

Public Document Pack

Planning	Plan/1	Wednesday, 2 December 2020
----------	--------	----------------------------

PLANNING

2 December 2020
10.00 am - 3.00 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Bird, McQueen, Page-Croft, Porrer, Thornburrow and Tunnacliffe

Councillor Bird left after the vote on item 20/79/Plan

Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Ganesh Gnanamoorthy

Senior Planner: Aaron Coe

Senior Planner: Luke Waddington

Planner: Mary Collins

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Other Officers Present:

Principal Environmental Health Officer: Greg Kearney

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/76/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Green. Councillor Bird attended as her Alternate.

20/77/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Extinction Rebellion and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Baigent	20/79/Plan	Personal: Application in Romsey Ward where he is a

		councillor.
Councillor Smart	20/79/Plan	Personal: Knows one of the registered public speakers. Discretion unfettered.

20/78/Plan Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 7 October and 4 November were approved as a correct record.

20/79/Plan 20/04395/PRI18A - Cambridge Railway Station

The Committee received an application for the Prior Approval for the erection of a building to enclose a new Carriage Wash Machine (CWM). The CWM building would be located on a section of track linking the two separate north and south yards of the Cambridge Rail depot, which are divided by Mill Road bridge.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to revised condition and recommendation wording on the Amendment Sheet and to amended wording of Condition 3 in his presentation.

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

- Resident of Eastern Street.
- A representative from Quash the Trainwash Community Organisation.

The representations covered the following issues:

- An industrial facility does not belong in a residential area that is itself in the centre of a conservation area. More appropriate land for its location at Cambridge North was sold, with only transport organisations consulted; not the community or Councillors. Even when the Mill Road bridge works were proposed in 2018, this facility was largely obfuscated. Had it been raised then, the community would have asked many more questions.
- This application has come before the Committee due to the effort and expense of residents. Even then, approval is sought only for two buildings rather than the industrial facility with which they are interdependent. It is not just two buildings. Residents were being asked

to accept continuous noise, vibration, and chemical outputs. Plus the visual blight of a 35m metre long and 8.5m metre high building and associated plant, lit up all night, just metres from their back fences.

- iii. This was a significant change. twelve carriage trains would arrive constantly to be cleaned 24/7, 365 days a year. Cleaning would peak with four trains an hour being cleaned at anti-social times of between 3:30am to 6am. While lorries were no longer allowed to idle in streets, residents were expected to tolerate trains idling in the depot 24/7. Residents accepted that living alongside the railway brought noise and they wanted an efficient railway. Residents felt like collateral damage in the railways' strategic plan.
- iv. Railways need to respect the communities they serve, and so residents objected to the application and proposed conditions as set out in their written representations.
- v. Asked for the following:
 - a. Visual alignment with the surrounding built environment - brick-effect walls and slate coloured roofs; dark brown or green fencing.
 - b. Maximum physical noise attenuation of the buildings, and acoustic fences at entrance and exit especially along the whole length of the sidings. Following the precautionary principle, this should be done now, and should not await post-operation tests.
 - c. On-going noise assessments to hold the operators to the claimed 44dB during cleaning and 38dB background.
 - d. Ongoing vibration assessments of the integrity of foundations and walls of houses.
 - e. Operations should be limited to Monday – Friday, with a maximum of two trains per hour.
- vi. Residents already suffered from almost seven day a week construction noise from both this and Ironworks, exacerbated by working from home during a pandemic. This facility raised the prospect that at no point in the future residents would be assured of a rest from noise, vibration, visual, light, and chemical pollution. Residents appealed to the Committee to impose reasonable conditions and not allow this facility to operate at the long-term cost of injury to the community.
- vii. Expressed particular concern that chemicals/spray from train cleaning operations would be spread (by wind) to residents' gardens. This and train cleaning operations would impact on residents' amenity space. The situation would be exacerbated by lockdown where residents were

forced to stay at home and so would be frequently disturbed by day and night time train cleaning work.

- viii. GTR had repeatedly been asked to confirm what chemicals would be used in train cleaning but they had not engaged with residents on this issue.
- ix. Re-iterated that:
 - a. Residents' sleep could be interrupted.
 - b. Residents wanted maximum mitigation of cleaning processes to avoid impact on their amenity.

Councillors Bird and McQueen temporarily left the meeting due to a disruption in their receipt of the remote meeting delivery. They participated in the discussion, but did not vote on the recommendation.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that prior to the full operation of the CWM that further noise monitoring and washing vapour assessments are undertaken.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

Resolved by (6 votes to 0) to grant the application prior approval 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 the Amendment Sheet;
- ii. an additional Condition: Prior to commencement of development of the CWM building above slab level, the colour and finish of the external materials to be used in the construction of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The building shall be built in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the building does not harm the visual amenity of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 55 and 61);

- iii. an additional Informative: The applicants are recommended that prior to the full operation of the CWM that further noise monitoring and washing vapour assessments are undertaken to establish the operational noise

- levels of the CWM and its vapour impacts. They utilise reasonable endeavours to implement any additional mitigation as appropriate; and
- iv. delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions and informatives in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

20/80/Plan 20/04083/FUL - 39 Akeman Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the continued use of the property as a community centre (Use Class D1) and associated office for a further period of 52 weeks.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved by all Members 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

20/81/Plan 20/01925/FUL - 1 Clarkson Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of the existing property and erection of a replacement two storey detached dwelling with a garage at the front of the property set off the western boundary. The replacement dwelling would be a substantial property with an 'L' shaped layout and the appearance of an Edwardian architectural style.

Ms Xuereb (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. On first seeing the plans two main points stood out for me that are also the main source of objections:
 - a. The size of the proposed house in relation to the site and the neighbouring property 4 Clarkson Close.
 - b. The impact of development on the Adams Road Bird Sanctuary (a county wildlife site).

- ii. The Officer's report addressed the potential impacts on the Bird Sanctuary and was content that the detailed ecological report is sound and there will not be any significant negative impacts.
- iii. On the subject of size:
 - a. Having viewed the site it should be noted that the plans and design statement don't show just how big 4 Clarkson Close is compared to the existing dwelling on the application site, and how much 4 Clarkson Close currently dominates.
 - b. As things stand, neither property has privacy where they face each other. The proposed plans fix this by adding to the natural screening and removing all direct visibility between habitable rooms.
 - c. 4 Clarkson Close would retain its view of the garden to 1 Clarkson Close and of the trees backing onto Trinity Old Field and have a good view of the trees on Clarkson Close.
 - d. The new plans mean the footprint of 1 Clarkson Close will match the footprint of 4 Clarkson Close.
- iv. The Applicants have been in constant conversation with officers in order to address these issues and others. They have shown they're willing to compromise and take on board ideas that improve both 1 and 4 Clarkson Close.
- v. Please support the officer's recommendation in approving this application.

Councillor Nethsingha (Ward County Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Had concerns about size and scale.
- ii. The Applicant was trying to manage the relationship with 4 Clarkson Close.
- iii. 1 and 4 Clarkson Close was formerly owned by the same family but were no longer.
- iv. Relations between the properties should be fair to both 1 and 4 Clarkson Close.
- v. The Officer's report addressed the Councillor's wildlife concerns.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative concerning air source heat pumps.

This amendment was **carried unanimously by all Members present (7 votes to 0)**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved by all Members 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the informative relating to air source heat pumps.

Under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015 permitted development rights were granted to the development of ground source or air source heat pumps for dwelling houses and flats. The MCS Planning Standards were developed to act as a resource for this and contains the requirements, including noise prediction methodologies, that ground source or air source heat pumps must comply with to be permitted development under the above Act. Development would not be permitted development if it failed to comply with The MCS Planning Standards. It would be a reasonable step to require that any new ground source or air source heat pump complies with the MCS Planning Standards. This should ensure that internal and external noise levels are kept to a reasonable level at any nearby residential premises.

The granting of permission and or any permitted development rights for any Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) does not indemnify any action that may be required under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for statutory noise nuisance. Should substantiated noise complaints be received in the future regarding the operation and running of an air source heat pump and it is considered a statutory noise nuisance at neighbouring premises a noise abatement notice will be served. It is likely that noise insulation/attenuation measures such as an acoustic enclosure and/or barrier would need to be installed to the unit in order to reduce noise emissions to an acceptable level. To avoid noise complaints it is recommended that operating sound from the ASHP does not increase the existing background noise levels by more than 3dB (BS 4142 Rating Level - to effectively match the existing background noise level) at the boundary of the development site and should be free from tonal or other noticeable acoustic features.

Delegated authority given to Officers to draft the informative in consultation with the Chair and Spokes.

20/82/Plan 20/02965/S73 - Grosvenor Court

The Committee received a Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 19/1250/S73 to permit changes including changes to the car port, plant room, roof profile and windows.

The Planner updated her report by referring to updated condition wording in her presentation.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Woodlark Road expressing the following concerns:

- i. The design was out of context with the area.
- ii. Impact on amenity space.
- iii. Overlooking of neighbours.
- iv. Boundary wall height was extended without his knowledge or wishes.
- v. Objected to looking out at solar panels.

Dr Wilson (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved by all Members present (7 votes to 0) to grant the Section 73 application 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;
 - a. Condition 18 (Green Roof) to be removed.
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following amended conditions:
 - a. Condition 15 - No operational plant, machinery or equipment shall be installed until a noise assessment and any noise insulation/mitigation as required has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any required noise insulation/mitigation shall be carried out as approved and retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

- b. Revisions to Surface Water Drainage Scheme - condition 3:
 - i. Prior to first occupation of the development, hereby permitted, a revised surface water drainage scheme that addresses the impact of the loss of the green roof to the garage/bike store (that formed part of the previously

approved scheme within application reference 18/1637/COND3) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

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

20/83/Plan 20/03250/HFUL - 3 Bradrushe Fields

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a loft conversion with side dormer, roof windows and front and rear gable end windows and the conversion of the garage roof with roof windows and front gable windows.

The Area Development Manager updated the Senior Planner's report by referring to revised condition wording in her presentation regarding obscure glazing in the dormer window (in perpetuity).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Conduit Head Road:

- i. Spoke as Custodian on the special character and nature of Conduit Head Road Conservation Area wildlife, flora, fauna, biodiversity and darkness.
- ii. Took issue with the Applicant's responses to objections.
- iii. Residents' concerns were supported by council officers and accorded with Cambridge Nature and Conduit Head Road Conservation.
- iv. Thought the application conflicted with Cambridge City Council biodiversity initiative 2019 to encourage, prioritise, protect and enhance habitat creation.
- v. Residents wanted to protect the singular Conduit Head space for day-time creatures and nocturnal creatures. Orchard House "nature reserve" is protected, private, fully dedicated, designated land. It was managed in accordance with conservation of flora and fauna. Its woodland, stream and ponds were quiet and undisturbed particularly when dark; and

integral with a wildlife corridor and darkness linking hedges, fields and woodland habitats.

- vi. Residents don't have to create habitat, establish or restore the natural environment; just protect what was in place from artificial light.
- vii. The proposal would adversely impact the surrounding diverse ecology, which is why residents object to any north roof windows due to concerns about light pollution and overlooking their land.
- viii. Artificial roof lighting would impact and disrupt nocturnal wildlife, interfering with natural patterns and feeding behaviour. Requested the Planning Committee referred to Biodiversity Officer (Guy Belcher) and Councillor Payne who had visited this site and agreed it needed protecting from light emission.
- ix. The proposal was in keeping with Bradrushe Fields street scene, but not in keeping with Conduit Head's rural character as one of the few remaining dark, quiet, private, sparsely populated historic Conservation Areas in Cambridge. Artificial light in Conduit Head was heavily screened with large mature gardens.
- x. Did not object to the loft conversion. Objected to the side dormer and four north facing roof windows. Black-out blinds would not mitigate light pollution from these, nor did they fit into context.

Mrs Thomson (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Wished to highlight to the Committee the unique character of Conduit Head Road and surrounds (which connect on to Bradrushe Fields) amongst residential areas in Cambridge. The road and the properties on it (some of which border 3 Bradrushe Fields) are a very dark area due to the lack of street lighting and the separation between houses. If you ever visit at night you will be struck by how dark and still it is. It is no wonder that nocturnal wildlife, in particular bats, thrive there.
- ii. This new development, which might introduce new light, needed to be carefully judged to help preserve the dark character of the area and avoid disturbing wildlife. Members should carefully consider the adverse impact light from this planned development may have in making their decision.

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

- i. Had sympathy with the Applicant's reason for this application and was sorry the need for it to go through Committee has caused a disruption to their works.
- ii. The reason she called this item into Committee was due to concerns raised by a neighbouring resident about the impact of the light from the windows on the woodland at Orchard House. Councillor Payne had not appreciated the extent and value of this woodland until going to visit the site and I would like to take the opportunity to convey that to the Committee so it forms part of their consideration. The wooded area was an exceptional area of natural forest, which was home to a number of wildlife including bats and newts. It was so different to a landscape one would expect in a residential area that she would simply ask the Committee to be sure they are fully aware of this before making their decision.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative requiring blinds to prevent light spillage.

This amendment was **carried unanimously all Members present (7 votes to 0)**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved by all Members 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;
- ii. an additional condition requiring obscure glazing in the dormer window (in perpetuity);
- iii. an additional informative requiring blinds to prevent light spillage;
- iv. delegated authority given to Officers to draft the conditions and informative in consultation with the Chair and Spokes.

The meeting ended at 3.00 pm

CHAIR

