

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 10 June 25
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Martin Smart (Chair of Planning Committee), Dave Baigent (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Toby Williams (Delivery Manager), Phoebe Carter (Planning Officer), Laise Facada (Planning Officer)

Apologies: Charlotte Peet, Dominic Bush

Minutes approved by: 13 June 25

25/01276/FUL – 6 Bourne Road East Chesterton

Retrospective application for the change of use from use class C4 (small scale HMO) to Sui Generis 8 person 8 bed HMO), the retention of a single storey outbuilding for use in association and the change of use of an existing outbuilding for the use in connection with the HMO.

Reason for Inclusion:

Ward Member requested (Cllr Ian Manning), Bob Illingworth asked to attend for this item (Neither Member spoke to the application)

Key Considerations:

Referencing policy 52 in the local plan 2018, I believe this is not compliant with:

52a: this is the only such planning proposal in the neighbourhood, by which I include the entire estate accessed from Cheney Way (roads of Bourne, Fairbairn, Long Reach. It would clearly be not in keeping with “the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the area”

52b: this significantly reduces garden space

52d: “provision is made for adequate amenity space”; this significantly reduces amenity space to the rear of the property, and because the shared kitchen in the main property would be used by more people reduces that space and potentially the lounge area too.

Referencing Appendix L.24: this is effectively an 8 bedroom property so according to this should have 7 cycle parking spaces, as well as visitor cycle parking spaces. This property does not comply with either condition. In addition fig 2.7 in the applications own planning statement shows a cycle resting in the garden next to the brick built building, further implying that the proposed 4m2 cycle parking is inadequate.

Impact on neighbours would be increased from comings/goings in the evening, particularly as access to the garden buildings is via the main house.

Overall I would add I am not contesting the principle of HMO use, but am contesting the increase from 6 to 8 and the nature of that increase, and this is why I believe it should go to committee.

Discussion

The case officer Phoebe Carter presented the application. The application was considered a minor proposal that had not attracted wider public interest. No implications for policy arise from the proposal that would give rise to a call-in. The application is not complex nor of a scale to warrant Committee consideration. There was no relevant planning or appeal history to the proposal, nor any other significant concerns to merit Committee consideration. Consequently, in consultation with

the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision: Do not refer to Planning Committee

25/01440/FUL – 22 Grafton Street

Change of use of Grafton House to a large 7 bed 7 person HMO (houses in multiple occupancy) and 1no 1bed studio.

Reason for Inclusion:

Number of objections (Cllr Tim Bick, Cllr Anthony Martinelli)

Key Considerations

Cllr Bick outlined his reasons for calling in the proposal, including the extent and nature of public representations received to the proposal in this part of Kite and the nature of the use proposed, being a large-scale HMO.

Discussion

On behalf of the case officer, Laise Facada presented the application. The application was considered a minor but complex and tightly configured proposal that had attracted wider public interest, with the footprint occupying a significant proportion of the site. No particular implications for policy were highlighted as arising from the proposal that would give rise to a call-in. Neither did the site have any relevant planning or appeal history which was complex and which required particular attention.

However, in agreement with the terms of the call-in request and mindful of the confined and complex nature of the proposal, including its relationship to the studio apartment and careful consideration of residential amenity required, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision: Refer to Planning Committee

24/04582/FUL – Innisfree, 1B South Green Road Newnham

Demolition of existing building and erection of a replacement two storey dwelling with a basement and single storey rear wing (Self-Build) at 1B South Green Road.

Reason for Inclusion:

Ward member requested (Cllr Hugh Clough)

Key Considerations

1. Cllr Call-in: Contry to Policy 55: Responding to Context a. & c. Policy 56: Creating successful places c. & h. Policy 57: Designing new buildings a. Policy 58: Altering & extending existing buildings ... has e: overlooking, overshadow or visually dominate Policy 61: Conservation a. & c.
Contry to multiple SNNP policies.
Wants to also stress as part of "planning reasons" for call-in *the extent of local concern and*

the number of objections, especially from those who are most affected by the plans.

2. Multiple third-party comments, both in objection and support.

In attendance, Cllr Clough read out his reasons for call-in, including the changed policy context, Forum objection, contact by residents for and against, number of policies engaged, the size, scale and massing of the proposal, its siting and location within the conservation area. In consideration of all of this and having visited adjacent residential gardens, Cllr Clough asked for the application to be called in.

Discussion

The case officer Beth Clarke presented the application. The application was considered in the context of the South Newnham NP, the Local Plan, the positioning of the application within the Conservation Area and the siting of the proposal in relation to residential amenity. The case officer outlined that a significant number of neighbour representations had been received, both for and against the proposal and that an objection had been received from the SN Neighbourhood Forum.

With reference to the terms of the call-in request and mindful of the significant representations to the application and the prominence of the proposal onto the street, and careful consideration of residential amenity required, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision: Refer to Planning Committee

25/00411/FUL – The Varsity Hotel & Spa 24 Thompsons Lane Cambridge

Installation of a new all-weather, stepped in, retractable roof canopy with independently supported tensile roof fabric and associated works.

Reason for Inclusion:

Ward member requested (Cllr Mark Ashton)

Key Considerations

As previous applications have been heard at full planning committee and generated public support could I request that they are brought to full planning committee if the decisions are for refusal.

The reason being that if residents who have had the opportunity to speak at previous applications are not allowed now, they would wonder why this is the case regards these applications.

I do hope you can agree to this request and look forward to your response.

Cllr Ashton was not in attendance at the Panel meeting having given his apologies.

Discussion

Toby Williams presented the application on behalf of the case officer Charlotte Peet. The presentation outlined the planning and appeal history relative to the site together with the differences between the two applications and the heritage setting. There was discussion around the need for the application to come to Committee given that similar proposals had come before and that on this occasion the number of representations to the proposal was not widespread and that there was no local ward member call-in. However, with reference to the considerable planning history at the site and very recent appeal outcome, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of

the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision: Refer to Planning Committee

25/00516/FUL – The Varsity Hotel & Spa 24 Thompsons Lane Cambridge

Construction of a pergola with retractable canopy and associated works.

Reason for Inclusion:

Ward member requested (Cllr Mark Ashton)

Key Considerations

As previous applications have been heard at full planning committee and generated public support could I request that they are brought to full planning committee if the decisions are for refusal.

The reason being that if residents who have had the opportunity to speak at previous applications are not allowed now, they would wonder why this is the case regards these applications.

I do hope you can agree to this request and look forward to your response.

Cllr Ashton was not in attendance at the Panel meeting having given his apologies.

Discussion

Toby Williams presented the application on behalf of the case officer Charlotte Peet. The presentation outlined the planning and appeal history relative to the site together with the differences between the two applications and the heritage setting. There was discussion around the need for the application to come to Committee given that similar proposals had come before and that on this occasion the number of representations to the proposal was not widespread and that there was no local ward member call-in. However, with reference to the considerable planning history at the site and very recent appeal outcome, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered the proposal should be referred to the planning committee.

Decision: Refer to Planning Committee