

Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Friday, 14 January 2022

PLANNING

14 January 2022
10.00 am - 2.00 pm

Present:

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

Delivery Manager Development Management: Nigel Blazeby

Area Development Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Lewis Tomlinson

Senior Planner: Dean Scrivener

Senior Planner: Tom Grey

Planning Project Officer: Dean Scrivener

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Claire Tunncliffe

Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/11/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Dryden.

22/12/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

22/13/Plan 21/01625/FUL - Church Hall 6A Chapel Street (Snap Nursery, Chesterton)

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for refurbishment, reconfiguration and extension of the existing chapel building to create an improved day nursery facility with external play area and 13 residential apartments (following part demolition), together with associated landscaping and infrastructure.

The Senior Planner updated their report by referring to the amendment sheet which can be viewed at the link below:

[Choose agenda document pack - Planning 14 January 2022 - Cambridge Council](#)

The applicant addressed the committee in support of the application.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Chapel Street.

- i. Agreed with the Planning officer's findings that the development was far too large for the site.
- ii. Expressed concerns for any future residents of any flats built, and for the other area residents/users.
- iii. The road through Chapel Street was in a poor repair and narrow. It was used as cut through for cyclists and pedestrians to Arbury/Kings Hedges. Residents rarely parked on the road but on weekdays it was always full, from those using the nurse, the dentist and public house.
- iv. Adding new residents with their parking, movement and deliveries would cause more blocks, delays, and damage. That did not even include the 1-2 years of building work.
- v. Safety and access issues: Everything such as bins, bikes, furniture would have to go through a small side door.
- vi. The bins for 13 flats would take up most of the pavement. The council stated there was not enough bike parking, let alone car parking.
- vii. The noise assessment took place in lockdown and was inadequate. The assessment of the impact on 2-4 Chapel street referenced the back of the houses, not the front. There was the noise of the pub which would impact the new flats; and the rooftop nursery impacting them and other residents.
- viii. All local comments (Chapel Street, Chesterton Towers, Church Street, the High Street, the pub) are objections. This emphasised the plans were not appropriate for the local area / residents. Those in support were from places like Scotland.
- ix. Not against development, but this scale was unreasonable. Residents did not support the application.
- x. Stated it was clear from the scale of development this was about profit and not community. This was not the right plan for Chesterton or Chapel Street.

Councillor Ashton addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Supported the application as he believed the development to be feasible, deliverable and would be an advantage to the community.
- ii. Acknowledged there were objections to the application but hoped these issues could be resolved with minor amendments.
- iii. The application was supported by all the three Cambridge City Council Ward Councillors, the County Council Ward Councillor and Daniel Zeichner MP.
- iv. The theatre company Chickenshed supported the application who hoped to operate in Cambridge from the new community space of the development bringing affordable inclusive drama opportunities to the area.
- v. Stated that Cambridge was the most unequal City in the county with a significant proportion of people experiencing poverty. The current building had reached out to those who required additional help to achieve the best possible start in life over the last twenty-two years.
- vi. The building was unfit for purpose and this application meet climate change policies and standard.
- vii. The applicant had worked with experts at the top of their profession. The architect, Richard Owers, director of NRAP Architects, a former chairman of the Cambridge Associations Architects. Gawn Associates, civil and structural engineers. Joanna Burton, Director of JV Heritage Consulting. All were professionals who understand policy, planning law, had provided specialist expert advice and had looked at the history of the site starting from the year 1842.
- viii. Advice had also been taken from fire, acoustic, energy and sustainability, planning and ecology consultants.
- ix. Advised that the City Council Planning Officers had not visited the site and had no engagement with the applicant despite being contacted by the applicant.
- x. Highlighted the amendment that had been published the day before the planning meeting as no viability study had been undertaken by the Council, but the day of the meeting had been found. The applicant had paid for and had submitted their study.
- xi. The application had suffered from mistakes in the administration process and queried how the Planning Inspector would view those mistakes through the appeal process if the application were rejected.
- xii. Recommended the Committee approved the application with conditions.

Committee Manager's note: *The committee report references the viability assessment and sets out the reasons why the Council hadn't assessed the viability at that time.*

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised he had not seen the e-mail recently sent from Camcycle regarding the cycle parking being incorrect which had been referenced in debate.

The Delivery Manager (Development Management) recommended the application was deferred for Officers to consider the comments from CamCycle and the viability issues that had been raised.

It was proposed by Councillor Smart and seconded by Councillor Porrer to defer the application.

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to defer the application.

22/14/Plan 21/02356/FUL - Cambridge Rugby Union Club, Grantchester Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for extension to the existing rugby club building to create a new children's nursery, together associated infrastructure and landscaping.

The Senior Planner updated their report by referring to the amendment sheet which could be viewed at the link below:

[Agenda for Planning on Friday, 14th January 2022, 10.00 am - Cambridge Council](#)

The Planner than provided a verbal update of the following amendments:

- Condition 4 would require cycle parking details to be submitted and approved.
- A further amendment to the condition 17 to delete the following text (struck through):

~~Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the~~ opening hours of the nursery, hereby permitted, shall be between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday only.

(Reason: To ensure that neighbour amenity is preserved and to avoid parking management issues in accordance with Policies 35 and 82 of the Local Plan 2018).

Councillor Baigent sought clarification of a clear pedestrian and cycle route. He then proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an additional informative for the relocation of cycle and car parking, including a covered cycle parking.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an additional condition for a travel plan.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer then proposed an informative to the Officer's recommendation to include the installation of an EV charging point on site.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer then proposed the terminology regarding Informative No 2 of the Officer's report, the possessive pro-noun of 'his' should be removed and replaced with 'their'.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an informative that the application should be a BREEAM Excellent standard.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Smart proposed an informative to a plant and tree planting scheme.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

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, subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report.

- ii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional/ amended conditions:
 - a. Amendment to Condition 4 for cycle parking
 - b. amendment to Condition 17 (deletion of text)
 - c. additional condition for the submission of a travel plan.
- iii. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional / amended informatives to be included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. An amendment to informative no 2
 - b. Tree planting
 - c. EV Charging Point
 - d. Adaptability of the reduction of fossil fuel
 - e. Relocation of cycle and car parking, including a covered cycle parking (linked to condition 4)
 - f. BREEAM Excellence standard.
- iv. Any applications submitted to discharge condition 4 and the condition requiring a travel plan in consultation with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

22/15/Plan 21/03340/FUL - 11 Cook Close

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for conversion of part of the habitable space to a podiatrist and chiropodist practice, extend and later the living, internal alterations, inclusion of sun pipe and change the gravel drive finish to a block paver system-permeable paving.

The Planning Project Officer updated their report by referring to removal of condition no 5 due to reason that the condition was unenforceable and unnecessary.

Jennifer Hinton (Applicant) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer proposed an informative to the Officer's recommendation be included regarding the installation of an EV charging point.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Gawthrope Wood proposed a condition expanding the internal access to make the bathroom wheelchair accessible.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

- i. **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 removal of condition 5.
- ii. Delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the additional condition of a disabled access toilet.
- iii. Delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes to add an informative included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a) EV charging point.

22/16/Plan 18/1321/OUT - 72-74 St Philips Road

The Committee received an outline application.

The outline application sought approval for the development of three studio flats.

The Senior Planner updated their report by referring to the amendment sheet.

[Agenda for Planning on Friday, 14th January 2022, 10.00 am - Cambridge Council](#)

The Committee:

Resolved unanimously to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report and amendment sheet.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank