

Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 5 July 2023

PLANNING

5 July 2023

10.00 am - 4.30 pm

Present:

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Dryden, Levien, Porrer and Thornburrow

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Principal Planner: Katie Christodoulides

Principal Planner: Michael Hammond

Principal Planner: Kate Poyser

Senior Planner: Tom Chenery

Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

Other Officers Present:

Historic Environment Team Leader: Christian Brady

Local Highways Engineer: Jon Finney (Cambridgeshire County Council)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

23/58/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Carling for whom no Alternate attended.

23/59/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Bennett	23/62/Plan	Personal: Had an exchange with the SOPRA public speaker (Objector) on social media.

		Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Levien	23/62/Plan	Personal: Knows the Applicant socially. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	23/62/Plan	Personal: Knew an Objector for the F1 development. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	23/62/Plan	Personal: Knows the SOPRA public speaker (Objector). Knows two families living in Rosewood Gardens. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	23/62/Plan	Personal: Application in her Ward. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Porrer	23/63/Plan	Personal: Application in her Ward. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	23/63/Plan	Personal: Knows the hairdresser opposite the hotel. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Baigent	23/64/Plan	Personal: Can see the (application) site from his house and had been a customer. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Bennett	23/64/Plan	Personal: Had dealings with Calverleys as they were on the Museum of Technology site in her Ward. Had visited the application site. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart	23/64/Plan	Personal: Knows the family who live next door to the site. Discretion unfettered.

Councillor Thornburrow	23/64/Plan	Personal: Application in her Ward. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Levien	23/65/Plan	Personal: Application in his Ward. Discretion unfettered.

23/60/Plan Minutes

No minutes were presented for review by the Committee.

23/61/Plan 22-02646-REM Eddeva GB2 Land at Newbury Farm

The Committee received a reserved matters application for appearance, landscape, layout and scale for Phase 2 comprising the creation of 80 residential units, hard and soft landscaping including the creation of a central square and associated works. The related partial discharge of Conditions 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 pursuant to outline approval 19/1168/NMA1.

The Principal Planner updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet in relation to:

- i. Corrections and clarifications to report text.
- ii. Revised Condition 4 wording.
- iii. Condition 8 – in the reason for the condition, omit the reference to South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan Policies HQ/1 and SC/9.

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

Councillor Levien proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that water and energy use should be monitored eg through meters.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include an electricity supply to the public square.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to increase the number of green roofs from 45%. All flat roofs should be green unless inaccessible.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillors Bennett and Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requiring the application to comply with M42 requirements.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requesting provision of solar shading and alternative ventilation in east facing single aspect homes.

The amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved to grant approval for the reserved matters in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), subject to:

- i. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet;
- ii. approve the part discharge of the outline planning conditions (planning application reference 19/1168/NMA1) in so far as they relate to this reserved matters application site according to the recommendations for each condition set out in the table on P33-34 of the Officer's report;
- iii. amended wording to Conditions 4 and 8 as reflected in the amendment sheet;
- iv. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. Comply with M4(2) requirements;
 - b. Water and energy monitoring (meter);
 - c. Electricity supply to the square;
 - d. Green roof scheme; and
- v. an informative included on the decision notice in respect of:
 - a. the desirability for the provision of solar shading and alternative ventilation in east facing single aspect homes.

23/62/Plan 23-01474-FUL B2 F2 Devonshire Quarter

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a severable development comprising the erection of two new buildings as follows:

- i. the erection of a building for Class E(g)i/E(g)ii floorspace including ancillary accommodation/ facilities with associated plant and cycle parking (Block F2), and
- ii. the erection of a building for Class E(g)i/E(g)ii floorspace with multi-storey car park for Network Rail, including car and cycle parking, and ancillary Class E(a)-E(c) (Block B2).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a member of South Petersfield Residents Association:

- i. Referred to concerns in written representation from South Petersfield Residents Association.
- ii. The digging of an additional basement would lead to many truckloads of contaminated soil going down Devonshire Road.
- iii. The Committee had given permission for 30% more metres squared for the development than in the outline consent.
- iv. Space allocated to business use above ground was more than the amount in the Local Plan. This would lead to unaffordable house prices as too many offices and too few houses were being built.

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

Councillor Robertson (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. This was not a change of use on its own, the application was also a request for a larger basement. This would lead to more traffic taking more waste from the site.
- ii. This would be a bigger building with more floor space.
- iii. The amount of floor space requested was now more than that applied for in outline planning permission.
- iv. Expressed concern there would be more traffic on the Great Northern Road.
- v. Preferred an Apart-hotel instead of more Airb'n'bs in the area as they caused anti-social behaviour. An Apart-hotel was needed, more offices were not.

- vi. The area between blocks B2 and F2 was a through route for pedestrians and cyclists. Condition 18 appeared inadequate to protect them. More detail was required before building work commenced on how the space would be managed.

Councillors proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation concerning:

- i. Block B2 façade treatment.
- ii. Groundwater protection.

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 5 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions) to grant the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the Officer's report (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), subject to:

- i. satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement which includes the Heads of Terms (HoT's) as set out in the Officer report with minor amendments to the Heads of Terms as set out delegated to officers;
- ii. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report;
- iii. delegated authority to officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to draft and include the following additional conditions:
 - a. Covering Block B2 façade treatment of ground floor retail and co-working space;
- iv. an informative included on the planning permission in respect of:
 - a. ground water protection and liaison with Environment Agency;
- v. delegated authority to officers to include informatives that had slipped off the Officer's report from the previous iteration.

23/63/Plan 23-01137-FUL The Varsity Hotel, Thompson's Lane

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 Senior Planner updated her report by:

- i. Correcting a typographical error: At para 10.79 of her report - the proposal would adequately respect the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and therefore would not be compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 58 and 60.
- ii. Referring to updated informative wording details on the amendment sheet.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Objector's Agent – residents:

- i. Took issue with the description of the roof area. The awning may retract, but most of the roof structure would remain in place.
- ii. Referred to sections 16 and 66 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.
- iii. The City Council must have regard to preserving/enhancing the character or an area. The application should not harm, if it does not actually enhance the area. The application did not meet this criterion or make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from the Objector's Agent - Magdalene College:

- i. Referred to Policy 60 of the Cambridge Local Plan. The application did not meet policy to protect the skyline and would have a negative impact on historic buildings within the central conservation area.
- ii. The report did not show the impact of the building from sensitive view points of the college.
- iii. Concern about overlooking from the application onto surrounding areas, which would be exacerbated when trees shown in Officer's presentation/plans lost their leaves (trees shown had leaves on).
- iv. The Varsity Hotel was a tall building now, the application would add to this. Any 'addition' should have a positive impact and architectural merit which the proposal did not.

Mr Vanoli (Applicant's Architect) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Overall, agreed with the Officer's recommendation to approve the application. Agreed the economic benefits were important and likely to

outweigh any visual harm, which he could not see would be particularly more pronounced than the current situation with the unfinished building already a part of the skyline.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to defer the application to seek further information in respect of views of development from the city; light levels to be used resulting from/by the application and to complete a Members' site visit.

23/64/Plan 23-00600-S73 23A Unit 1, Hooper Street

The Committee received a S73 application to vary conditions 2 (noise management plan) and 3 (external areas) of ref: 20/02619/S73 (S73 to vary condition 5 of ref: 19/0902/FUL (Change of use from existing automobile repair shop (vacant unit) to a mixed use Class B2 (micro-brewery) and Class A4 (drinking establishment) and installation of cycle storage facilities) to vary condition no.2 to read as: "Operation of the premises to be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted/approved Noise Management Plan" and to vary condition no.3 to read as: The external seating area for patrons shall be strictly limited to the 17.5sq m seating area as shown by the blue line within approved drawing number P101, including accessing this seating area from inside. This external seating area shall only be used by patrons during the following hours: Tuesday to Thursday: 16:00-21:00, Friday: 16:00-22:00 and Saturday: 12:00-22:00".

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

- i. There were clear reasons for the existing permission. Took issue with the request for variations. This would cause noise and drinking anti-social behaviour which would affect neighbours' amenities.
- ii. Residents' complaints to Environmental Health Officers ceased when outdoor drinking previously stopped on the site.
- iii. Asked the failed experiment of outdoor drinking not to be repeated. Suggested the Applicant took over a pub in another area.
- iv. Support for the application came from people who were distant from the site, if not out of town. Residents who lived closer had objected.

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

Councillor Robertson (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. Houses in Ainsworth Street near the application would be affected by noise from the pub.
- ii. Referred to representations from local residents. Pub management was good but 'fun' would always be noisy.
- iii. Referred to Environmental Health Officer comments. They had to investigate complaints before planning constraints were put in place to stop outdoor drinking.
- iv. Noise was not an issue when residents moved in. The issue arose when outdoor drinking was allowed by the pub/brewery.

Councillor Bennett proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a condition requiring a noise management plan.

This amendment was **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to grant the S73 application 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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the amendment to draft a new appropriate condition regarding a noise monitoring strategy and to then seek approval afterwards via Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokes.

23/65/Plan 22-04783-FUL Land to Rear of 115 Shelford Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of eight dwellings along with access, car parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure works.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Lapwing Avenue. [The Committee Manager read a statement]:

- i. Much tree felling had already taken place on this site and on 26.06.23, major works, reportedly archaeological, were taking place.

- ii. Supported the provision of more house building in Cambridge, not in the green belt, and thus in principle supported some development in Shelford Road.
- iii. The concern with this submission was that it inserted eight three-bedroom dwellings into a very limited area and includes, beyond the buildings themselves, little other than nine car parking spaces (one/property and one visitor space). There was no proper communal outdoor area apparent, the nearest was in Austin Drive.
- iv. Local residents could expect the site to require more parking than this, as a) eight three-bedroom houses will produce more than eight cars and b) restrictive covenants on properties regarding the number of vehicles were unenforceable.
- v. The development with eight properties will inevitably cause 'wild' parking elsewhere, either on Austin Drive or across Addenbrooke's Road on the cycleway/ footway, as happens currently. The problem was likely to be especially acute overnight and at weekends.
- vi. Requested fewer properties be included in the design, perhaps six, but with more space for car parking – and to provide play space for children whose likely existence the design seems to ignore.

Mr McKeown (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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted).

The meeting ended at 4.30 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank