

Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 7 December 2022

PLANNING

7 December 2022

10.05 am - 1.45 pm

Present:

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

Also present:

Officers:

Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager: Toby Williams

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Head of 3C Building Control Consultancy: Heather Jones

Principal Planning Officer: Katie Christodoulides

Planning Officer: Dominic Bush

Senior Planning Officer: Alice Young

Committee Manager: Chris Connor

Meeting Producer: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/127/PlanApologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Page-Croft and Bennett.

22/128/PlanDeclarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Porrer	5	Ward Councillor - unfettered

22/129/PlanMinutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 05 October 2022 and 02 November 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

22/130/Plan22/02761/HFUL 45 Barrow Road - 10:45am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval of the demolition of a single garage and the erection of a one and a half storey side extension including an integrated single garage, single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.

Applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee received a written representation in objection to the application from a resident of Barrow Road which was read out by the Committee Manager:

Number 45 is in its original structural state. Neighbours' smaller developments were before the designation of the Conservation Area.

The Conservation officer states that "With reference to the NPPF and the effect on the significance of the heritage asset, paragraphs 194, 195, 199, 200, 202 apply".

Cambridge City Local Plan

Policy 58

The appearance is transformed, front and back. It is not sympathetic to the existing building, (with "unashamedly modern" rear); or the Conservation Area; in scale (more than doubling the footprint); or, by the use of materials or character (using rendering and big sections of glazing on both the ground floor and the first floor).

Number 43's garden would be overlooked.

The Conservation officer says the proposals do not comply with policy 58.

Policy 61

Number 45 sits where the footpath in the Hobson's Brook designated Cambridge City Wildlife site runs closest to the Conservation Area, and all floors are clearly visible from it.

The development would spoil views within the Conservation Area, and from outside it. According to a comment from a Long Road resident, the "public path is used all through the day by people who enjoy the timeless peace and space it offers. To have a frankly enormous structure advancing down the garden would significantly impact the pleasure of a very significant number of members of the public".

The proposals overwhelm the original house. The rear alterations blur the distinction between buildings in and outside the Conservation Area.

The Conservation officer says the proposals don't comply with Policy 61.

Barrow Road Conservation Area

The Conservation Area Guidance recognises the gardens' sense of enclosure and privacy. Due to its orientation, Number 45 has windows on its north side overlooking the top of Number 43's garden. Privacy at the bottom of the garden is especially valuable. The picture windows over two floors and extended terrace would overlook the bottom and full width of Number 43's garden.

As one public comment says: "If this proposal goes ahead there will be no point in the Conservation Area at all."

The Conservation officer says, "the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation area."

Considering the NPPF, Local Plan Policies, the Barrow Road Conservation Area Appraisal, the Conservation officer's assessment, the views of Cambridge Past Present and Future, and strong public opposition, we urge you to reject this planning application.

The Committee Manager read out the following points on behalf of Councillor Hauk (Trumpington Ward Councillor):

I called planning application 22/02761/HFUL (Extension to No.45 Barrow Road) in for scrutiny at a full Planning Committee meeting because it raises several material concerns with respect to the Barrow Road Conservation Area, the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- i. The proposal's scale and design seem wholly inappropriate in a Conservation Area.
- ii. It could spoil the public view from the street as well as from the public footpath in the wooded area in the back.
- iii. The neighbours have valid concerns relating to being overlooked by the proposed picture windows at the rear.
- iv. The large areas of glazing on two floors may cause light pollution.

I refer the Committee to the response to this application of Conservation Officer Paul Robertshaw, who concludes that the development "would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area". Paul's response form of 4 August 2022 describes the property and its current positive contribution to the Barrow Road Conservation Area, assesses the proposals and concludes that they would not comply with Local Plan policies

58 and 61. He states that with reference to the NPPF and the effect on the significance of the heritage asset, paragraphs 194, 195, 199, 200, 202 apply. I find his assessment compelling.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) 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 two informatives as listed below:

- i. In relation to cycle parking, referencing possible use of garage and encouraging a planning application for cycle parking to be made for the front of the property.
- ii. In relation to solar panels.

22/131/Plan18/2013/FUL 78 Arbury Road - 11:30am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the change of use of 78 Arbury Road (C3 Class Use) to a 9-bed 10 person House of Multiple Occupation (sui generis). The application is solely for the change of use, not any extensions to the existing dwelling.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to updated condition 4 regarding cycle storage, details were included in the Amendment Sheet.

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 conditions set out in the Officer's report as updated by the amendment (to condition 4) as contained within the Amendment Sheet.

22/132/Plan22/02969/FUL 73 Newmarket Road - 10am

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval of a mixed-use development comprising a ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E) with nine residential units on the

upper floors along with associated infrastructure following demolition of existing buildings.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Cambridge Past, Present & Future (CPPF).

- i. The Officer's report in front of you states that weight placed on the heritage value of the site is finely balanced. CPPF wish to speak up in favour of greater weight being placed in the historic significance of the building and that permission should be refused.
- ii. The Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal describes the area of Newmarket Road from Parsonage Street to Elizabeth Way. It describes the attractive terrace of two storey houses, the Burleigh Arms Public House, the decorative three storey Burleigh House, the substantial villas, leading up to the modern buildings adjoining this site. It describes these latter buildings as of little visual interest, unrelated to each other and creating an uninspiring street scene. Number 73 Newmarket Road is a small island of history within this sea of bland redevelopment in an otherwise historically important street. It needs to be preserved and not replaced.
- iii. We support the views of the Conservation Officer who raises the importance of the building reflecting the historical use of this site as a public house. He also describes the visually positive relationship the building has to the street due to its human, domestic scale and attractive architectural detailing. The replacement building does not replicate this detailing and human scale. The fact that the building is surrounded by modern development is not a reason to continue this approach but makes it more important to preserve this building.
- iv. We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of policies relating to development in a Conservation Area and should be refused.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from representative from Cambridge Riverside (Midsummer Common) Residents' Management Company Ltd.

- i. Heritage Impact – we are in strong support of the Conservation Officer's submission and that of the Cambridge Past Present and Future statement. The two previous applications allowed for both the

- preservation of the historic frontage and the provision of 6 or 9 apartments.
- ii. Neighbourhood amenity - Height and Mass – The proposed 4 storey vertical facing building is proposed to be very close to the Kingsley Walk boundary and artwork. It effectively doubles the height of the existing building. This will adversely impact on the privacy of residents in Brooke House and Newton Court and change the current open approach to Kingsley Walk.
 - iii. Highway Safety – We are very concerned about the traffic safety during the demolition and building phases as well as in the longer term.
 - iv. Our development comprises 196 apartments and 10 five-bedroom townhouses and this junction between Kingsley Walk and Newmarket Road is very busy and we have already had to fit a mirror to assist drivers exit Kingsley Walk on to the busy Newmarket Road. This new plan will make the junction more hazardous.
 - v. The junction is already made complex by the 7 day per week dental surgery which was a Class E provision for our developer. The issues are drop offs, cars idling waiting to collect patients and unauthorised parking on Kingsley Walk.
 - vi. The artwork at the junction was especially commissioned for the development and refers to the education heritage of Brunswick School and the Regional College. There is also a foundation stone from 1927 to the Council Education Committee. Walking tours visit the site and the planning conditions must support protecting the wall from damage.

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

- i. Would like Conservation officer's advice to be given more weight.
- ii. Proposed replacement building, thought modern, detracts from the environment of the area.
- iii. Wants historical domestic areas, such as this public house, to be preserved.
- iv. Though he understands the principal of re-development believes that the current architecture of the building should be maintained.

- v. Wants existing building to be used when constructing the new to reduce carbon usage.
- vi. Benefits do not outweigh the harm of caused by re-developing this heritage sight.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) 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 the conditions in the Officer's report and a further condition recommended by the Officer in relation to cycle parking provision.

22/133/PlanGCSP Planning Compliance Policy Report - 12:15pm

GCSP Planning Compliance Policy Report

The Committee received an information report from the Assistant Director of Planning and Building Quality.

The Committee to note the updated Compliance Policy for Greater Cambridge Shared Planning which is to be submitted for public consultation in December 2022.

Assistant Director of Planning and Building Quality said the following in response to Members' questions:

Stated that they will include case studies on the report and will include flow charts to make it easier to follow on the website.

With regard to new complaints procedure, there has been a great improvement. Officers were able to be more responsive and able to deal with complaints in a timelier manner. Officers are checking workloads to ensure the complaints caseload is allocated fairly across the team.

Officers have recently recruited a permanent Compliance Manager who has over twenty years of experience who will be starting in the January 2023.

The Committee:

Noted the Officer's report.

22/134/PlanSite Visit Policy City Report - 1pm

The Committee received a report from Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager.

It is proposed to introduce this Protocol across the three Planning Committees of the Shared Planning Service, viz, for South Cambridgeshire District, the City and the Joint Development Control Committee. The Protocol is being presented to all three Committees for Member comment and approval ahead of implementation. Officers recommend that the Committee:

- i. Notes this report and the accompanying Planning Committee Protocol for Officer-Led Site Visits.
- ii. Confirms implementation of the protocol for the Cambridge City Council Planning Committee.

Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

1. If a developer has approached a Member about a site visit there should always be an officer present, whether online or in person.
2. Would need to give thought to where a document would record be so it is available to applicants. However, saw no reason why it could not be shared with applicants.
3. Where Officers have suggested a site visit, there is a good reason for it and Councillors should make every effort to attend. However, if a Planning Committee Member is unable to attend they are welcome to share their experiences with other Councillors of the Committee.

4. Noted that Members would like notice period for site visits to be a “couple of weeks”. Officers will strive to give Members reasonable notice of site visits.
5. Of the view that mini-bus tours of sites are unnecessary for Councillors in Cambridge City.

The site visit protocol is applicable to equally to Members of the Planning Committee and Alternates.

The Committee:

In relation to the report’s recommendations:

Section 2.1 (i): **Noted** the Officer’s report.

Section 2.1 (ii): **Approved (by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention)** the Officer recommendation therein.

22/135/PlanAppeals Overview 2021-2022 - 1:45pm

Members are asked to note the statistical outcomes and individual decisions on cases.

Interim Development and Planning Compliance Manager said the following in response to Members’ questions:

1. to investigate whether it is practical to have all appeal decisions sent to Members.
2. The Council should not be afraid of defending Planning Committee decisions that believes it has made it decision reasonably and democratically.

The Committee:

Noted the Officer’s report.

The meeting ended at 1.45 pm

CHAIR