

Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 6 October 2021

PLANNING

6 October 2021

10.00 am - 2.55 pm

Present:

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

Councillor Flaubert left after the vote on item 21/00537/FUL - 29 High Street and did not return.

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: Alice Young

Planner: Mary Collins

Planning Project Officer: Dean Scrivener

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/105/PlanApologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart.

21/106/PlanDeclarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Porrer	21/108/Plan	Personal: Family member owns property right behind the site. Did not vote or participate in the debate.

21/107/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/108/Plan20/02172/FUL - 11 Queen Ediths Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of new buildings to provide 40 serviced apartments (sui generis) together with hard and soft landscaping, basement car parking spaces and associated infrastructure and works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Queen Ediths Way:

- i. Concern about loss of community asset by replacing a care home with a hotel.
- ii. 22 people would lose a care home facility.
- iii. Care homes were covered by Local Plan Policy 47. The application did not satisfy the policy requirements to justify the change of use to change from a care home to a hotel.
- iv. Took issue with the scale and mass details of buildings set out in plans submitted by the Applicant, did not think they were accurate i.e. showed true extent.
- v. Queried if hotel would be viable in future.
- vi. Pressure on local parking.
- vii. Biodiversity concerns.
- viii. Impact of refuse/waste collection (arrangements) on local residents and cycle lane.

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

Councillor S. Davies (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Requested the application be rejected.
- ii. Local Plan Policies:
 - a. Councillors needed to consider Local Plan Policies 17 and 77.
 - b. Policy 77 stated that high quality accommodation would be supported "at Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's hospital)". In para 8.5 of the Officer report the

- Officer suggested that 11 QEW is close enough to the Campus to qualify for approval under Policy 77.
- c. Policy 17 stated campus accommodation needs should be met on-site.
 - d. Suggested that Policy 17 was a more important consideration than Policy 77 in this case.
 - e. The campus should not negatively impact nearby residents.
- iii. Impact of this development on the character of area:
 - a. the character of the area was predominantly residential with early-mid 20th century 2.5 storey detached houses;
 - b. the application would be incompatible with this residential character, in terms of both scale and usage type; and
 - c. there was no precedent for this type of accommodation in the area.
 - iv. Queen Edith Way was used by cyclists/commuters accessing local employment sites (including the Biomedical Campus) and education sites (including Netherhall School, Long Road Sixth Form College, Cambridge Academy for Science and Technology and Trumpington Community College). Queried why the highways authority did not comment on this application when they commented on the nearby Fendon Road 'Dutch' style roundabout.
 - v. Local takeaway facilities/infrastructure could not support the needs of residents in the proposed apartments where the apartments are only 25 sq. m, i.e. only 2/3rd the size of the minimum space standard specified in Policy 50 and where there are no communal facilities on site.
 - vi. The lack of policies to prohibit development on-site was a low bar to overcome to approve development on this site. It did not mean that this was the right development in the right location.

Councillor Baigent proposed and Councillor Dryden seconded a motion deferring the decision until further information could be obtained.

This proposal/motion was **carried (by 5 votes to 0)**.

Councillor Porrer did not vote or participate in the debate on this application.

The Committee:

Application deferred to a future Planning Committee to allow Officer time to present further information they considered material to the application.

21/109/Plan21/01521/FUL - Land r/o 56-58 Cherry Hinton Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of 7 apartments comprising 1 x 2-bed and 6 x 1-bed units, including bin and cycle storage facilities, together with reconfiguring the pedestrian access to 56A and 58A Cherry Hinton Road and installation of a new ground floor rear wall to the retained retail unit at 56-58 Cherry Hinton Road, following demolition of existing warehouse building.

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

Councillor Dryden proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation calling for new residents to be advised they would not be issued parking permits so they could share parking facilities with existing residents in the area (which had controlled parking on the road).

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Baigent proposed the following amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. The inclusion of a fire hydrant condition.
- ii. The inclusion of an Informative concerning fire appliance access to site.
- iii. External bike racks should be available if there was no cycle store.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that post boxes should be accessible and located outside of buildings.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

Unanimously resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reasons:

- i. The design and layout of the scheme fails to respond appropriately to its context. The footprint and lack of external space around the building is constrained and does not promote sustainable access to the site (which is car free) or inclusive design for all users and does not demonstrate adequate space would be made for providing renewable technologies and is therefore an over-development of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- ii. The future occupiers of the proposed flats would be exposed to the odour generated from nearby cooking food outlets and there is no certainty that the existing odour issue will be mitigated. The development is therefore contrary to policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

21/110/Plan19/1167/FUL and 19/1350/LBC - Public Toilet, Silver Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for refurbishment of existing basement toilets and associated works to include the provision of a new guard rail to the basement stairs, and the erection of a replacement wheelchair accessible WC and kiosk (following demolition of the existing wheelchair accessible WC structure).

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

- i. This application differed little from the previous iteration. The same concerns remained.
- ii. Trees would be pollarded and/or given a crown lift.
- iii. There was no net gain in biodiversity.
- iv. Grey water recycling facilities were inadequate.
- v. It would be hard to clean and maintain the building.
- vi. Fewer tourists were visiting the city so a building for masses of tourists was no longer required.
- vii. The application failed to meet Local Plan policies.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Eltisley Avenue :

- i. This building puts form above function, was wasteful and designed for mass tourism pre-pandemic; before the council recognised that we were in climate and biodiversity emergencies.
- ii. Tourists would remember the 'gateway to the city'. Please put facilities in an appropriate place so the city looked attractive to visitors.
- iii. The building was not accessible, easy to maintain or truly sustainable, so failed to meet policies in the Local Plan and should be refused.

The Chair ruled the points to be made in a written statement by a resident of Ascham Road were not relevant to this application.

Mr Mac Mahon (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 viz:

- i. 19/1167/FUL granted planning permission subject to the conditions; specified in the officer's report for the application; and
- ii. 19/1350/LBC granted listed building consent subject to the conditions specified in the Officer's report for the LBC application.

21/111/Plan21/00537/FUL - 29 High Street

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of five dwellings and associated landscaping.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to updated condition 23 wording in her presentation:

The development, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the proposed first floor windows in the north-east elevation of unit 2 have, apart from any top hung vent, been fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity and shall be fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The glazing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57/58).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Principal Planning Officer (Cambridge, Past Present & Future) - written statement read by Committee Manager:

- i. Spoke on behalf of Cambridge Past, Present & Future. Their aims relevant to this application were to protect the important built heritage of Cambridge.
- ii. A detailed response was provided to the planning application. Asked Members to give weight to the impact of the proposal on the tree coverage and the character of the conservation area and refuse the application.
- iii. More than half the curtilage benefits from tree canopy and the proposal involved wholesale removal of 12 individual trees, one group of trees, one area of trees and 2 hedgerows and a section of hedgerow. Only 2 existing trees were retained. This level of tree cover would never be replicated on site if the development went ahead.
- iv. This wholesale loss of tree cover did not sit well with the Council's corporate approach to trees as set out in its Tree Strategy and the Cambridge Canopy Project.
- v. Guidance in the conservation area appraisal is that new buildings must respect the character, constraints, and opportunities of the site. This application approaches this by removing the trees rather than designing the proposal around them.
- vi. The conservation area appraisal identified the corner of High Street and Church Street as a positive view or vista. The listed building of 25 & 27 High Street which adjoins the site creates an attractive gateway whose setting needs to be protected. The current property on the application site, sits back from the road and provides space and allows views of the listed building notably its eastern elevation. The 2 replacement dwellings are sited to the front the site and abut the listed building. They form a very substantial whole and are located only a meter from the side of the listed building, hiding its eastern elevation and encroaching on its setting. This also narrows the vista and creates a more strongly defined urban corridor to the detriment of the conservation area.
- vii. The Officers' report, contrary to the advice of the Conservation Team, did not consider that the change to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building would be harmful and have tipped the balance in favour of meeting the Council's housing requirement. Members were asked to reconsider this and favour the

protection of the conservation area, the setting of the listed building and the retention of trees and refuse the application as being contrary to Local Plan policies 52, 55, 57, 59, 61 and 71.

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

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that an informative be included on the planning permission in respect of air source heat pumps.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 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. the amended condition 23; and
- iii. delegated authority to Officers to include an additional informative in respect of air source heat pumps.

21/112/Plan21/00660/FUL - Land adj 131 Ditton Fields

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for construction of 6no. dwellings together with access, car parking, bin and bikes stores, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

The Principal Planner updated his report by referring to updated recommendation wording in his presentation viz:

Grant permission subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report, including the prior completion of a s106 Agreement and the amendment proposed in this presentation with regard to securing the off-site biodiversity improvements through a s106 planning obligation rather than by way of condition (condition 24), and the amendment to the reason for condition 12.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 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 and the prior completion of a s106 Agreement as recommended by the Officer.

21/113/Plan21/03469/FUL - 75 Cromwell Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for change of use of early years nursery and community space to early years nursery, with associated works.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 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.

21/114/Plan21/03892/S106A - 75 Cromwell Road

The Committee received an application for modification of planning obligations contained in a Section 106 Agreement dated 11th October 2019 pursuant to ref: 19/0288/FUL.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0) to approve the application to vary the planning obligations in accordance with the Officer's report and recommendation for the reasons expounded in the report.

The meeting ended at 2.55 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank