

# Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 30 June 2021

## PLANNING

30 June 2021

10.00 - 11.50 am

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors D. Baigent (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Dryden, Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood, Porrer and Thornburrow

### Officers:

Assistant Director Delivery: Sharon Brown  
Area Development Manager: Toby Williams  
Senior Planner: Aaron Coe  
Senior Planner: Luke Waddington  
Planner: Mary Collins  
Arboricultural Officer: Matthew Magrath  
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber  
Committee Manager: James Goddard

### Other Officers Present:

Fire Officer: Danny Hans  
Fire Officer: David Rees  
Local Highways Engineer: Jon Finney

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 21/55/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart.

### 21/56/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Porrer	21/58/Plan	Personal: Application in Market Ward where she is a Ward Councillor. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	21/62/Plan	Personal: Would abstain from voting

		on policy decision as Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.
--	--	---

## **21/57/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 24 March 2021, 21 April 2021 (as amended) and 28 April 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

In the minutes for 21 April Councillor Porrer asked for a minor change to the notes for 20/03843/FUL Carlyle House. In the sum up of her amendment at committee "mast storage location" was mentioned, whereas in fact it was just "mast relocation" and the same where it is repeated in the decision at (ii) b. Details were correct on the decision notice from Planning Department (available on-line).

## **21/58/Plan 20/02504/S73 - Varsity Hotel and Spa, 24 Thompsons Lane 10am**

The Committee received an application for removal of condition 2 (vehicle parking) of planning permission 08/1610/FUL.

At 21st April 2021 Planning Committee, Members resolved to defer the application due to concerns over the fire safety matters and members requested a representative of Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue be present at the committee meeting to answer members questions and concerns in relation to fire safety matters. Following on from the deferral of the application a site meeting had taken place between the case officer, the applicants and fire safety consultant. Additional information had also been submitted in the form of a fire strategy and a further consultation on this document had taken place with Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue and Cambridgeshire County Council Highways authority.

The Senior Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet and updated condition wording in his presentation:

- i. Additional conditions were recommended as follows:
  - a. The area within the hotel site available for visitor drop off and taxi turning shall be retained throughout the lifetime of the development to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in forward gear. The

area shall be used solely for that purpose and shall not be used for the parking of cars.

Reason: To avoid obstruction to traffic in Thompson`s Lane and in the interest of highway safety, and to ensure the area is retained free of obstruction for fire safety reasons. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 81).

- b. The hotel shall continue to offer a valet parking service for all disabled guests throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To secure the provision of an adequate car parking service to meet the needs of disabled visitors. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82).

- ii. Officer recommendation: The proposed loss of the disabled car parking space subject to the conditions which retain the ability for taxis to enter and leave the site in forward gear and the provision of a valet car parking service for disabled guests throughout the lifetime of development is on balance considered to be acceptable.

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

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an informative concerning the provision of signs giving information where taxis could park when dropping off/collecting passengers from the hotel.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Dryden requested a recorded vote.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 1)** to grant the S73 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 and the amendment in the Officer presentation (listed above);
- ii. an informative included on the planning permission concerning signage giving information where taxis could park when dropping off/collecting passengers from the hotel.

Votes in favour of application: Councillors Baigent, Flaubert, Gawthrop Wood, Porrer and Thornburrow.

Vote not in favour of application: Councillor Dryden.

### **21/59/Plan 20/04824/FUL - 130 Queen Ediths Way 10:30am**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing 2 storey house and replacement with three, two person one bedroom flats and two, three person two bedroom flats in a one and two storey building.

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

- i. The recommendation is for approval subject to conditions.
- ii. Condition 13 – removal of permitted development rights for gates. This condition has been attached as recommended by Highways.

The Planner/Chair allowed the Objector to present parking stress levels pictures and his own survey information to the Committee as a late representation. The Applicant had been made aware of details before Committee.

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

- i. Referred to previous objections about the cutting of parking provision.
- ii. Expressed concern regarding the risk from traffic flow.
- iii. The Developer/Applicant had submitted a traffic flow survey after being invited to do so in the day time by council officers. The Developer conducted their survey at night, as set out in the Officer's report.
- iv. The Objector took issue with the Developer's survey and undertook his own one day before committee. The details in this contradicted the Developer's survey.
- v. Requested the development be refused as it was overdevelopment of the site.

Councillor Page-Croft (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Was pleased that a parking survey had been done, and that parking spaces on Queen Edith Way were not to be included as they were unsuitable for on street parking.
- ii. This was a very narrow road with double decker buses going up and down every 10 minutes.
- iii. There were also young adults cycling along the road, not always aware that other traffic also used the road too.
- iv. If cars parked on the road then a serious accident was likely.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that external letter box details should be submitted as part of planning conditions.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the application was a car free development, so should not add to parking stress in the area (by people living in the development but parking in neighbouring streets). The Planner suggested an informative drawing the Applicant's attention to four car parking spaces being made available for five properties, car free travel was encouraged and the application should not add to parking stress in the area.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 1 (with 1 abstention))** 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:

- iii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet;
- iv. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include an additional conditions that external letter box details should be submitted;
- v. an informative included on the planning permission, drawing the Applicant's attention to four car parking spaces being made available for five properties, car free travel was encouraged and the application should not add to parking stress in the area.

**21/60/Plan 20/05021/FUL - Land r/o 69 Green End Road 11am**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of a two bedroom bungalow.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Shernbourne Court (written statement read by Committee Manager):

- i. Referred to previously submitted comments and those of the majority of local residents consulted, who strongly objected to the proposed planning application.
- ii. This was an inappropriate development of a garden and the destructive practice of 'garden grabbing'. The proposed plans ignored the character of the neighbourhood by removing vital green space. 69 Green End Road had already extended into the garden area and reduced its garden size. Continuing to develop the vast majority of the garden into another property was unacceptable.
- iii. Would lead to an increase in traffic on what is already a very busy cul-de-sac.
- iv. Would cause poor/hazardous access to Sherbourne Close/Court. With only one off-street parking space, it would inevitably lead to an increase in on-street parking immediately outside the property. The 'S' bend on this section of road made it difficult for two cars to pass without parked vehicles. More vehicles parking here would be hazardous and lead to poor access to Sherbourne Close/Court, especially for larger vehicles including ambulances and delivery vans. Ambulances were regularly called to the care home on Sherbourne Close, so quick and easy access was crucial.
- v. A further property on this street would cause the area to become overdeveloped. Sherbourne Close/Court have been built on and developed over the years and there is simply not the space to cram in anymore buildings. It would destroy the quieter suburban environment that attracts residents to live here.
- vi. Would lead to an increase in noise which would have a negative impact on the peaceful character of the neighbourhood and on the quality of life of the local residents already living here.

- vii. It was inconsiderate that the plans place the building so close to the border of 1 Sherbourne Court rather than locating it proportionately between the landowner's current property and 1 Sherborne Court.

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

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

- i. the development should be M4(3) compliant (not just M4(2));
- ii. the heating system should be adaptable to allow a change to a non-fossil fuel source.

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's report, subject to:

- vi. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- vii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:
  - a. the development should be M4(3) compliant;
  - b. the heating system should be adaptable to allow a change to a non-fossil fuel source.

### **21/61/Plan 21/0499/TTPO - Newnham Mill 11:30am**

The Committee received an application for:

- i. Willow T1, remove split branch.
- ii. Willows T1 and T2, reduce crown by 10-11m, pruning back to secondary growth points.
- iii. T3 reduce crown by 9-10m, pruning back to secondary growth points.

The Committee:

**Unanimously resolved** to accept the Officer recommendation and grant consent for the tree works proposed.

### **21/62/Plan Local Validation List 12noon**

Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) were required to undertake a regular review of their validation requirements for planning applications. It was necessary to ensure that a validation list is in place and remains fit for purpose in the context of changes to national legislation and Development Plan policies.

The validation list should set out the level of information required by the LPA to support a planning application. It should explain clearly what plans and documents are required as part of a planning application to ensure that the LPA can make transparent, well informed and robust decisions on planning applications in the public interest.

Report recommendation: that the revised Local Validation List should be adopted.

The Committee:

**Resolved (5 votes to 0)** to accept the Officer recommendation that the revised Local Validation List should be adopted.

Councillor Thornburrow abstained from voting on this decision as she is the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

The meeting ended at 11.50 am

**CHAIR**