

**Planning Applications Committee: 13 August 2020  
Updates to reports**

---

**Application: 20/00630/MA**

**Address: 1 Leopold Close**

**Item no: 4(c)**

**Pages: 51-62**

**Additional letter of representation (second letter from contributor)**

Having had time to look at all previous documentation and to really consider the full ridge roof I object to this amendment. The building is too dominant and having a half hip roof would have gone some way to mitigate this. I can also see that changes have been made which go against the original agreement. From where we are it is a blot on the landscape. I urge the Planning Committee to take action against this and insist that reparation is made by the builder.

---

**Application: 19/01801/F**

**Address: Rear of St Faiths House, Mountergate**

**Item no: 4(f)**

**Pages:**

**Additional point raised by agent**

The applicant's agent highlights within their statement (to be read out by officers to committee members) that the buildings are structurally unsound and dangerous and that demolition is necessary to protect the safety of the public (including those who attempt to illegally occupy the building). Officers accept that this situation would make the case more compelling for demolition, but since we haven't received any evidence to support this claim, we are unable to attach any significant weight to it. Our recommendation remains for approval.

---

**Application: 20/00024/F**

**Address: 174 Newmarket Road**

**Item no: 4(g)**

**Pages: 107-116**

**Use of consulting room within the proposed extension**

The applicant via their agent has provided further detail regarding the future use of parts of the proposed extension. As noted within the report, the proposed extension includes a consulting room, waiting room and patient WC to be used by the applicants for visiting patients as they work as GPs. The applicants have confirmed

that they expect to have 'around two patients per day' attending their home surgery during normal working hours.

Working from home can be considered ancillary to the main use of the dwelling, the point at which there is a material change in use will vary on a case by case basis and will depend on a number of factors, such as if there are proposed to be any employees, if it is solely for the occupants, the floorspace taken up by the working from home use and if there are visiting members of the public and if so how many and the extent of impact on any working from home use. In this case officers are content that based on the information supplied the proposed use can be considered ancillary to the main use of the dwelling, this is on the basis that there is no indication that employees would operate from the property, given the overall scale of the dwelling the overall space taken up by a working from home function is minor, the applicants have indicated around two patients a day and given the size of the plot the impact of such visits would be relatively immaterial. A condition will make clear what the consent is permitting and an informative can be added to make clear the basis on which we have assessed the proposed use as being ancillary. Any intensification of the use may require further planning consent.

### **Additional Condition**

An additional condition is proposed to be added to ensure that trees on site are protected. The condition shall require compliance with the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) submitted with the application. This is in addition to the submission of a replacement tree planting condition.