

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 16<sup>th</sup> September 2009**

**Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 1      APPLICATION REF:      **09/0775/S73**

Location:      **The Varsity, 24 Thompsons Lane,**

Target Date:      12.10.2009

To Note:      Additional representations have been received from:-

- 3 St Clements Gardens
- 7 Beaufort Place
- 26 Beaufort Place (should be 36 Beaufort Place – amended after first circulation)
- 41 Beaufort Place
- 16 St Johns Road
- Park Street Residents Association
- Trinity Hall
- The Directors of Beaufort Place Ltd

The issues raised in the additional correspondence are addressed in earlier correspondence and the report. A summary is that this proposal is not seen as differing materially from the last, refused, application. There is continuing concern about: access and the blocking of Thompson's Lane; that any of the promises about delivery can be met; that refuse can be properly handled; that the traffic survey work was not taken at a good time for gauging properly the impact (students and residents away from Cambridge); that the restaurant will be on the top floor (despite suggestions previously and again now, that conditions can preclude that happening); that the suggestion in the report that the restaurant will reduce traffic in and out of the lane is stark contradiction of the original claim that it would help local service providers. There is also what is perceived as continuing misreading of the initial reasoning for allowing the hotel, policybss6 of the East of England Plan 2008 and the whole issue of deliveries.

As most matters are picked up in a letter from the Park Street Residents' Association that is set out below:

Dear Mr Carter,

Further to your recent conversation with Mr Richard Price (and in Mr Collins' absence on leave), I have been asked to write to you on behalf of the Park Street Residents' Association regarding this application. This in essence differs little from the developer's previous application, which was considered and REJECTED at the Planning Committee on 22 July. We believe that this was a correct decision, which should continue to be upheld. Our objections to the current application are as follows:

1. The inclusion of a restaurant within the hotel will result in a greater number of deliveries, placing extra strain on the access roads and services.
2. Entry to the service 'undercroft' will be barred by a large door. It is therefore likely that delivery vehicles will stop and be unloaded in the street, thus causing congestion and visual obstruction at the nearby intersection. Taxis, too, are unlikely to deposit passengers in the 'undercroft'.
3. A restaurant will generate additional waste and the lack of off-street access for refuse vehicles will cause obstruction and additional noise in this tightly-knit and predominantly residential area.
4. Although the restaurant indicated on the latest drawing is of limited size, there is concern that if consent were to be given for it, the applicant would seek to increase its size at a later date, thus further exacerbating the situation. This looks like the thin end of a wedge.
5. The record of vehicle movements appears to be incomplete and was, in any case, made during the school holiday period and, for part of the time, when the bollards near the Maypole public house had been removed to allow roadworks to proceed in the area.

For these reasons, our Association urges the City Council to REJECT this application.

I should like to add that deposited plan (A) does not show on which floor the proposed restaurant is to be located. The accompanying ground floor plan also indicates two openings linking the hotel with the adjoining (Glassworks) building. No mention is made of this in the current written application, although it might have a substantial effect on the how both buildings are managed and operated. This lack of clarity makes it difficult to assess the applicant's real intentions and reinforces the Association's request for the application to be refused.

Yours sincerely,  
John Cooper

#### Amendments To Text:

Further comment has been received from the Conservation Officer:  
"The main impact of the site is the building already granted consent. However, in terms

of the impact on the CA, a restaurant use in part of the building would stem mainly from the usual need for air extract plant and associated trunking, etc. for the kitchen, toilets, etc.. Whether these could successfully be incorporated within the building or would have to be external is not made clear. The visual impact of these essential adjuncts could be quite significant. The other aspect to be considered is the need for extra waste storage for restaurant products [food waste]. The GF plan supplied shows a space for wheelie bins, etc. for the flats in the block but whether this can accommodate whatever is necessary for a restaurant use is not clear [the D & A Statement seems to concentrate on collection of bins rather than how many and where they will be within the site].

There is not really sufficient information provided to comment one way or another.”

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **09/0706/CAC**

Location: **127 -127a Hills Road**

Target Date: 29.09.2009

To Note:

- 5.3 The comments of the Historic Environment Manager have been received. The officer notes that the possibility of an alternative solution has been explored without success. He is satisfied that there is no realistic alternative to the proposed demolition. The view of the HEM is that in these circumstances, the demolition of these buildings, and of the garden wall is justifiable in terms of the PPG15 criteria for wider public benefit.
- 5.4 English Heritage is of the view that the case for demolition has been substantiated as set out in PPG15 as bringing substantial benefit for the community (i.e. as part of delivering the Station Area redevelopment).

An additional representation has been received from the occupier of 22 Brentwood Close, Cambridge. The representation is in the form of an objection to the proposals on the following grounds:

The buildings have made a significant contribution to the street scene for over a hundred years.

Although the principle of the public benefit of a bus link may be self-evident there is no assessment in the report of the method or design. Paragraph 8.9 refers to a

consultation with the City Council but there is no evidence of the design having been submitted for consideration by the public or Members.

There is no assessment of whether an alternative approach to the bus link layout would not only be achievable but also enhance the public benefit by preserving the historic streetscene. This arm of the junction served the industrial mills beyond for many years. The scale of land take for the bus link is twice the width of the junction entrance and it is contended that the loss of the contribution that these buildings make and the scale of the junction will be detrimental and further erode the local character. Much has been lost of the other side of Hills Road and every effort should be made to preserve historic character.

The application should be deferred for submission of the detail of the highway design or refused on the basis that the proposal does not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and the wider public benefits could be achieved by other means.

Condition 4 is welcomed but is not a substitute for retention.

Officer Note:

In response to the above letter and to questions raised by Members at the Chair's Brief a copy of a drawing, which was submitted in the Heritage Statement is attached to this Amendment Sheet. This drawing shows the alignment of the new bus link road and identifies which parts of the scheme are 'Highway Works' and which are 'Development Highway Works'. 'Highway Works' are those works that are permitted development (green) and 'Development Highway Works (red) are those works that need planning permission. Paragraph 8.9 of my report sets out the procedure for dealing with the works that require planning permission i.e. that the City Council will be consultees to that application which is determined by the County Council.

The County Council have held one workshop for key stakeholders in the bus link scheme including the Cycling Campaign. Some Councillors attended the workshop along with members of the Design and Conservation Panel. Further events are planned prior to the submission of the planning application.

There is an existing access off the highway between 127a Hills Road and the garden wall to the Earl of Derby PH. This did serve the RHM site and I have no reason to doubt that it was used by large vehicles. However this access does not constitute a fourth arm to the junction and it is not technically possible to adapt this access to provide for the bus only link road.

Also in response to a question raised at Chair's Brief, the planning history of the site as listed in the report includes reference to an application for advertisement consent approved under reference 07/0045. This application allows of advertising hoardings around 127 Hills Road which are required to be removed when development is completed.

Amendments To Text:      None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

**DECISION:**

---

**GENERAL ITEMS**

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM:

Location: LAND ADJOINING FITZWILLIAM ROAD AND CLARENDON ROAD (FORMER CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS SITE) (CUP SITE)

To Note:

Paragraph 3.27 – I have taken advice from my colleagues and have reached the view that the indexation clause should be revised to relate to the date of the Decision Notice and not the s106 Agreement as requested by the Developers. In my view the situation that has arisen in this case, which resulted in the delay, is unusual and this should be acknowledged by the City Council.

Amendments To Text:

I have not heard from either the Developer's agent or the County Council regarding the commuted sums for education. In the light of this situation I would request that delegated authority be given to officers to allow variations to be made to the s106 Agreement to reflect whatever agreed approach is reached between the Developer and the County Council.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

The following table sets out the proposed variations against the existing clauses in the s106 Agreement for clarity and includes reference to the 'education' clauses as referred to above:

Comparison between the proposed variations and the s106 Agreement as currently drafted.

Proposed Variation	Original s106 clause
--------------------	----------------------

Submission of public art scheme prior to implementation of Phase 2.	Payment of a commuted sum prior to first occupation or submission of a public art scheme prior to implementation.
Approval of public art scheme prior to occupation of Phase 2.	Approval of public art scheme prior to first occupation.
Submission of a specification and management plan for the Community Facility for approval before implementation of Phase Two	Submission and approval of the Community Centre Specification and the Management Plan prior to implementation of the development
Submission of the open space specification for approval prior to implementation of Phase Two	Specification for on site open space, including play space, be submitted for approval prior to first occupation of the development.
Committed sums for informal open space and play space to be made on a quarterly basis based on a contribution per unit for units that have been occupied.	Phased payments of the open space contribution on the basis of 50% on the implementation of Phase One, 25% on the implementation of Phase Two and 25% on the implementation of Phase Three.
Education contributions ([pre-school and life long learning) to be made in accordance with arrangements agreed with the County Council.	Full payment of education contributions prior to first occupation.
Variation of indexation applied to open space commuted sums to relate to the date of the Decision Notice (Outline) (November 2005)	Indexation applied to open space commuted sums relates to the date of the s106. (February 2005)

**DECISION:**

---

Figure 1.1 – Cambridge Gateway Scheme

