

# Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 17 June 2020

## PLANNING

17 June 2020

10.00 am - 5.50 pm

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Green, Lord, McQueen, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

### Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planning Officer: Yole Medeiros,

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

Committee Manager: James Goddard

### Other Officers:

Principal Planner: Philippa Kelly

Environmental Quality & Growth Manager: Jo Dicks

Highways Engineer [County]: Jon Finney

Transport Manager [County]: David Allatt

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

Environmental Health Officer: Greg Kearney

Scientific Officer: Elizabeth Bruce

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 20/48/Plan Apologies

No apologies were received.

### 20/49/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and Cambridge Cycling Campaign

Councillor Porrer	20/52/Plan	Personal: Knows a local resident mentioned in the appeal documentation. Approaches this application with an open mind. Legal Officer satisfied that there was no conflict of interest.
-------------------	------------	--

### **20/50/Plan Minutes - to follow**

Minutes of the previous meeting to be reviewed in future.

### **20/51/Plan 19/1763/FUL - Whittle Laboratory, 1JJ Thomson Avenue**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extension of the Whittle Laboratory, including new National Centre for Propulsion and Power(4,251 sq metres of Academic (D1) Floorspace), demolition of 1,149 sq metres of D1floorspace, and all associated infrastructure including landscaping, drainage, substation and car and cycle parking.

Rob Miller, Director of the Whittle Laboratory addressed the Committee in support of the application on behalf of Cambridge University.

The Committee noted the amendment sheet. The Committee Chair briefly lost internet connection to the meeting and the Officer repeated the relevant section of the presentation.

Members questioned some of the conditions including, green roofing, public art, long term maintenance of trees, completion date of cycle lane and the BREEAM (**B**uilding **R**esearch **E**stablishment **E**nvironmental **A**ssessment **M**ethod) sustainability assessment. These matters were addressed as follows:

- i. Condition 16D to be amended in read 'in perpetuity' in line with other application in the area.
- ii. Public Art would be addressed as part of a wider strategy for the wider campus.
- iii. Conditions regarding maintenance of trees to be amended to include maintenance of any trees lost from the intial planting for a further five year to ensure their long-term maintenance.

- iv. Adding a specific date for the completion of the cycle path was agreed to be problematic as it would require the cooperation of the Highways Department and road closures. It was agreed that an informative requiring the cycle lane to be completed as expediently and timely a fashion as possible.
- v. The BREEAM standards were agreed to be satisfactory.

### 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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; and
- ii. the following amended conditions where the final wording of the conditions would be delegated to Officers in consultation with the Chair and Spokes:
  - a) The addition of standard condition one, requiring commencement on site within three years.
  - b) Amendment of condition regarding green roof to add the word 'in perpetuity'.
  - c) Additional condition regarding maintenance of any replacement trees for a further five year period.  
and
- iii. An additional informative included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. the cycle lane to be completed as expediently and timely a fashion as possible.

### **20/52/Plan 18/1678/FUL - Station Area Development**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of two new buildings comprising 5,351sqm (GEA) of Class B1(a)/ Class B1(b) floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant, 162 cycle parking spaces, and 8 off-gauge cycle spaces for Block F2 and an Aparthotel (Class C1) comprising 125suites, terrace, ancillary accommodation and facilities with multi-storey car park for Network Rail (total GEA 12,153sqm) comprising 206

car parking spaces and 34 cycle parking spaces for Block B2 with associated plant, hard and soft landscaping, new alignment of access from Station Road into Station Square and permanent access from Devonshire Road to the Cambridge Station Car Park, utilising the existing pedestrian and cycle access, restricted to emergency access to the railway only.

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

- i. Chair of South Petersfield Residents Association.
- ii. Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
- iii. Resident of 85 Great Northern Road.
- iv. Resident of 89 Great Northern Road.

The representations covered the following issues:

- i. Where would taxis 'over rank' when they cannot fit into the car park?
- ii. Was it acceptable that the footprint of building B2 would be far bigger than in the outline application?
- iii. Building F2 would block a cycle route and encroach on a generously wide pavement.
- iv. Camcycle objected to this application under Local Plan policies 56 and 80.
  - a. Their members believed this application would exacerbate problems in the Station Square area, in large part because of the multi-storey car park, which Camcycle thought conflicted with the council's own transport plans to reduce car usage here.
  - b. Cycle parking expansion commitments were cancelled, car parking spaces should have been taken out instead.
  - c. This site contains a key link in the Chisholm Trail, which the city and the GCP have been advancing for years as a route intended to be easy enough for a 12-year old to navigate. There was still no safe and obvious cycle route through this site suitable for all ages and abilities. The proposed buildings encroach too closely on the junctions at either end of the site.
  - d. Asked the committee to refuse permission to this application because it fails to create a successful place.
    - i. It did not integrate vehicle, pedestrian or cycle access routes and spaces between buildings well.
    - ii. It did not safeguard the Chisholm Trail.

- v. Expressed concern about noise from:
  - a. Traffic.
  - b. Bin movements / refuse collection.
- vi. Requested:
  - a. Heavy traffic be limited to 09:00-17:00.
  - b. Construction traffic be limited to 09:00-16:00.
- vii. Suggested relocating the entrance nearer the loading bay.
- viii. As the City Council had declared a climate emergency, it should be mindful of the amount of carbon embedded in the development.
- ix. A pedestrian crossing was required on the eastern end of the site.
- x. Expressed concern the application would block light for nearby [existing] residents' homes and amenity spaces. There had been no light impact study.

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

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

- i. Would speak on behalf of himself and County Councillor Jones.
- ii. Buildings F2 and B2 draw on the concept approved just over 10 years ago.
- iii. It was regrettable that F2 was given outline planning consent as would overshadow neighbouring buildings. It was now bigger and would be dominant, overbearing and loom over local residences.
- iv. F2 and B2 were now proposed to be located closer together than originally proposed, which would cause a canyon effect. This would negatively affect the area, and the Chisholm Trail in particular.
- v. Believed that F2 and B2 conflicted with Local Plan policies:
  - a. Overshadowing.
  - b. Creation of comfortable pedestrian areas.
  - c. Sustainability of pedestrian and cycle movements.
  - d. Creating successful places.
- vi. Asked for the application to be rejected. But if accepted, please go with option B [in officer's report] where a stakeholder group would be selected to look at people movements in the CB1 area.
- vii. Made the following points on behalf of Councillor Jones:
  - a. This development was objectionable in size and scale, and an unnecessary addition to the tightly packed blocks that are already constructed in CB1.

- b. The aparthotel would increase traffic movements and the Network Rail car park would encourage commuters in a crowded city to access the rail station by the most environmentally damaging mode of transport.
- c. The county council had objected to the proposed licensed hackney carriage access across Station Square. A new road cutting across the square runs against the design of the square, which currently enabled pedestrians to move safely from the station to the start of Station Road. It was also a reversal of the county transport hierarchy that puts pedestrians and cyclists at the top.
- d. It was claimed that taxi access across the square would relieve traffic on Great Northern Rd but, if so, this was likely to be a minor, short-term effect. Systematic traffic management in the square and better policing of delivery lorries could achieve as much. Giving priority on Great Northern Road to cyclists and installing a safe pedestrian crossing point would achieve more.
- e. Took issue with the claim that pedestrians should be persuaded to walk on the other side of Station Rd to avoid Tenison Rd.
- f. Called on the planning committee to strike out the proposal in para. 2.17. The city council should not settle for supposed short-term 'fixes' for problems created by growth but focus on strategic, whole area improvements, such as opening up an Eastern approach to the station.

Councillor Baigent briefly lost internet connection to the meeting so the Principal Planner repeated the relevant section of officer answers to councillors' questions.

Councillor McQueen proposed and Councillor Lord seconded a proposal to defer the application.

The proposal was **lost by 2 votes to 6**.

#### The Committee:

Before considering the substantive officer recommendation for approval of the application, Members first had to vote on whether they wished to agree:

- i. Option A (with new access).
- ii. Option B (without new access).

Voted on whether to:

- i. Accept Option A in the Officer's report - **lost by 3 votes to 0**.

- ii. Accept Option B in the Officer's report - **agreed by 5 votes to 0.**
- iii. Refuse Options A and B in the Officer's report - **lost by 2 votes to 0.**

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 3)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

Adjourned 16:25-16:44 for officer discussion to quantify minded to refuse reasons.

- i. The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CBI area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CBI to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.
- ii. By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.
- iii. The proposal would cumulatively exceed the anticipated hotel need for Cambridge contrary to policy 77 and is therefore unjustified.

Voted on whether to:

- i. Accept Reason 1 - **agreed by 5 votes to 3.**
- ii. Accept Reason 2 - **agreed by 5 votes to 3.**
- iii. Accept Reason 3 - **lost by 2 votes to 6.**

The Delivery Manager recommended using the Adjourned Decision Making Protocol as the reasons councilors proposed went against Highways Authority advise.

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 4 and on the Chair's casting vote)** not to accept the officer recommendation of approval, as the committee were minded to refuse the application, a decision on whether to approve or refuse the application was subsequently deferred under the Adjourned Decision Protocol

Under the Council's agreed Adjourned Decisions Protocol this application will be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee to allow further discussion of reasons for refusal. The following matters may form the basis for detailed reasons for refusal:

- i. The proposed development would fail to prioritise the movement and safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CBI area introducing conflict at Station Square and Station Road and further conflict along the car park access road connecting to Devonshire Road. In addition, the footprint of B2 would reduce the flexibility of development coming forward within this quarter of CBI to adequately respond and provide for high quality cycling (including the Chisholm Trail) and pedestrian routes that should have priority over vehicular traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 56, 57, 59 and policy 80 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraphs 104 and 109.
- ii. By virtue of the scale, massing and footprint of building B2 in close proximity to Carter Bridge, the proposed building would appear visually cramped, overly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the existing area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and NPPF (Feb 2019) paragraph 124.

## **20/53/Plan 19/1375/FUL - 1 Rectory Terrace, High Street, Cherry Hinton**

Councillor McQueen left after the vote on item 20/52/Plan.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the rebuild of the existing Tesco convenience store building (including part demolition, external works, and refurbishment) to provide the following:

- Retail unit (use class A1).
- 8 x 1 bed residential units.
- Reconfiguration of the car park and associated areas.

The Principal Planner updated his site plan from the version shown in the plans pack.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of 6 Chalfont Close:

- i. All objections related to the car park.
- ii. Had no issue with the proposed housing.



- iii. The proposed car park design would remove screening and enable significant overlooking of 6 Chalfont Close, by bringing people to the boundary <2.3 m from the house. This would allow views into the kitchen of 6 Chalfont Close.
- iv. Reduced parking spaces would cause overflow onto side streets and the already limited parking at Chalfont Close.
- v. The redesign of the car park to give apparent amenity (ie the small green space) reduced functionality, ultimately shifting parking into the surrounding residential streets.

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

Councillor Ashton (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. He supported the scheme as did a majority of residents.
- ii. The Developer had been proactive in trying to keep residents informed of development.
- iii. Councillor Ashton has signposted residents to the Developer so their concerns could be addressed.

Councillor Dryden (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Agreed with Councillor Ashton's points.
- ii. Security of the car park would be improved as flats were located above it and could overlook it.
- iii. The streetscene would be better as a result of the application.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation for landscaping at the entrance to the car park.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that a green roof be required, and that it should be maintained.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation for a:

- i. courtyard landscape plan.
- ii. buffer around car parking space 18.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved by all present (7 votes to 0)** to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report; [and]
- ii. an additional condition requiring a green roof, and that it should be maintained in perpetuity.  
[and]
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. landscaping at the entrance to the car park
  - b. first floor external courtyard landscape plan
  - c. buffer around car parking space 18[and]
- iv. Delegated powers for officers to finalise the wording of the new condition and informatives.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

**CHAIR**