

# Public Document Pack

Planning	Plan/1	Wednesday, 2 November 2022
----------	--------	----------------------------

## PLANNING

2 November 2022  
10.00 am - 3.30 pm

### Present:

**Planning Committee Members:** Councillors Smart (Chair), D. Baigent (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Dryden, Gawthrope Wood, Page-Croft, Porrer and Thornburrow

Also present: Councillor Gilderdale (virtually) and Councillor Bird (physically)

### Officers:

Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Dean Scrivener

Senior Planner: Michael Allen

Senior Planner: Phoebe Carter

Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet

Senior Planner: Nick Yager

Arboricultural Officer: Joanna Davies

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Sarah Steed

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 22/118/PlanApologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Collis.

### 22/119/PlanDeclarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Porrer	22/121/Plan	Personal: Contacted by ARU students (where she works) about this application. Discretion unfettered.

Councillor Baigent	22/124/Plan	Personal: Had been involved in the application to help bring it forward to committee (general discussions with Planning Officer and Applicant). Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Gawthrope Wood	22/125/Plan	Personal: Lives near Tedders Way. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	22/125/Plan	Personal: Contacted by residents concerning this application. Discretion unfettered.

## 22/120/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 6 July and 3 August 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 22/121/Plan22-00778-FUL The Varsity Hotel, Thompson's Lane

Councillor Baigent was not present in the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for installation of a new all weather lightweight retractable roof canopy and associated works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Beaufort Place:

- i. Referred to Local Plan guidance about tall buildings and their impact on the skyline.
- ii. The proposal would have a negative impact on the skyline and views in the city.
- iii. Agreed with the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application and the reasons for doing so.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a local resident:

- i. When residents of the Thompsons Lane enclave pass the Varsity Hotel (the only unbollarded route) they expected to find vehicles parked near

or on the kerb or people gathering outside the door. These often required avoidance, and sometimes stopping and waiting, by drivers or pedestrians. Greater use of the roof terrace would increase arrivals, departures and deliveries and thus the likelihood of delays.

- ii. The two upper levels of the Varsity Hotel were out of keeping with the buildings in the local area in terms of their height and materials. The roof terrace was visible from many points including the five approaches to the hotel.
- iii. At night, well-lit objects caught the eye, making them difficult to ignore. Increased use of the roof terrace, particularly with lights at night, would make it even more of a dominant and discordant feature of the area.
- iv. A canopy would increase the structural height and also the incongruity of the building with its surroundings. A comparison could be made with the canopy of the Hyatt Eddington, but the Hyatt building is far more in keeping in height and style with the buildings around it.

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

Councillor Gilderdale (Market Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. How would the roof be used? Would the canopy generally be open or closed? How would this affect the look of the building?
- ii. Would the roof canopy be similar to the one on the lower floor eg in position and usage?
- iii. As summers got hotter having a canopy could help people avoid problems such as heat stroke.
- iv. Would the proposal lead to a better building design environmentally for example by reducing the need for heaters on the roof by having a canopy and therefore lowering electricity bills?

The Committee Manager read out the following points on behalf of Councillor Ashton (Mayor and Cherry Hinton Ward Councillor):

- i. Normally in these cases he left it to the ward councillors to input their concerns and residents' feelings but in this case felt it was right for him to put the views from an impartial person.

- ii. Councillors would have been fully versed from both the Council's Planning Team as to the reasons for their recommendation for rejection of the application and the applicant's reason for approval.
- iii. This application could be allowed as the Applicant has demonstrated via responses to the planning officers' questions the reasons why they were within planning regulations to let this go ahead.
- iv. Councillors did not look at numbers (in support or objection) for planning but a considerable number were in support and only a very small number against.
- v. One reason for turning down the application was height and mass, yet Park Street redevelopment was actually taller and had more mass.
- vi. Queried if the Council applied the same rules in its approach to Park Street and The Varsity applications, it would seem quite unfair if two buildings so close to each other had different rules applied.
- vii. This was the third application the Applicant had brought to Committee. The previous two were turned down, went to appeal and then the Inspector ruled in favour of the Applicant.
- viii. Asked the Committee to think long and hard about how to vote on this matter.
- ix. Could see that if Members voted to refuse the application, the Applicant could choose the right to go to Appeal.
- x. Councillor Ashton fully understood the difficulties and choices that had to be made having sat on Planning Committee. Planning Law tried to make this easier by setting down guidelines.
- xi. As Members were well aware, guidelines were open to interpretation. Inconsistences regarding height and mass between similar buildings could arise if the same rule was not applied to them both.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's reason for refusal regarding the impact of light on the skyline. The Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager suggested amending reason for refusal 2 (as shown in bold text):

