

Planning Committee

29 April 2009
9.30am – 2.50pm

Present: Councillors Al Bander, Baker (Chair), Blair (Vice Chair), Blencowe, Dixon, Dryden, Hipkin, Reid and Smart.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

09/plan/13 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 April 2009 were confirmed as a correct record.

09/plan/14 Apologies

None

09/plan/15 Declarations of Interest

Code of Conduct personal interests were declared as follows:

Councillor	Application	Interest
Dixon	08/1575/FUL & 08/1579/FUL	Prejudicial Interest – Member of Petersfield Mansion Board <i>Cllr Dixon withdrew from the room while items 4.1 and 4.2 were being discussed and voted upon.</i>
Blencowe		Graduate of CCAT
Dryden		Former student of CCAT
Smart	09/0094/FUL	Shops at Sainsburys

09/plan/16 Planning Application

The Planning applications were determined as shown in the appendix to these minutes.

Councillor Reid and Smart participated and voted for items 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 but retired for the remainder of the meeting.

The meeting ended at 2.50pm

CHAIR

**Planning Committee
29 April 2009**

Appendix

Full details of the decisions, conditions of permissions and reasons for refusal may be inspected in the Environment and Planning Department, including those which the committee delegated to the Head of Development Control to draw up. These minutes and the appendix should be read in conjunction with the reports on applications to the committee, where the conditions to the approved applications or reasons for refusal are set out in full and with the Amendment Sheet issued at the meeting. Any amendments to the recommendations are shown in the appendix.

4.1	08/1575/FUL
Site	Anglia Ruskin University, East Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB1 1PT
Proposal	Erection of D1 education building following demolition of Rackham Building and relocation of cycle store.
Applicant	C/o Unex House 132-134 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PA
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to the satisfactory completion of the s106 agreement by 25 th May 2009 and subject to conditions as set out in the officer's report.
Public Speakers	Steven Bennet (Applicant) Nick Evangelista (Supporter) Jenny Kirner (Objector) Mrs Joan Pilmer (Objector) Cllr Lucy Walker (Ward Councillor) Cllr Nichola Harrison (County Councillor)
Decision	APPROVED by 6 votes to 2 subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the officer's report. Also subject to the changes, additional condition and informative stated on the amendment sheet:

Additional condition:

Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1900 hrs on Monday to Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring properties, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

Additional informative:

“In bringing forward information to discharge condition 4 the applicant is requested to give full consideration to the application of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) principles. Further advice may be sought from Simon Bunn (City Council SUDS engineer on 01223 457193).”

The Committee agreed to the Chair's suggestion that the details pertaining to conditions 2 and 18 of the Decision Notice are agreed by the Chair, Vice-Chair and Spokes person of the Planning Committee before formal discharge of the conditions.

4.2	08/1579/FUL
Site Proposal	Cycle Park, Anglia Ruskin University Erection of D1 educational building and external alterations to electricity sub-station.
Applicant	Bishop Hall Properties, c/o Unex House, 132-134 Hills Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB2 2PA
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions as set out in the officer's report.
Public Speakers	Steven Bennet (Applicant) Nick Evangelista (Supporter) Jenny Kirner (Objector) Mrs Joan Pilmer (Objector) Cllr Lucy Walker (Ward Councillor) Cllr Nichola Harrison (County Councillor)
Reasons for refusal raised in debate	Members who spoke against the Officer recommendation expressed their concerns with the visual impact of the rear green wall of the proposed optometry building as it would be an unacceptable design solution for the Conservation Area that adjoins the site. They were concerned that the rear green wall of the proposed optometry building would have an adverse impact upon the outlook from neighbouring dwellings in Petersfield and would dominate and enclose those dwellings and their associated private amenity space. Members expressed their dissatisfaction with the proposed materials and design quality for the rear wall, as it would have a detrimental effect for the residential amenity.
Decision	REFUSED by 5 votes to 0 against officer recommendation. The following reasons for refusal were subsequently agreed with Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes as reflecting the views expressed by Members at the meeting:

1 The proposed development, by virtue of the external treatment and appearance of the rear elevation fronting Bradmore Lane, would have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area which abuts the site. In so doing the development fails to respond positively to its context and would not create an attractive built frontage to the adjoining street. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV 7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to guidance provided by PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment.

2. The proposed development, by virtue of the external treatment and appearance of the rear elevation fronting Bradmore Lane, would have an adverse impact upon the outlook from neighbouring dwellings in Petersfield and would dominate and enclose those dwellings and their associated private amenity space. In so doing the development would have an adverse impact on the level of residential amenity that the occupiers of Petersfield could reasonably expect to enjoy, demonstrating a failure to respond positively to the opportunities and constraints of the site. The development is therefore contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to guidance provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

4.3	09/0094/FUL
Site	Sainsburys Store, Brooks Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB1 3HP
Proposal	Extension to existing Sainsburys Store (2709 sq m) to include extensions to store frontage, provision of a mezzanine level, new entrance lobby, new associated access and improvements to the parking arrangements.
Applicant	Sainsburys Supermarket, Swan Court, Worple Road, London SW19 4JS
Recommendation	REFUSE for the reasons set out in the officer's report.
Public Speakers	Georgia Johnson (Support refusal) Amy Napp (Support refusal) Mr Sean McGrath (Applicant's Agent)
Decision	REFUSED by 5 votes to 2 for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

4.4	09/0108/FUL
Site	Land Adjacent to 95 Ditton Walk, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB5 8QD
Proposal	Residential development to form 12 x 1-bed units with associated car/cycle parking and landscaping (following demolition of existing garages)
Applicant	Ferndale Design and Build Ltd C/O Agent Januarys Chartered Surveyors York House Dukes Court 54-62 Newmarket Road Cambridge, CB5 8DZ
Recommendation	REFUSE for the reasons shown in the officer's report.
Public Speakers	Paul Belton (Applicant's Agent)
Decision	REFUSED by 6 votes to 0 for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

4.5	
Site	94 – 100 St Andrews Road (Simoco)
Proposal	Variation of Section 106 Agreement
Applicant	Redeham Hall, 137 Redeham Road, Burstow, Surrey. RH6 9RJ
Recommendation	That the Section 106 Agreement be varied to allow the reduction of the Public Open Space to be transferred to the City Council from 1.4 hectares to 1.25 hectares.
Public Speakers	None
Decision	AGREED by 5 votes to 0 for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

5.1	Objection to Tree Works Application: TWA 09/075/Tree 2: 38 Norfolk Terrace
Site	Norfolk Terrace
Recommendation	The Council raises no objection to the felling of the ash tree. The tree is not made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.
Public Speakers	Letter from Madeline Cunningham & Zenia Alcock read out in support of tree felling
Decision	AGREED by 6 votes to 0 (unanimous) that members raised no objection to the felling of the ash tree and the offering of a free tree as a suitable replacement.

5.2 Objection to Tree Works Application: TWA 09/101/Tree 2:
107 Grantchester Meadows

Site Grantchester Meadows

Recommendation The Council raises no objection to the felling of the spruce tree. The tree is not made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

Public Speakers None

Decision **AGREED** by 6 votes to 0 (unanimous) that members raised no objection to the felling of the spruce tree and welcomed the planting of a suitable replacement.

5.3 Objection to Tree Works Application: TWA 09/086/Tree 2:
Malcolm Place, King Street

Site Malcolm Place, King Street

Recommendation The Council raises no objection to the pruning of the sycamore tree. The tree is not made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

Public Speakers None

Decision **AGREED** by 6 votes to 0 (unanimous) that members raised no objection to the pruning of the sycamore tree and that the tree should not be made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.