

Planning Committee10 February 2010
9.30am – 14.20pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**10/plan/06 Minutes**

It was noted that Councillor Stuart had attended the meeting on 13 January 2010 and therefore Councillor Zmura (as alternate) had not been required to attend.

With this minor correction the minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2010 were confirmed as a correct record.

10/plan/07 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Dryden.

10/plan/08 Declarations of Interest**Councillor Application**

Stuart 09/1103/FUL Personal Interest: Works on Station Road

Al Bander 09/1103/FUL Personal Interest: Regular user of Station Road

Reid 09/1103/FUL Prejudicial Interest: Husband involved with another building on the CB1 site.

Councillor Reid left the room during this discussion and did not take part in the vote.

10/plan/09 Planning Application

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

10/plan/10 General Items

The General Items were determined as shown in the appendix to these minutes.

The meeting ended at 14.20pm

CHAIR

**Planning Committee
10 February 2010**

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	09/1103/FUL
Site Proposal	Red House 27 - 29 Station Road Cambridge Erection of 169 room hotel, together with ancillary facilities such as bar/restaurant, meeting room and gym facilities, drop-off area/disabled parking and cycle parking
Applicant Recommendation	C/o 7 Dukes Court 54-62 Newmarket Road Cambridge APPROVE subject to satisfactory completion of a S106 agreement by 23 February 2010 and subject to conditions
Public Speakers	Frank Gawthrop - Glisson Road/Tenison Road Area RA (Objector) Colin Brown (Applicants Agent) Ward Councillor Ben Bradnack
Reasons for approval raised in debate	Members raised concern regarding the design, massing and height of the proposal and felt that it did not respond to context. Concerns were also raised about increased traffic and the impact the limited parking provision would have on the surrounding area.
Decision	REFUSED (unanimously) against officer recommendation. Reasons for refusal to be agreed by Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

The following reasons for refusal were subsequently agreed:

The proposed development, by virtue of its height, scale and bulk, would have an overpowering impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, which forms part of the Central Conservation Area. In particular the building would be a dominant form in the Station Road streetscene as a result of its increased height in comparison with buildings and building forms that have been approved on neighbouring sites and would dominate the views from the north and in due course public open space and residential/student

accommodation which is proposed to be developed in that area. In so doing the development fails to respond positively to the site context and constraints and does not preserve or enhance the amenities of the Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to policies ENV6 and ENV 7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and 3/4, 3/7, 3/12, 3/13 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to guidance provided by PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment.

The proposed development, by virtue of the lack of off-street car parking provision on site, fails to make adequate provision to meet the needs of car borne guests, which would be likely to result in additional demands being placed upon on-street parking space in an area where competition for parking space is at high levels. In addition the valet car parking arrangements would generate additional traffic on the road network, which already experiences high volumes of traffic and associated congestion. In so doing the development will have an unacceptable transport impact and would be detrimental to residential amenity which represents a failure of the development to respond positively to the site context and constraints. Also, in the absence of evidence to demonstrate that car parking demand could reasonably be expected to be lower than the car parking standards set out in the Cambridge Local Plan, the development fails to make provision for an appropriate level of car parking. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3/4, 8/2 and 8/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and to guidance provided by PPG13 Transport.

The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for transport mitigation measures, public realm improvements and public art in accordance with policies 3/7, 8/3, 9/9 and 10/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; and policies P6/1 and P9/8 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004, Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan 2002, Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes 2002 and the Station Area Development Framework 2004.

4.2	09/0708/FUL
Site	180-190 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8HF
Proposal	Erection of 219 bed hotel and restaurant (following demolition of existing buildings), together with associated infrastructure
Applicant	C/o 7 Dukes Court 54-62 Newmarket Road CB5 8DZ
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to completion of a S106 agreement by 10 April 2010 and subject to conditions
Public Speakers	Lynette Gilbert - Riverside RA, PACT, BruNK (Objector) Colin Brown (Applicants Agent) Ward Councillor Margaret Wright Ward Councillor Lucy Walker Ward Councillor Sedgwick-Jell
Reasons for approval raised in debate	Members raised concerns regarding the design and massing of the proposal and felt that it did not respond to context. Concerns were also raised about increased traffic and the impact of the proposal on the Conservation Area.
Decision	REFUSED (unanimously) against officer recommendation Reasons for refusal to be agreed by Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes.

4.3	09/0843/FUL
Site	Sainsburys Store Brooks Road Cambridge CB1 3HP
Proposal	Extension to existing Sainsbury's Store (2709 sq m) to include extension to store frontage, provision of a mezzanine level, new entrance lobby, new associated access and improvements to the parking arrangements
Applicant	Sainsburys Supermarket Ltd C/O Indigo Planning Swan Court Worples Road, London SW19 4JS
Recommendation	REFUSE
Public Speakers	Mr McGrath (Applicants Agent)
Decision	DEFERRED (unanimously) in order to give the applicant time to assess the significance of information received by the case officer after the completion of his Report.

5.2 Recommendation Public Speakers Decision	<p>Review of Delegations (Head of Development Services) APPROVE as per officer's report N/A APPROVED (unanimously):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The scheme of delegation as set out in amended Appendix 2 (as circulated at the meeting) with the following change to the wording of A1i (additions underlined). <p><i>The application is one where, within 21 days of the date of publication of the weekly list, or within 14 days of receipt of any subsequent <u>significant</u> amendment to the <u>still current</u> proposal, any Member (including County Council Members representing City Wards) requests in writing (including e-mail sent in accordance with the Council's guidelines), that the application should be determined by Committee, stating the planning grounds on which the request is based.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The scheme of delegation set out in amended Appendix 2 to take effect immediately.• The revised Amendments Protocol in Appendix 5 (circulated with the amendment sheet) subject to a revision to incorporate the text of A1h) of the revised Appendix.
--	--