2. The National Planning Policy Framework and policies 61 and 62 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 aim to ensure that heritage assets of the city are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including their setting. By virtue of the scale, bulk, **potential night time lighting impacts** and poor quality appearance, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area and the setting of Grade I and Grade II listed buildings. Furthermore, it would also harm the setting of buildings of local interest, which make a positive contribution to the character of the

Central Conservation Area. The harm to these designated heritage assets is not outweighed by the limited public benefits and the proposal would also harm the setting of non-designated heritage assets, to the detriment of the character of the area. As such, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area or the setting of listed buildings contrary to the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework and Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 61 and 62.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present.**

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, subject to the amendment set out above.

## **22/122/Plan22-01504-FUL 196 Green End Road**

Councillor Baigent joined the Committee.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for demolition of 196 and 198 Green End Road and the construction of 9 Apartments (8 no 1 bed flats and 1 no. studio flat) along with ground floor commercial space and associated parking.

The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf Green End Road residents (as supplied by the Agent) which addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. The area proposed for development had been derelict for years which led to residents' concerns about anti-social behaviour and drug dealing.
- ii. A separate planning permission was granted in 2021 but the Applicant had not proceeded with it. Local residents, including near neighbours, had raised no objections.
- iii. Consultees had raised no objections.

- iv. The development would improve the area. Particularly as more housing was needed in the ward.
- v. There were five open spaces nearby, so there were amenities in the area available to potential residents.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 2)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report.

**22/123/Plan22-0669-TTPO Report Tree Works 76 De Freville Avenue**

The Committee received an application for:

- i. T1 – Acacia : Dismantle to near ground level and replant with Liquidamber Worplesdon.
- ii. T3 Birch - Reduce height by 2m.

Recommendation:

- i. APPROVE removal of T1 subject to conditions.
- ii. REFUSE crown reduction of T3.

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

- i. The value of the T1 tree outweighed the risk of "failure" (dying). It was better to keep the existing tree rather than replace it with a younger one that may not survive.
- ii. There was no evidence to prove T1 needed to be felled due to a safety risk because of decay.
- iii. Suggested pruning T1 every four to five years instead of pollarding it was a more appropriate method to mitigate any possible decay.
- iv. T1 could be seen from various locations. A replacement sapling would not provide the same amenity value for some years.

Councillors asked for the minutes to record that they would like a Tree Preservation Order to be imposed on T1 in future.

The Committee:

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

**22/124/Plan21-00809-FUL Cambridge Snooker and Pool Centre**

Councillor Dryden left the Committee before this item was considered and did not return.

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a new linked warehouse for flexible use (Use Class E(g)(iii), Use Class B2 & Use Class B8), an extension to the rear/side of the existing building, demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and the creation of new access to the site, car and cycle parking; Conversion of Snooker and Pool Centre (Use Class E) into flexible Use Classes (E(g)(iii), Use Class B2 & Use Class B8) and associated works.

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

Councillor Gawthrope Wood proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that sustainable building standards (eg photovoltaic panels) informative could be applied.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present.**

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. A condition to require a Travel Management Plan.
- ii. An access informative.

The amendments were **carried by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present.**

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present)** 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 condition:
  - a. Travel Management Plan;
- iii. informatives included on the planning permission in respect of:

- a. access arrangements;
- b. photovoltaic panels and their use.

## **22/125/Plan22-00440-FUL Land at Tedder Way**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a 4bed dwelling including landscaping and parking.

Ms Bailey (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that bike storage should have capacity for adapted bikes such as cargo bikes.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present.**

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that the landscape condition could cover bin and bike storage.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present.**

### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 votes to 0 – unanimous of those present)** 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:
  - a. revision to Condition 15 to include reference to adaptable bike storage;
  - b. a new hard and soft landscape condition to cover bin and bike signage and locations.

## **22/126/Plan22-02200-FUL 109 Milton Road**



The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a single storey dwelling with associated parking.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to an amendment to Condition 27 in her presentation.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0 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, and subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer including the amendment to Condition 27.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank