

# Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 3 February 2021

## PLANNING

3 February 2021

10.00 am - 7.15 pm

### Present:

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

### Officers:

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Lorraine Casey

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Yole Medeiros

Senior Planner: Aaron Coe

Senior Planner: Luke Waddington

Senior Planner: Alice Young

Planner: Phoebe Carter

Planner: Rebecca Claydon

Planner: Mary Collins

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard // Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

### Other Officers Present:

Joint Housing Development Officer (Growth): Tracey Harrison

Principal Sustainability Consultant: Emma Davies

Nature Conservation Projects Officer: Guy Belcher

Principal Landscape Architect: Dinah Foley-Norman

Urban Design Consultant Annemarie de Boom

Principal Transport Officer: Tam Parry

Local Highways Engineer: Jon Finney

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 21/11/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor McQueen.

### 21/12/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Porrer	21/15/Plan	Personal – Sat on Housing Scrutiny Committee where topic was discussed but did not fetter her discretion.
Councillor Baigent	All	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

### **21/13/Plan Minutes**

No minutes were presented to committee for approval.

### **21/14/Plan 20/01972/OUT - GB1 Netherhall Farm, Worts Causeway**

The Committee received an outline application (all matters reserved except for means of access) for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings, with associated infrastructure works, including access (vehicular, pedestrian and cycle), drainage, public open space, and landscape.

The Principal Planner referred to details on the amendment sheet as part of their officer presentation.

The Principal Planner updated her report to recommend removing Condition 1.

The Committee received a number of representations in objection to the application:

Representation from a Camcycle representative:

- i. This application was completely unacceptable as it lacked basic connectivity for walking and cycling to and from schools and community amenities. This would badly affect not only this generation but future ones too.
- ii. The site is only 300 metres away from the Netherhall School open space, but schoolchildren will have to trek a very long and circuitous route to get there: almost 2 kilometres. Distance was the single biggest factor in people's choice of transport mode. The long routes were also dependent on a narrow and decrepit cut-through that was unsuitable for its existing use, much less hundreds of additional families. It was likely

that many new residents would turn to driving instead of walking or cycling to everyday destinations.

- iii. Policy 80 states that developments should be 'conveniently linked with the surrounding walking and cycling networks' Policy 81 states that developers were required to make investments to encourage the use of sustainable transport, including infrastructure.
- iv. Paragraphs 3.1.3 and 3.5.1 of LTN 1/20 state that there should be a 'densely spaced cycle network' with '250m - 400m' between routes 'so that all people can easily travel by cycle for trips within and between neighbourhoods'. There was over 1 kilometre of site perimeter with no route and even worse it lacked a cycle route on the strongest desire line.
- v. Establishing a direct walking and cycling link from the development to Almoners' Avenue and/or Beaumont Road is the lynchpin of this application. The existing estate was specifically designed for expansion at these points. A weak planning condition that allows the applicants to say 'they tried and gave up' is an abdication of the city's responsibility to its future residents.
- vi. The lack of basic connectivity was a strong reason to reject this application under policies 80, 81 and LTN 1/20. Asked the committee to require the applicants to secure at least one more walking and cycling land in the direction of schools and community facilities.

#### Local resident representation:

- i. The amenities at Wulfstan Way are identified as a neighbourhood centre in Appendix C to the adopted 2018 Cambridge Local Plan.
- ii. The vital role and significance of neighbourhood centres in the Local Plan is recognised in Policy 72, the purpose of which is "Ensuring that the district, local and neighbourhood centres remain healthy with a suitable mix of uses and few vacancies."
- iii. Specific references include the:
  - a. *Paragraph 2.65* "In particular, the smaller local and neighbourhood centres need to be protected, as they perform an important function in providing for day-to-day needs."
  - b. *Paragraph 8.7* "Local and neighbourhood centres are particularly valuable in providing for everyday needs and need to be protected and enhanced. This network of centres is important in providing

shops and facilities that can be accessed by foot and bicycle rather than having to travel by car.”

- iv. As noted by other objectors to this application, the failure to include convenient and direct walking and cycling access between GB1 and Wulfstan Way severs the Netherhall Farm development from local amenities at the Wulfstan Way neighbourhood centre. This deficit undermines both the principle of prioritising sustainable transport (Policy 80 and 81) and the principle of ensuring the health of the existing neighbourhood centre (Policy 72). It is therefore incumbent on councillors to reject the application until appropriate connectivity to support these Policies is provided.

#### Local resident representation:

- i. Representation related to the suitability of the proposed design of the access to Netherhall farm, which has been identified as the means of emergency access on the illustrative masterplan.
- ii. The means of access for this application was not a reserved matter. At present the submitted arrangement shows no widening of the junction with Worts Causeway and no suitable passing provision at an appropriate and usable location for the existing users.
- iii. The arrangement cannot serve the existing users of the access and emergency vehicles. Until a suitable and safe design access has been secured the application should not be approved with access not being a reserved matter. Ask that this matter is looked into before any approvals being issued.

#### Local resident representation

- i. The current plans posed a security risk, as well as an invasion of their privacy. (Showed plans on screen to detail privacy concerns)
- ii. No additional privacy measures were proposed by the developers. Expected to have the same privacy protecting measures as the Northern Front.
- iii. Referred to 2.21 of the main project plan, showed fencing of at least 1.8m high plus trees of at least 5m tall. Expected this around the whole of their property. It was inconsistent to grant one set of households to the northern front ‘additional security and privacy’ but not them.

- iv. The Planning Officer had noted their concerns in the planning report but stated that it should be noted that the development was making public spaces around their property. This made their concerns greater and there would be zero accountability to who could access these grounds, which was to the rear of their house.
- v. Building heights around the development would be 11.5m or 12m high. The visual assessment stated that 3 storey houses were prevalent in the area. Asked the developer to provide evidence how this was within the local character of the area.
- vi. The nearest bus stop was outside the maximum recommended by the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport. The Developers misrepresented advice from the CHID. The development was therefore not sustainable development from a public standpoint.
- vii. All previous objections, which have gone unanswered, still stand.

#### Local resident representation

- i. Issue of the status of Netherhall Farm and the barns as a Building of Local Interest (BLI). Referred to Policy 62 and
  - a. appearance, the BLI would be hidden by the proposed development
  - b. setting within agricultural heritage.
- ii. Previous applications submitted by the speaker had been declined because they had not been consistent with BLI. It was inconsistent to have a BLI be surrounded by a housing estate. Asked if the development was approved that the BLI status was removed from Netherhall Farm and the barns.
- iii. Expressed concerns regarding loss of privacy. The 20m buffer did not extend to their property. There was only a 6-7m buffer between edge of their garden and the proposed development. Asked that the 20m buffer proposed by the developer was consistently applied to all existing properties.
- iv. The access plan was unworkable. The developer proposed using the track leading to their property for emergency access. The developer had proposed a passing place but this was unworkable due to right of way issues. Requested condition regarding rights of way between the developer and all residents if the application was approved.

- v. Mown pathway between site and western area through country wildlife site.
- vi. Tree on their land had been omitted from the tree retention plan.
- vii. Road widening on Worts Causeway will stop the road having the rural character it currently had. Road should be retained at current width as it provided a speed retention.
- viii. Queried cycleway way over a footway at the south side of Worts Causeway.
- ix. Summarised principal objections:
  - a. CEG design inappropriate adjacent to Building of Local Interest
  - b. Loss of privacy having buildings so close to their property
  - c. CEG's access proposal is unworkable as no legal means for vehicles to pass
  - d. Tree retention plan
  - e. Mown pathway past bedroom windows
  - f. Cycleway over footpath

Sophie Pryor (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Noted the applicant's willingness to work with the community and local councillors.
- ii. Noted the application's 40% affordable housing contribution, which would make housing available to those who could demonstrate they had family locally.
- iii. Noted high house prices in Queen Edith's Ward.
- iv. GB1 would provide 32 homes for people who work nearby and 24 affordable homes for people with family in the area, in addition to 24 affordable homes more generally available.
- v. Application made positive contribution to biodiversity.
- vi. Referred to the recently published Sustainability SPD.
- vii. Noted that there was still no undertaking to provide a bus service to the area. Referred to section 8.107 of the officer's report which stated that people would walk to the existing bus stops on Babraham Road. Thought people would not do this and would drive into town instead. Stated that

- there should be a new bus stop on Worts Causeway at the south western site entrance point. This could serve developments GB1 and GB2 equally. Asked for an update on bus providers / County Council.
- viii. Expressed concerns regarding the size of buildings going up close to residents' homes.
  - ix. Noted that the 3 storey blocks had been moved into the centre of the development.
  - x. Queried the proposal to widen the road.
  - xi. Queried access to the local wildlife site.
  - xii. Asked for more information regarding the management plan for protected habitat.
  - xiii. Expressed concerns that the pavement could become and overflow car park.
  - xiv. If the development went ahead asked the officer to explain why Netherhall Farm and associated buildings should retain their status of BLI.
  - xv. Requested fencing around 31 Worts Causeway.
  - xvi. Expressed disappointment there was no walking and/ or cycling link into the Queen Edith's community.

Following Councillor Tunnacliffe's concern over allotments and several councillors being unsure that sufficient efforts were taken by applicants to secure north access cut through route, the Principal Planner updated her report with the following recommendations:

- i. Landscape and ecological management plan could be secured through the s106 Agreement (would need to include reference to allotments).
- ii. Re-instate Condition 35.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation for an informative that the Applicant should negotiate a northern access cut through route for houses suggesting liaison with SusTrans who did something similar for the Chisholm Trail.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. Changing the foul water informative to a condition.

- ii. Condition 11 should include reference to the Cambridge Water Management Plan regarding 2020-2025 water resources.
- iii. To increase the percentages in Condition 28 to adapt for current flooding conditions.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3)** to grant the application for outline planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to:

- i. the prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with delegated authority granted to Officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on terms considered appropriate and necessary;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and the Amendment Sheet;
- iii. removal of Condition 1;
- iv. landscape and ecological management secured through the s106 Agreement (to include reference to allotments);
- v. re-instatement of Condition 35;
- vi. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional/amended conditions:
  - a. changing the foul water informative to a condition;
  - b. condition 11 to include reference to the Cambridge Water Management Plan regarding 2020-2025 water resources;
  - c. increase the percentages in Condition 28 (in consultation with Lead Local Flood Authority and the Council's Drainage Engineer); and
  - d. an informative that the Applicant should negotiate a northern access cut through route for houses. Suggested liaising with SusTrans who did something similar for the Chisholm Trail.

**21/15/Plan 20/03501/FUL - Land at Barnes Close**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission. This is a Regulation 3 under the Town and County General Regulations 1992 (as amended).



The application sought approval for demolition of existing garages and hardstanding and the construction of 6 No. modular homes.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to updated condition wording and written statements by Objectors on the Amendment Sheet. The Committee adjourned for 10 minutes to ensure all Members had read the additional details.

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

- i. The development was not a good living space:
  - a. loss of floor area;
  - b. does not meet accessibility standards;
  - c. lack of private amenity space.
- ii. Parking pressure from the application would lead to more on-street parking.
- iii. The colour of the pods would harm the character of the area.
- iv. The pods would harm the privacy of nearby neighbours.
- v. Did not object to the principle of housing pods, but they should be located on other site(s).

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

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that electric vehicle charging point should be put in the car club parking space.

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's report and the Amendment Sheet, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the amendment to the condition regarding the electric vehicle charging point and its location.

Committee also delegated authority to Officers to draft the conditions in consultation with the Chair and Spokes.

**21/16/Plan 19/1221/FUL - Land r/o 29-31 Peverel Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a detached dwelling on the site, which has been assembled from the severed gardens of numbers 29 & 31 Peverel Road with boundary fencing.

The Planner referred to a statement from Objectors on the Amendment Sheet.

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

- i. Three out of the thirteen material planning considerations had still not been met.
- ii. Regarding harm to wildlife, section 9.22 of the Officer's report stated that gaps will be left in the boundary fencing for hedgehogs, with no consideration made to the low chance of survival for the many nesting deep among the log-piles in the portion of the site that has been untouched for over a decade. Even though such instances were not strictly protected by the Conservation of Habitats Act, a survey is required to assess how many females are present and to ensure they are given the optimal chance of surviving having to establish new nests after construction commences, particularly if this occurs during the crucial post-hibernation months when hoglets are present.
- iii. One element of the design and layout still failed to meet planning considerations, namely how far the first floor protrudes deep beyond the line of neighbouring homes. This was evident as extensions with first floors extending out this far were not permitted along the very same housing row due to the unreasonable overshadowing caused. It's clear that in an area of bright concrete terraced and semi-detached houses, a detached brick dwelling with a first floor set back this prominently into neighbouring gardens does not relate appropriately to the buildings and spaces surrounding it. Though I appreciate that efforts have been made to adequately address this issue in the past year or so, with further more open discussions with residents, the moving of this first floor back towards the existing row of houses can be more than offset by increasing the ground floor area, jointly making better use of the land available and increasing the principle of development.

Mr Taylor (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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer.

**21/17/Plan 20/02791/FUL - 196 Green End Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the demolition of no. 196 and No. 198 Green End Road and construction of 7no. Apartments (5no. 2bed, 1 x 3bed and 1 x 1bed) and commercial space.

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

- i. Addition of further conditions: Condition 25, 26 and 27.
- ii. Referred to a statement from an Objector.

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

- i. Safety concerns about road junction:
  - a. Impact of extra traffic from the shop.
  - b. Lack of parking for shop visitors.
- ii. There were twenty mature trees and wildlife in the green space. Expressed concern only two to three trees would be left with less wildlife due to replacement hard standing which could also impact on water drainage.
- iii. Shop could overlook nearby nursery and lead to lack of privacy.
- iv. Questioned if there was:
  - a. A fire risk from just one entry/exit point.
  - b. An appropriate level of parking.
- v. Expressed concern about:
  - a. Development out of character with the area.
  - b. Loss of light.
  - c. Overlooking of neighbours.
  - d. Traffic noise.
  - e. Overshadowing.

- f. Application goes over building line.
- g. Overbearing.
- h. Impact on local drainage system.
- i. Overdevelopment of site.
- j. Application too close to pavement, people step out of shop straight onto pavement, causing possible conflict between shoppers and pedestrians.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation that:

- i. The position of letterboxes should be policy compliant.
- ii. Replacement trees should be maintained for 5 years after planting up.

These 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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
  - a. To ensure the position of letterboxes would be policy compliant.
  - b. Any replacement trees should be maintained for 5 years.

### **21/18/Plan 20/03020/FUL - 184 Thoday Street**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval to erect a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and roof extension and to subdivide the existing dwelling into 4 separate flats with private and shared amenity space.

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

- i. Amendment to Paragraph 8.22.
- ii. Referred to a statement from the Applicant.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Thoday Street:

- i. Was not against development and understand the need for more housing.
- ii. Supported the redevelopment of the former Ridgeon's site and applaud the Council that much of it will be affordable.
- iii. The proposed development was the wrong one in the wrong place.
- iv. Wanted to put on record the Objector's view the Applicant has gone about this application in an underhand way:
  - a. Alleged the Applicant said he intended to live in the property with his partner.
  - b. The Applicant then quickly installed tenants who subjected those in the adjoining property to anti-social behaviour.
- v. Objector's specific objections to this application include:
  - a. Overdevelopment – almost all properties in the immediate vicinity are still family homes or single unit HMOs.
  - b. Out of scale and character with neighbouring buildings – application is much larger than those buildings in immediate vicinity.
  - c. Increase in noise and waste particularly to those living in the properties adjacent and adjoining. Four dwellings = 12 waste bins.
  - d. Intensification of use and increased disturbance from subdivision caused by more movements from property and deliveries to it etc.
  - e. Increased overlooking of adjacent properties and those on Fairfax Rd and Ross Street caused by the increased scale & third storey.
  - f. Loss of distinction between public space at front and private space at rear impacting negatively upon the privacy of residents
  - g. Change in character from a family orientated area undermining existing sense of community amongst residents.
  - h. Lack of car parking provision which is already limited in area – a view supported by County Highways and Officers
  - i. Also increases pressure to introduce residents parking scheme.
  - j. Amenity space at the rear is poorly related to the flats it serves which will not encourage those who own to it to look after it.
  - k. Insufficient cycle parking and bin stores, this may result in them being stored at front of property which is detrimental to appearance and amenity.

- l. Proposed design will result in further blocking of light to side bedroom window at 182 Thoday Street.
  - m. Structurally flats 3 and 4 do not conform to roof heights for residential space standards.
  - n. Internal stairs also do not comply with Building Regulations.
- vi. Closing Comments
- a. Para. 8.22 referenced bus stops on Milton Rd and Kings Hedges Rd rather than Mill Rd.
  - b. There was no acknowledgement that there could be an impact upon residential amenity which Councillors should consider.
  - c. Officers also recognise the ceiling heights in flats 3 and 4 do not meet the height standards set out in the Council's own policy.
  - d. Overall this application does not suggest that the proposed development is fit for purpose for the future.
  - e. It is instead a speculative attempt to maximise profit to the detriment of existing residents.

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

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 1)** to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reason:

The proposed development would represent an overdevelopment of the site, resulting in extensions of a scale and massing which would be out of keeping with the existing building and being overly prominent and bulky in the street and a poor quality provision of internal space due to restricted head heights and no private outdoor space for flat 4, resulting in a cramped form of development for future occupants that would result in a poor standard of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 53, 55, 56 and 58.

**21/19/Plan 18/1321/OUT - 72-74 St Philips Road**

Item deferred to enable the Applicant time to amend the scheme to address some of the issues raised in the Officer's report in relation to the new Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **21/20/Plan 6pm Guillotine**

The Committee unanimously resolved to continue past 6pm and not adjourn the meeting.

### **21/21/Plan 20/02954/FUL - 8 Kings Hedges Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of four dwellings, including a dropped kerb and associated infrastructure following the demolition of the existing buildings on site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Kings Hedges Road:

- i. The development would exacerbate existing traffic and parking issues.
- ii. The application was positioned right up against the Objector's boundary line.

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

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation to require:

- i. An air source heat pumps informative.
- ii. A condition requiring details to be submitted regarding cycle parking provision.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative that the fire service need access to the rear of the property.

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's report, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional condition:
  - a. condition requiring details to be submitted regarding cycle parking provision;
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. air source heat pumps informative;
  - b. the fire service need access to the rear of the property.

### **21/22/Plan 19/1670/FUL - 60 Wycliffe Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for single storey rear extension and conversion from 3 bedroomed house to two x one-bedroom flats.

Councillor Baigent proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative that the land shown green on the plan is City Council owned land, not part of the site, and should be replanted with grass to stop people parking on it.

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including an informative bringing to the fore that the green area adjoining the site was Council owned land, not part of the site, and should be replanted with grass to stop people parking on it.

### **21/23/Plan 20/05247/HFUL - 63 Gilbert Road**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.



The application sought approval for the installation of external wall insulation installed on the ground floor side elevation and the first-floor side and rear elevations.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the Chair and Spokes should be consulted if anyone lodges an objection to the application between the date of this meeting and the end of the statutory consultation period.

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's report, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the amendment that the Chair and Spokes be consulted in the event of any objections being lodged between the date of this meeting and the end of the consultation period.

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank