation made by Camcycle.

The Principle Planning Officer recommendation the following amendment (deleted text struck through)

20. Amend new Condition 48 (ex-49) to read (deleted text struck through: ‘No development shall take place until a plan showing the layout and design of an informal pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street between the application site and the main Pembroke College porters' lodge, in broad accordance with drawing ref: ~~6991-WSP-01-XX-DR-TP-022 P05~~, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved crossing design shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

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 amendment sheet, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers, but with the following additional amendments:

- i. The decision to **APPROVE** the application is subject to the satisfactory submission of a sustainable drainage strategy and its supporting calculations.
- ii. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** is granted to officers to approve such a strategy.
- iii. Amend Condition 48 to read ‘No development shall take place until a plan showing the layout and design of a pedestrian crossing of Trumpington Street between the application site and the main Pembroke College porters' lodge has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved crossing design shall be implemented prior to any occupation of the student accommodation hereby approved.’

- iv. Amend Condition 39 by replacing the words 'Phase 2 of the development' by 'the student residential accommodation'.
- v. Add Condition 50: 'Development shall take place only in accordance with the approved Sustainable Drainage Strategy (version number to be added) and supporting calculations, submitted on (date to be added.)'

Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage of surface water. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

### **19/81/Plan 18/1931/LBC - Redevelopment Area Of Mill Lane Cambridge**

The Committee received an application for listed building consent.

The application sought approval for the demolition of rear two storey extension to Kenmare House, dwarf wall of Kenmare House fronting Trumpington Street, narthex, foyer spaces, lobby, two storey school rooms and north gable end of Emmanuel United Reformed Church; and alterations to 1 Mill Lane, Kenmare House, and Emmanuel United Reformed Church, in connection with expansion of Pembroke College.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from a representative of Camcycle and a resident of St Mary's Lane under application 18/1930/FUL.

Lord Smith had already addressed the Committee in support of the application under application 18/1930/FUL.

Ward County Councillor Harris (Market Ward) had already addressed the Committee under application 18/1930/FUL.

#### The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for listed building consent accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **19/82/Plan 17/2265/FUL - Homerton College, Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of existing conference reception building and construction of a new dining hall, buttry area, kitchens and associated facilities and new areas of hard and soft landscaping.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application from a resident of Harrison Drive.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Welcomed the design of the dining hall but objected to the waste collection element which utilised the residential area of Harrison Drive as a service yard.
- ii. Considered the service yard to be unsafe, unsightly and unsociable as it did not comply with Local Plan policies, 35, 55 and 56.
- iii. Believed there was a better alternative to the proposed service area on the applicant's site with the use of security barriers preventing out of hours deliveries. The benefits would include CCTV camera's and wide roads where vehicles could drive in and without having to reverse. This location would be safe, quiet and out of sight and responded to Local Plan policies 35, 55 and 56.
- iv. The collection site was currently further away from the proposed location and the waste collection could still be heard; the noise level would increase with the relocation of the service area.
- v. Had video evidence of vehicles collecting glass at 5.30am.
- vi. The applicant's proposals trusted their supply chain to comply with conditions but to date they had not.
- vii. The planning officer stated the environmental health officer had raised no concerns so it would be unreasonable to impose condition of hours of delivery under para 8.20 of the report but strongly disagreed as supported by Local Plan policy 35.
- viii. Requested a similar condition to 10.4 of the report to restrict collections and deliveries outside normal working hours.
- ix. The waste facility design had a large industrial door 8m x3 on the building frontage which could be left open, noisy in operation, dysfunctional over time and offered a poor visual view to the resident's living opposite.
- x. Felt the conservation officer had not recognised the issues with the door and this should be clarified. A large industrial sized door did not constitute good detailed design.
- xi. Stated the urban design officer had not received the latest design, as in their acceptance of the scheme stated the door is at the side and not at the front.

- xii. The planning officer had advised that as the highway on Harrison Drive was not adopted the highway authority had no comment to make. This was socially unacceptable.
- xiii. Had been advised that signage would be a solution but there was already a large number of signage on Harrison Drive.
- xiv. Potential risk injury of unsafe vehicle movements from waste vehicles.

