

# Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 4 October 2023

## PLANNING

4 October 2023

10.00 am - 6.00 pm

### Present:

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

Councillor Dryden left after the vote on item 23/97/Plan.

Councillor Bennett left after the vote on item 23/102/Plan.

Also present Councillors: Bick and Davies

### Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Historic Environment Team Leader: Christian Brady

Principal Conservation Officer: Susan Smith

Principal Urban Designer: Jonathan Brookes

Principal Planner: Dean Scrivener

Senior Planner: Phoebe Carter

Senior Planner: Charlotte Peet

Planning Officer: Rachel Brightwell

Planning Officer: John McAteer

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 23/92/Plan Apologies

No apologies were received.

### 23/93/Plan Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridgeshire Cycling

		Campaign.
Councillor Bennett	23/96/Plan	Personal: Lived near application site which was in her ward. Discretion unfettered.
Councillor Thornburrow	23/96/Plan	Personal: The Drainage Strategy in Condition 10 was prepared by CAR Ltd. She was an associate of CAR Ltd. Not involved in this item so discretion unfettered.
Councillor Smart (for Committee)	23/97/Plan	The Council received a rental income from the proposed facility.
Councillor Carling	23/97/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Would speak as Executive Councillor. Had responsibility for this item in his portfolio.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.
Councillor Porrer	23/97/Plan and 23/99/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Would speak as Ward Councillor.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.
Councillor Baigent	23/100/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: Acquainted with an individual whom he believed stood to benefit from this application so did not think it appropriate to take part.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.
Councillor Bennett	23/102/Plan	Personal and Prejudicial: A number of close friends lived in the area near the site so would withdraw from meeting.  Withdrew from discussion and did not vote.

**23/94/Plan Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 August 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**23/95/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 referring to the amendment sheet:

- i. Additional representations.
- ii. The Ministry of Defence had provided comments on the application. They had no objection to the application but sought a condition to secure construction details to ensure cranes and other equipment would not obstruct air traffic movements. Officers thought the addition of this condition was reasonable, this would be added to the recommendation.

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

- i. The Applicant had submitted more images since the application was last considered by Committee. These confirmed the Objector's view that the application would have an impact on the central college area, including listed buildings.
- ii. The application would significantly impact on views from the college. This would affect visitor and staff etc perceptions of the college which would cause reputational damage to Magdalene College and the city. Furthermore would result in harm to the character of the Conservation Area and listed buildings.
- iii. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 placed a statutory duty on decision makers to preserve the character of the Conservation Area and protect the setting of listed buildings. These planning considerations had great weight in the making of a decision and could only be outweighed by significant public benefits from an application, which were not present in this one.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from Objectors' Solicitor:

- i. The proposed canopy was lightweight, the support structure would not be. The steel structure was in effect another storey.
- ii. Statutory guidance states that only public benefits, not private benefits for the Applicant had to be considered when assessing which bits of legislation to consider when reviewing whether to give the application planning permission or not.
- iii. The benefits of the scheme did not outweigh the harm to heritage caused by the application.
- iv. Anything that detracted from the character of the area led to reputational damage to the city.
- v. The application was incongruous as a tall building. It would be visible from various points of the city. This would cause visual harm all year round. The level of harm would be higher than claimed by the Applicant.

Mr Davies (Applicant's Agent) and a resident of St John's Road addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. The Applicant's business added to the prosperity of the city. It had a good reputation as an employer. A lot of work had gone into the design of the application.
- ii. The decision was about the 'end product' not 'work along the way'.
- iii. Agreed with the Officer there was harm to the area ie important views:
  - a. Was most concerned about the impact on the view from Jesus Green.
  - b. Took issue with the opinion the retractable roof would mitigate the impact of the design.
  - c. The Trafalgar Hotel roof example referenced in the Officer's report was not the same as the one in the application.
- iv. Significant public benefit was needed to outweigh the additional height to the building from this application. Suggested there was not enough benefit to justify approval.
- v. If the application was complementary to the skyline, it would be acceptable, it was not.
- vi. Planning balance considerations:
  - a. The Varsity Hotel was a business. The application would help it.
  - b. The application would do harm to the character of the Conservation Area.

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

- i. Overall, would agree with the Officer's recommendation to approve the application. The economic benefits were important and likely to outweigh any visual harm, which would not be particularly more pronounced than the current situation with the unfinished building already a part of the skyline.
- ii. There had now been sufficient time for the Committee to consider this application so would be grateful if a decision could be made this week.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 3 with 1 abstention)** to reject the Officer recommendation to approve the application.

**Resolved (by 5 votes to 3)** to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reasons:

1. Policy 60 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 requires that any proposals for a structure that breaks the existing skyline and/or is significantly taller than the surrounding built form must demonstrate that the proposal would result in a high-quality addition to the Cambridge skyline, that complements the character of the surrounding area. The proposed development is considered to result in a permanent incongruous addition to the Cambridge skyline that would fail to positively respond to the existing delicate and historic features through its height, scale, bulk, appearance and lighting. As such, the proposed development fails to contribute positively to its surroundings and the Cambridge skyline and is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 58, 60.
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 proposed height, scale, bulk, appearance and lighting, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings and would adversely impact the unique, historic landscape of the River Cam. 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 heritage assets

is not outweighed by the public benefits. As such, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Central Conservation Area and the setting of listed and buildings of local interest, contrary to the provisions of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 7, 10, 61 and 62.

### **23/96/Plan 23-01457-FUL - Cheddars Lane**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for erection of building for commercial & business uses, associated infrastructure and works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Cheddars Lane:

- i. The developer had tried to secure the eviction or buying out of residents in 1-7 Cheddars Lane.
- ii. The area had changed in the period he lived in it 1960s-ish to date.
- iii. Queried where to move (to) if move out from current abode.

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

Councillor Porrer proposed amendments to the Officer's recommendation:

- i. To include an air source heat pump noise mitigation informative.
- ii. Requesting safeguarding privacy for neighbours through either obscure glazing or louvres to those windows overlooking onto adjoining properties (specifically second floor window overlooking 7 Cheddars Lane).

The amendments were **carried unanimously**.

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 (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted), subject to:

- i. the prior completion of an Agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [with delegated authority granted to Officers to negotiate, secure and complete such an Agreement on terms considered appropriate and necessary];
- 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 an additional condition seeking privacy for neighbours from the application proposal either through providing obscure glazing or louvres to overlooking windows (specifically second floor window overlooking 7 Cheddars Lane); and
- iv. include an informative on the planning permission in respect of air source heat pump noise mitigation.

### **23/97/Plan 23-03297-FUL Ice Rink, Parker's Piece**

Councillors Carling and Porrer withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

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 use of land at Parkers Piece for the holding of temporary Christmas event, including the annual installation of ice rink, food, drink and market stalls (including lodge bar), Ferris wheel, carousel, attractions, seating areas and associated fencing, works and structures for the period 1st November to 14th January the following year each year for the next 4 years (until period November 2027-January 2028).

The Senior Planner updated the Officer report by referring to the amendment sheet:

- i. Amended description of development.
- ii. Amended recommendation 3 in the Officer report to correct an error with dates and to accommodate a minor change to condition 3.
- iii. Replacement text for condition 11 (Energy Provision).
- iv. Amendment of condition 12 to clarify bio-fuel included bio-diesel.

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

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

- i. The application was received just 5 weeks before committee. Queried if it had been submitted too soon as the consultation period had not closed.
- ii. Ward Councillors were minded to support an appropriate winter fair.
- iii. Noted changes to the application such as bio diesel instead of diesel.
- iv. Requested a condition that employees would not park on site.
- v. Expressed concern about:
  - a. (Big) observation wheel location on site.
  - b. Height and lighting which could disturb nearby residents at night.
  - c. Noise.
  - d. The 'wheel' was described as a Ferris wheel in the application but was in fact an observation wheel ie bigger than described.
- vi. The benefits were not sufficient to approve the application in this case.

Councillor Carling (Executive Councillor for or Open Spaces and City Services) addressed the Committee about the application:

- i. The application would be a positive feature and provide a high quality event.
- ii. The application took into account concerns about events by the previous operator. Issues could be mitigated by conditions.

Councillor Bennett proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that Christmas trees from the maze should be recycled eg donated to a local zoo.

This amendment was **carried by 5 votes to 0**.

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 the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the amendments to conditions set out in the amendment sheet and including the informative relating to recycling of Christmas trees.

### **23/98/Plan 23-01821-HFUL 30 Maids Causeway**

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.



The application sought approval for the demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey double garage.

The Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet.

- i. Revised text in Planning Balance para. 8.36.
- ii. Revised condition 3 text.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Maids Causeway:

- i. Suggested the application went against Local Plan Policy 61.
- ii. Lanes had a heritage interest.
- iii. The development was not similar in design to existing Salmon Lane buildings.
- iv. The proposal was bigger than other buildings in Salmon Lane.
- v. Requested a light assessment to review the impact on neighbours.

The Planner recommended an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to include a condition to control materials.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 7 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 the conditions recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including a condition to control materials.

### **23/99/Plan 23-01554-FUL Land Adjacent to Grafton House, Maids Causeway**

Councillor Porrer withdrew from 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 the erection of new office building (use Class E) and associated development, infrastructure and works.

The Senior Planner updated her report by referring to the following in her presentation:

- i. Second set of Conservation Team comments.
  - a. These comments follow-on from those previously made and you are referred to those for observations on the proposed new office development. The comments below relate to the revised proposals and additional information submitted regarding the two-storey brick wall on the western boundary.
  - b. Whereas the previous plan showed the removal of a central section of the wall from ground to top, the revised plan (3879-SK300-Rev. 1) now shows an opening being made within the wall to allow for the delivery of materials. This opening is to be 3m high and the text on the drawing gives the sequence of events to create and support the opening and the method for closing it again. This is an acceptable approach that looks to be achievable and is therefore supported in Conservation terms.
  - c. The proposed amendments to the exterior of the new development are acceptable in terms of their impact on the BLI and the conservation area.
- ii. Amendment to condition 19 (Ecology).
  - a. All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in Preliminary Ecological Appraisal at Grafton House Offices, Cambridge by Applied Ecology Ltd (April 2023). Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57
  - b. Addition of nest boxes condition in line with Ecology Officer recommendation, to read:
  - c. No development above ground level shall commence until a scheme for the provision of nest boxes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of box numbers, specification and their location. The development, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until nest boxes have been provided for that property in accordance with the approved scheme. Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 57).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Maids Causeway:

- i. At a height of 10 metres, the proposed office building was too close to residential properties in Maids Causeway (many Grade II listed fine terraces) as well as the 16 flats at Grafton House. This meant the office building would dominate, overshadow and overlook, with the associated loss of privacy. It was highly detrimental to the Building of Local Interest

site as well as the general Kite Conservation Area. It would completely undermine the character and setting of the area.

- a. The Applicant argued that the existence of two-storey coach houses in Salmon Lane justified and sets a precedent for the construction of a ten-metre-high office building, which would rise 4 metres above the Salmon Lane boundary wall. These coach houses are subservient to the four-storey main houses, which was not the case with the office development. Furthermore, the application did not note the significant drop in height as the road slopes downwards from the large wall, which made the proposed roof line considerably higher, much more prominent and overbearing.
- b. The application further stated that the proposed building would not act as a landmark feature along Salmon Lane. That was not true.
- ii. This application differed from the planning consent (now lapsed) obtained in February 2000 for nine flats (six subterranean and 3 single-storey above ground) and considerable landscaping - 19/0300/FUL, so it would represent a “volte-face” by Planning for this application to be supported.
- iii. There was no justification for more office space. Office space close-by in Newmarket Road had been vacant for some time. More affordable accommodation was what was needed, not more office space.
- iv. Very high risk of significant increase in unauthorised parking and traffic congestion in Salmon Lane and 64 Maids Causeway as well as damage to Salmon Lane itself.
  - a. Salmon Lane (a narrow lane which runs parallel with Maids Causeway) provides the sole access to/from garages of properties numbered 28 to 52 Maids Causeway. It was neither robust nor suitable for the passage of heavy construction vehicles cause serious damage to the Lane. Even dustbin lorries could not drive into Salmon Lane.
- v. Permanent heritage damage caused by part removal of boundary wall in Salmon Lane, could never be restored properly.
  - a. In 2020, the Conservation Team wanted to make clear that the construction of the units must be done from the site itself, and that we would not support the demolition of the tall wall at the end of Salmon Lane during the construction phase for site access. The

wall had a particular, albeit rebuilt, quality of its own which could be lost, even if it were reconstructed using the same bricks.”

- vi. The proposal did not meet a number of important policy requirements of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) eg policy 60.

Mr McKeown (Applicant’s Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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

- i. Councillors Bick, Martinelli and Porrer objected to the application due to its scale, massing and materials.
- ii. Queried if the building height was acceptable.
- iii. The application would be visible from various viewpoints.
- iv. The application would be located near buildings of local interest. It did not match the character of the area.
- v. Expressed concern about:
  - a. Lack of amenity space for flats.
  - b. Demolition activity in Salmon Lane.
  - c. How the site would be accessed.
- vi. Queried if there would be a net gain in biodiversity.
- vii. If the application were approved, requested conditions regarding:
  - a. Construction traffic.
  - b. A traffic management plan.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer’s recommendation to include weight and time limit provisions for construction traffic in Salmon Lane.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment to the Officer’s recommendation that an informative be included concerning inclusion of a lift to make the first floor accessible to all.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 2 with 1 abstention)** not 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. the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report and amendment sheet;
- ii. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to amend condition 4 to include both weight and time limit provisions for construction traffic in Salmon Lane;
- iii. include an informative requesting inclusion of a lift to make the first floor accessible to all.

A discussion ensued on 'minded to' reasons for refusal . Three reasons were considered by the Committee which ultimately resolved:

**Resolved (by 4 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions)** to accept as a reason for refusal:

1. The proposal by virtue of its scale, massing, form, inappropriate materials and overall appearance would result in an overly dominant, stark and simplistic building form which would fail to successfully contrast with its immediate context and would therefore be out of character with its surroundings. As a result, less than substantial harm would result to the setting of surrounding heritage assets, including nearby listed buildings, buildings of local interest and the conservation area. There are no public benefits which would outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 61, 62 and the NPPF (2023) paragraph 202 and Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (LBCA) (1990).

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions)** not to accept as a reason for refusal:

2. The proposal fails to meet the principle of inclusive design, in particular of disabled people because of its failure to provide access to all parts of the building due to the absence of a lift to the first floor. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 56 (criteria k) and 57 (criteria b).

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions)** not to accept as a reason for refusal:

3. The proposed construction access to the site would result in undue harm to adjacent residential neighbours because of the constrained nature of Salmon Lane resulting in noise, vibration, dust and disturbance, which could not adequately be mitigated. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 35.

**Resolved (4 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions)** to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation for the following reason:

The proposal by virtue of its scale, massing, form, inappropriate materials and overall appearance would result in an overly dominant, stark and simplistic building form which would fail to successfully contrast with its immediate context and would therefore be out of character with its surroundings. As a result, less than substantial harm would result to the setting of surrounding heritage assets, including nearby listed buildings, buildings of local interest and the conservation area. There are no public benefits which would outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 61, 62 and the NPPF (2023) paragraph 202 and Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (LBCA) (1990).

### **23/100/Plan23-02487-FUL - Land at 64 Cromwell Road**

Councillor Baigent withdrew from 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 the demolition of the existing garage and creation of a new one bedroom dwelling including outdoor amenity space and pedestrian access from Cromwell Road.

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

- i. Removed reference to s106 contributions from text in para 8.31.
- ii. Revised para 8.58 wording.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation that reason 2 should include a reference to M42 regarding access width

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 votes to 0)** to refuse the application for planning permission in accordance with the Officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the officer report; with Officers to investigate if M4(2) (in relation to the width of the access to the property) should be included in reason 2, with delegated authority to Officers to insert and amend the text if appropriate.

### **23/101/Plan23-01790-FUL 10 Queen Ediths Way**

The Committee received an application for change of use to allow short-term letting of the space above the garage.

The Planner updated his report by referring to the amendment sheet which set out an additional proposed condition 6 (ensure adequate cycle parking).

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a resident of Queen Ediths Way (written statement read by Committee Manager):

- i. Allowing the change of use would be contrary to the conditions of the planning permission granted on 15 March 2017 No. 17/0076/FUL.
- ii. The development was permitted on a condition that the space above the garage would not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 10 Queen Ediths Way, and would not be separately used, occupied or let. This was so that the amenity of the adjoining residential properties was protected. We and our neighbours in 8 Queen Ediths Way would like for the amenity of our residential properties to continue to be protected.
- iii. The Applicants had previously breached the conditions of the planning permission granted to them in 2017 and used the space above the garage (which was completed as a studio flat with a fitted kitchen) as a letting space, until a complaint was raised by neighbours to the Council. This demonstrated there was no effective way of enforcing the planning conditions in particular where the Applicants seemingly knowingly breach the conditions.
- iv. Granting permission for a change of use in the circumstances in question had the potential to create a precedent whereby a commercial use of ancillary accommodation was applied for post-factum seemingly making a mockery of the planning process. Therefore urged the Committee to reject the Application.

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

- i. Referred to 17/0076/FUL. Ancillary use of the property was clearly understood by the owners and neighbours. There would have been more objections from neighbours if not for the agreed ancillary use ie more lax usage terms would have attracted more objections to the original application.
- ii. Queried why the condition was being changed to allow short-term letting. This appeared to allow any applicant to change property use via the backdoor by applying for ancillary use then applying to remove the condition.
- iii. Expressed concern about the realism of conditions 3 and 5 as these were usually ignored and hard to enforce.
- iv. It was not appropriate to seek ancillary use then seek a change within 5 years.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer's recommendation to investigate the appropriateness of a condition linking to access provision under M4(2) and building regulations.

This amendment was **carried by 7 votes to 0**.

#### The Committee:

**Resolved (by 3 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions)** 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 recommended by the Officer (with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted) including the amendment to condition 6 to ensure adequate cycle parking provision, and (with delegated authority to Officers) to investigate the appropriateness of a condition linking the access provision under M4(2) and building regulations.

The Committee voted to continue past 6pm.

#### **23/102/Plan23-01570-FUL 4 Uphall Road**

Councillor Bennett 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 a single storey rear extension and change of use (C4 to Sui Generis - large HMO).

The Planner updated her report by referring to the amendment sheet which revised condition 6 (“The dwelling, 4 Uphall Road, Cambridge, shall have no more than 7 people residing within it at any one time”).

The Committee Manager read a statement on behalf of the Applicant which addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed an amendment to the Officer’s recommendation to include an informative requesting a window or door to use as means of escape from the inner room.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

Councillor Porrer proposed an amendment to the Officer’s recommendation to include a green or seeded roof.

This amendment was **carried by 6 votes to 0**.

The Committee:

**Resolved (by 6 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 (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. delegated authority to Officers, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes, to amend condition 3 to refer to a bio diverse roof;
- iii. an informative included on the planning permission requesting a window to escape from the inner room.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

**CHAIR**