

Public Document Pack

Planning

Plan/1

Wednesday, 6 March 2024

PLANNING

6 March 2024

10.03 am - 4.40 pm

Present:

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

Councillor Dryden left the meeting after the vote on item 24/27/Plan and did not return.

Officers:

Delivery Manager: Toby Williams

Built Environment Team Leader: Trovine Monteiro

Built and Natural Environment Manager: Jane Green

Area Team Leader (West): Michael Sexton

Principal Ecologist: Daniel Weaver

Principal Planner: Katie Christodoulides (virtually)

Senior Planner: Laurence Moore

Senior Planner: Tom Chenery

Planning Officer: Rachel Brightwell

Legal Adviser: Keith Barber

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/24/Plan Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart, Councillor Baigent as Vice-Chair chaired the meeting.

Councillor Thornburrow was elected as Vice-Chair for the meeting for the purpose of consultation requirements arising from any decisions.

24/25/Plan Declarations of Interest

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

24/26/Plan Year One Review of the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel and the Incorporation of the Disability Consultative Panel into the GCDRP

The Committee received an information report regarding the Year One Review of the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel (GCDRP) and the incorporation of the Disability Consultative Panel into the GCDRP.

The Chair of the GCDRP attended the meeting to answer Members' questions.

A summary of Member comments is as follows:

- i. Accessibility and design needed to be considered at the earliest point of any development proposal.
- ii. Supported merging of the Design Review Panel and the Disability Consultative Panel.
- iii. Welcomed the Accessibility Officer drafting a guide which could be provided to developers at the outset relative to accessibility matters.
- iv. Queried if volunteers on the Panel would be paid for their contribution to the Panel's work.
- v. Asked for the new Terms of Reference to be shared with the Committee.

In line with the recommendations set out in paragraph 2.1 of the officer's report, the Committee noted:

- the recommendations made by the Independent Advisory Group about the GCDRP and how these will be taken forward; and
- the incorporation of the Disability Consultative Panel into the existing GCDRP and establishing an Accessibility Forum.

24/27/Plan 22-05352-FUL 18 Adams Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the erection of a single dwelling and garage.

The Area Team Leader updated the Officer's report by referring to additional information contained within the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. third party representation received from Chris Smith of Small Ecology regarding ecology issues; and
- ii. amendments to conditions 10 and 11.

The Committee received representations in objection to the application which covered the following issues:

- i. Nature Reserves such as the Adams Road Bird Sanctuary (ARBS) contributed to biodiversity, conservation, public amenity, and recreation.
- ii. The Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal against refusal of the previous application because the information provided did not comply with Local Plan policies.
- iii. The matter did not hinge on details of the individual garden at 18 Adams Road; the key factor was the group value of the curtilage gardens. The harm created by the development could not be appropriately dealt with by conditions.
- iv. The Applicants had focused on the individual garden and noted the Officer's recommendation included 35 conditions.
- v. Noted there were 35 objectors to the applications and 4 supporters of the application.
- vi. Noted comments that the increased distance of the new house to the ARBS was enough to make a difference on the ecological impact but commented that the proposed new house was just one metre further away compared to the previous proposal (at 10.4m as opposed to 9.4m).
- vii. Referred to location plans displayed during the meeting for the previous application and the current application and noted that the new house was aligned east to west along the ARBS boundary; the ecological impact would be greater.
- viii. There was a presumption against approval unless proposals could demonstrate no adverse effect on adjoining designated sites and their biodiversity. The application failed to do this.
- ix. Referred to a summary of the ecological information which the applicant had submitted commenting the data had been underplayed as the data was one point away from national importance. The site appeared to be a significant foraging area.
- x. In the absence of additional surveys, particularly an autumn survey, best practice guidance on bat protection was being breached.
- xi. Rapid risk assessment for impact on newts was being wrongly applied.

John Mason (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee Manager read out statements in objection to the application on behalf of Ward Councillors - Councillor Nestor and Councillor Payne.

Councillor Simon Smith addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor speaking in objection to the application.

A vote was taken on the Officer's recommendation to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the Officer's report subject to the conditions recommended by the Officer and to the amendments to conditions 10 and 11 as set out within the Amendment Sheet. The vote was lost by 0 votes in favour to 5 against with 2 abstentions.

The Committee made the following comments as reasons for refusal:

- i. Requested reference to Local Plan Policy 56(g) – Designing places to remove the threat or perceived threat of crime. Conflict between the ecological requirements to keep light levels low versus lighting and safety in design.
- ii. Requested reference to lighting and referred to the Planning Inspector's Appeal decision. The proposal introduced first floor row of lights, facing north which are on the elevation facing the ARBS which added weight to the Inspector's decision. The harm was not mitigated.
- iii. Referred to NPPF paragraph 186a.
- iv. Reference to previous reason for refusal 3 and substantial hard surfacing and impact on European protected mammal (great crested newt).

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of reasons for refusal reflecting Members' discussion during the meeting, which the Committee confirmed: that the application be refused on the grounds of ecology and biodiversity with reference to Local Plan policies 55, 56, 69, 70 and NPPF paragraph 186 with the detailed wording for the reason(s) for refusal delegated to Officers in consultation with Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokespersons.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 6 votes to 0) to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation on the grounds of ecology and biodiversity with reference to Local Plan policies 55, 56, 69, 70 and NPPF paragraph 186 with the text for the reason(s) for refusal being delegated to Officers in consultation with Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokespersons.

24/28/Plan 23-04037-FUL Babbage House, Castle Park

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for refurbishment and retrofit of the existing building with new fourth storey, rooftop plant and rear extension, new cycle parking and landscaping adjacent to the building together with new cycle hub in existing basement car park under Castle Court.

The Principal Planner updated their report by referring to amendments contained within the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. amendments to the trigger points for conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 24;
- ii. an amended recommendation that 'Delegated authority for Officers to determine whether any representations received in the intervening period between today and the 12 March 2024 in respect of the amended red line are significant or sufficiently sensitive as to necessitate bringing the application back to Committee for determination and to otherwise grant permission in accordance with the Planning Committee resolution'.

David Seddon (Applicant's Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

- i. to delegate authority for Officers to determine whether any representations received in the intervening period between today and the 12 March 2024 in respect of the amended red line are significant or sufficiently sensitive to necessitate bringing the application back to Committee for determination or otherwise grant permission in accordance with paragraph 9.1 of the Officer's report;
- ii. the amendments to trigger points for conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 24 as set out in the Amendment Sheet;
- iii. the amendment to condition 5 - hard and soft landscaping regarding surface treatment of the car and cycle parking to ensure adequate segregation and safety for people arriving by bike;
- iv. an additional informative referring to Botanic House cycle standard to encourage the provision of a centralised cycle park of the highest standard; and
- v. delegated authority to Officers to seek advice and apply, if possible, an informative or additional condition in relation to 'water in use'.

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 planning conditions set out in the Officer's report with amendments to trigger points for conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 24 as set out in the Amendment Sheet;
- ii. an amendment to condition 5 - hard and soft landscaping condition regarding surface treatment of the car and cycle parking to ensure adequate segregation and safety for people arriving by bike;
- iii. an additional informative referring to Botanic House cycle standard to encourage the provision of a centralised cycle park of the highest standard;
- iv. delegated authority to Officers to seek advice and implement, if possible, an informative or additional condition in relation to 'water in use'.
- v. delegated authority for officers to determine whether any representations received in the intervening period between today and the 12 March 2024 in respect of the amended red line are significant or sufficiently sensitive to necessitate bringing the application back to Committee for determination otherwise to grant permission in accordance with the Committee resolution.

24/29/Plan 23-03704-FUL BT Site Long Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The retrospective application sought approval for the creation of a secure storage compound to the rear of the Cambridge Trunks Telephone exchange site and siting of five containers to the front of the site.

The Committee received a representation in objection to the application from a representative of a Retirement Living Scheme which backed on to the BT Site:

- i. The site was a couple of metres from the rear of the retirement living scheme accommodation.
- ii. The site had been an issue for over three years.
- iii. Had raised concerns about pollution and noise; works often started at 5/6am.

- iv. Noted bushes on the site had been removed, the site was now completely visible to residents and removed residents' privacy.
- v. Had requested the site was relocated to the front car park but had been told this was not possible due to security issues.
- vi. Had been told that a previous application (which resolved residents' concerns) had been approved by mistake and had been withdrawn by the Manager.
- vii. Asked for the site to be moved away from the residential area.
- viii. Requested a leylandii hedge to screen the site from residents and for noise restrictions to be imposed.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation reflecting Members' debate during the meeting to approve the application subject to the planning conditions as set out in the Officer's report with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to Officers;

- i. an additional informative in relation to the management of the civils area and better liaison with residents; and
- ii. a green roof condition in relation to the siting of the storage containers.

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 planning conditions set out in the Officer's report with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to the conditions as drafted;
- ii. delegated authority to Officers to draft and include the following:
 - a. a green roof condition; and
 - b. an informative regarding the management of the civils area and better liaison with residents.

24/30/Plan 23-04895-S73 Cherry Hinton Library, High Street, Cherry Hinton

The Applicant withdrew the planning application, so the application no longer needed to be determined by the Committee.

24/31/Plan 23-03778-HFUL 65 Ferrars Way

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, rear dormer that raises the ridge height, and garden studio/outbuilding.

The Planner updated their report by referring to the additional informative detailed in the Amendment Sheet namely:

- i. Proposing an informative to be added bringing to the notice of the applicant of the need for planning permission to change the use of the dwelling to that of an HMO.

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

- i. Was directly affected by the proposal as the site faced the rear of their house.
- ii. The size, bulk and massing overpowered their rear garden and adjoining properties.
- iii. The proposal would change a small mid-terrace 2-bed house into a 3-storey house with 6-7 bedrooms, possibly 8 bedrooms with the garden room included.
- iv. The dormer was proposed to span the width of the dwelling and would substantially overlook their house and garden, the roof height was proposed to be above adjoining properties.
- v. The proposal would result in a loss of privacy to them and their neighbours.
- vi. Expressed concern regarding loss of light / overshadowing.
- vii. The height of the garden room was above permitted development and would lead to further overshadowing of their property.
- viii. Noted a lack of amenity space inside the proposed development and the size of the garden would be reduced.
- ix. Their neighbours had expressed concern with noise with potentially 10+ people living at the property.
- x. No bike or bin stores were planned.
- xi. Rear access would be by a small passageway.
- xii. The application was overdevelopment of the site.

Councillor Todd-Jones, Cambridge City Councillor, addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application.

A vote was taken on the Officer's recommendation to approve the application subject to the planning conditions set out in the Officer's report with delegated authority to Officers to make minor amendments to conditions with an additional informative (making the applicant aware of the need to apply for planning permission to change the use of the dwelling to an HMO) as set out in the Amendment Sheet.

On a show of hands, the recommendation was lost by 0 votes in favour to 6 against.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of concerns reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

- i. disproportionate extensions, character of the scheme, poor design, inadequate provision of bike and bin storage, being overly dominant, impact on residential amenity, cramped internal and external amenity spaces, noise and disturbance all arising from the proposed layout of the extended family house and resulting relationship of those users to their ability to use the property and external environment in the context of Local Plan Policies 55, 56, 58 and Appendix E of the Roof Design Guide.

Committee confirmed this summary.

The Committee:

Resolved (unanimously) to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation (as amended in debate) on the grounds of:

- i. disproportionate extensions, character of the scheme, poor design; the inadequate provision of bike and bin storage facilities, being overly dominant, the impact on residential amenity, the cramped internal and external amenity spaces, and the potential for noise and disturbance all arising from the proposed layout of the extended family house and resulting relationship of those users to their ability to use the property and external environment with reference to Local Plan Policies 55, 56, 58 and Appendix E of the Roof Design Guide with the detailed text for the reason(s) for refusal to be delegated to Officers in consultation with Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokespersons.

24/32/Plan 23-03762-FUL - 79 Coleridge Road

The Committee received an application for full planning permission.

The application sought approval for the retrospective change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to nine person HMO (Use Class Sui Generis) and retrospective part two storey rear extension, part single storey side extension, part single storey rear extension, increase in ridge height, rear dormer roof extension and other associated external alterations.

The Delivery Manager offered the following summary of amendments to the Officer's recommendation reflecting Members' debate during the meeting:

- i. to approve the application subject to the planning conditions as set out in the Officer's report with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to Officers; and
- ii. additional conditions regarding:
 - a. landscape to soften the frontage of the site; and
 - b. the bike store to ensure sufficient spaces for bike storage; and
- iii. an additional informative making the applicant aware of the need to apply for an HMO licence.

The Committee:

Resolved (by 4 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 (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;
- ii. additional conditions regarding:
 - c. landscape to soften the frontage of the site; and
 - d. the bike store to ensure sufficient spaces for bike storage; and
- iii. an additional informative making the applicant aware of the need to apply for an HMO licence.

24/33/Plan CCC Appeals Report (21.02.2024)

The Committee noted the appeals list from 21 February 2024.

The meeting ended at 4.40 pm

CHAIR