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

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. Harrison Drive was a residential street which the college choose to develop for residential use which housed a number of families and a developing community.
- ii. The applicant as landlords had a responsibility to respond to residents' concerns.
- iii. The applicant had recently removed 100 metres of hedgerow for a temporary footpath opposite a separate development which they were currently undertaking.
- iv. While the applicant had said there were no plans to increase student numbers the College had been allowed to grow to become the largest College in Cambridge.
- v. Access to the staff car park was at the end of Harrison Drive; the Hills Road end has the Facility of Education.
- vi. Harrison Drive was in continuous use for service vehicles making deliveries and collections. Vehicles used the layby to make u turns nearer to Hills Road although the noise was still disruptive to occupants.
- vii. The proposal to move the layby would mean it would sit directly opposite resident's front doors. This would have an adverse impact on residents.
- viii. A mature protected tree would be cut down to accommodate the relocation of the layby.
- ix. A large TPO tree had already been taken down without authorisation. In total four trees would be lost but the drawings did not reflect this.
- x. Would question if the Committee had all the information to consider the environmental loss.
- xi. The environmental officer did not support the application as outlined in pages 420 & 423 of the agenda pack.
- xii. Requested the Committee added a condition to install a bollard on the junction of Harris Drive and Scholars Court to prevent large vehicles performing u turns.

- xiii. The College needed to respond positively to the surrounding environment and avoid leaving its own tenants with an unreasonable number and dangerous vehicle movements on the road where they lived.
- xiv. Any conditions applied were likely to be ignored and difficult to enforce.

The Senior Planning Officer proposed that the Committee agreed to grant delegated powers to officers to discuss with the College the restriction of delivery and collection times, in conjunction with the Chair and Spokes.

**Unanimously resolved to do so.**

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 plus delegated power to Officers to deal with a condition to restrict delivery hours.

### **19/83/Plan 17/2266/LBC - Homerton College, Hills Road**

The Committee received an application for Listed Building Consent.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing conference reception building and construction of a new Dining Hall. The application is accompanied by an application for full planning permission which will be heard concurrently at Planning Committee.

Professor Ward had already addressed the Committee in support of the application under application 17/2265/FUL

Councillor McGerty (Queen Edith ward councillor) had already addressed the Committee under the application 17/2265/FUL.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to grant the application for Listed Building Consent in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the officers.

### **19/84/Plan 18/1807/FUL - India House, 31 Newnham Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of new building comprising of a single A1 or A3 (in the alternative) unit at ground floor and seven self-contained flats above.

Matt Hare (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

A statement in support of the application on behalf of a member of South Newnham Residents' Association was read out to the Committee.

Councillor Dr Gehring (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. The most sensitive location in all of Newham; an exposed location which was viewed by thousands of visitors to the City when dropped off by tourist coaches.
- ii. The proposed design would change the character of the historic street scene.
- iii. The redevelopment of the Cambridge University Arms had shown it was possible to replicate certain heritage elements sensitively; this application did not reproduce any of the historical elements which were being taken down.
- iv. The application would have an adverse effect on the existing street scene.

Councillor Cantrill (Newnham Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application as follows:

- i. A complex and sensitive site in relation to the architectural and heritage content of the area.
- ii. No objection to the redevelopment and demolition of the site.
- iii. If a sensitive design were to be delivered it would achieve more than the original building offered to the existing street scape.
- iv. Had spoken with the architect and the South Newnham Residents' Association on various occasions to determine a design in nature and form worthy of the location; many of the aspects had reflected those discussions.
- v. The proposed design was using high quality materials, respected the space, while addressing the sites which surrounding the building, Newham Road; the Mill Pond and Victoria Road.
- vi. Despite all the positives, the design did not go far enough concerning the massing of the three storey component and how it related to Newham

Road. The dominance of the building and how it relays to the surrounding buildings.

vii. The application should not be approved in its current form.

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 subject to the following changes:

- i. Revision to condition 27 to refer to new rather than existing building.
- ii. Additional condition requiring sample materials.

**19/85/Plan 18/1859/FUL - 39 Akeman Street**

This item was postponed until the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 June 2019.

**19/86/Plan 18/1520/FUL - 11 Napier Street**

This item was postponed until the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 June 2019.

**19/87/Plan 18/1887/FUL - 57 Peverel Road**

This item was postponed until the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 June 2019.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

**CHAIR**