



## Cambridge City Council

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUMS

26 & 27 July 2006

#### Committee Room 1, The Guildhall

Contact: John Blunt Tel 01223 457012

**West Central Area Committee:** Cllrs Cantrill, Dixon, Hipkin, Holland, Kightley, Reid, C Rosenstiel, J Rosenstiel, J Smith.

**East Area Committee:** Cllrs Benstead, Blencowe, Bradnack, Bruce, Durrant, Ellis-Miller, Hart, Herbert, Lynn, Shah, Smart, Stafford,

**Planning Committee:** Cllrs Baker, Blencowe, Dixon, Dryden, Durrant, Hipkin, Hymans, Reid, Slatter, Stuart (*Alt*)

Applicants/Agents and Lead Petitioners

*Published & despatched: Friday 14 July 2006*

### Forum Timetable 26 July and 27 July

#### Wednesday 26 July

9.00am Prospect Wine and Deli, Prospect Row *West/Central Area Committee*

10.30am Cambridge City Football Club, Milton Road *Planning Committee*

1.30pm Cambridge University Press Site, Shaftesbury Rd *Planning Committee*

3.00pm Howard Mallet Centre, Sturton Street *Planning Committee*

#### Thursday 27 July

1.30pm Rear of 163/167 High Street, Cherry Hinton *East Area Committee*

3.00pm Cambridge Water Company, 41-45 Rustat Road *Planning Committee*

### Agenda 26 July 2006

**9.00am FORUM 1: Prospect Wines and Deli, Prospect Row** (Two Petitions)

**West/Central Area Committee**

**Application No:** 06/0568/FUL

**Site Address:** Prospect Wines and Deli, Prospect Row

**Description:** Change of use from shop to wine bar and first floor extension to create wine bar

**Applicant:** Suffolk Life Annuities Ltd

**Agent:** CHS Architects

**Address:** 21 Coles Lane, Oakington, Cambs CB4 5AF Tel: 236070

**Case Officer:** Mrs Rebecca Flood

**Lead Petitioner (1):** Craig Bickley, 7 Prospect Row Tel 368337

**Text of Petition (1):**

Conservation Area Or Not?

As I believe, the Kite area is a conservation area and the plans should improve or preserve the character of the area and in our belief an extension will not meet these requirements.

Undermining The Historic Culture Of The Area.

As mentioned above, the premises involved is the historic centre of the area. As we know

Cambridge is a city with extreme historical interest and by placing an extension on top of a piece of Cambridge's history we believe the building will be ruined and so will the area. Every part of Cambridge has piece of historical interest and this is ours.

#### An Oversubscribed Area

The area already has an adequate number of licensed premises that serve food, wine and beer. In fact three in the space of 20 yards, and we the public at times get angered with combined noise from the three pubs let alone another joining in. And with regards to the offering, the Free Press offer a range of food, wine and beer as do the Cricketers. And I believe the Elm Tree are soon to serve food along with their beer and wine. So is a wine bar, that I ask. Also surely the local school will have issues with the premises going from a community store to a wine bar as it is already surrounded by three pubs at present. And if you widen the band then more licensed premises come into play with the Clarendon Arms, Tram Depot and The Vine which offers fine wines and bistro style food.

#### Disruption To The Area

This area has already been under siege from various building works during the last few years, firstly the new courts at the end of Prospect Row producing lots of noise, dust and traffic problems. Secondly, extension works on houses further down Warkworth Street, then the women's refuge building being knocked down and developed as I write. And finally utter chaos with water works going on around us for over eight months. So I put it to you that the proposed plans will bring with it constant building noise, dust, traffic problems with the need for builders vans and skips to be placed close to the building. And with there being no footpath opposite it will mean pedestrians and wheelchair bound people will be forced into the middle of the road with the building already on a blind bend.

#### Need For Local Store For Elderly Residents

A lot of the local residents are elderly and seriously need a local store and not a fancy wine bar. It will then force them to trek to either Tesco's, Sainsbury's, Asda or Marks and Spencers, with the latter being much too expensive for the average pensioner.

**Lead Petitioner (2) :** Berry Groisman, 3 Eden Street , Cambridge CB1 1EL, Tel: 358863

#### **Text of Petition(2):**

1. In the plan displayed in the shop's window it is claimed that "We feel that this [i.e. the wine bar – BG] would very much appeal to the local community..." The level of noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of the local residents, especially those in the immediate vicinity of the wine bar, will increase even if the potential patrons live in the area.
2. In the plan displayed in the shop's window it is claimed that "We feel that this [i.e. the wine bar – BG] would very much appeal to the local community..." The level of noise, disturbance and loss of privacy of the local residents, especially those in the immediate vicinity of the wine bar, will increase even if the potential patrons live in the area.
3. Building of the second floor in the premises will change unique character of the corner, and many adjoined properties will be overshadowed.
4. The plan states that the food will not be cooked on the premises, but rather prepared in two other establishments. Frequent food deliveries in the evening hours might also cause disturbance to the local residents.

**10:30am FORUM 2:** Cambridge City Football Club, Milton Road (Three petitions: Cambridge Victoria Homes and Simon Baugh will share a 20 min slot and Rab Crangle of the Cambridge City Supporters Trust will have a further 20 mins.)

#### **Planning Committee**

**Application No:** 06/0438/FUL

**Site Address:** Cambridge City Football Club, Milton Road Cambridge CB4 1FA  
**Description:** Redevelopment on Cambridge City Football Ground to provide: 230 residential units, including 66 affordable units (the units will comprise 62 x 1-bed apartments, 136 x 2-bed apartments, 17 x 3-bed terraced houses and 15 x 4-bed terraced houses); landscaping; open space and equipped play areas  
**Applicant:** Ross River Ltd  
**Agent:** Savills (L&P), Unex House, 132-134 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 2OA  
**Address:** 5 Victoria Homes, Victoria Road, Cambridge CB4 3DX  
**Case Officer:** Mr Mark Parsons

**Lead Petitioner (1):** Cambridge Victoria Homes

**Text of Petition (1):**

- We do not feel that the density of the proposed new housing is ‘appropriate for the area’. We are concerned that 230 units plus adequate parking and recreational space would over-develop the site and compromise its surroundings. This results from the disproportionate ratio of apartments against houses.
- We do not feel that the design of the proposed new housing either ‘respects the character of the site...(or)...the surrounding area’. The proposed design is unlike any other residential development erected locally and it appears aesthetically displeasing.
- We are particularly concerned that five/six-storey blocks could be constructed: a height that would exceed that of the nearby Westbook Centre office complex. Residents have expressed grave concerns over the height of the proposed new buildings: they feel intimidated by the realisation that they might be overlooked to this extent and concerned that they will inevitably suffer a significant loss of privacy. They are also worried about the height of the three storey terraced town houses planned for erection immediately adjacent to our common boundary and the invasion of personal space caused by constructing housing in such close proximity.
- The residents have expressed concern about the substantial increase in the levels of noise undoubtedly emanating from a development containing 230 units of accommodation. Residents have expressed concern about the lack of garden and meaningful open spaces currently incorporated into the plans.
- We acknowledge that Cambridge Victoria Homes would not be directly affected by an increase in traffic but the Trustees and residents are aware that the area surrounding the proposed new development is unlikely to be able to adequately, or safely, support the levels of traffic movements which would occur were this development to built as proposed.

**Lead Petitioner (2):** Simon Baugh, 32 Greens Road, Cambridge CB4 3EF

**Text of Petition (2):**

- The scale of the proposed development is inappropriate for the area. There is no similar residential site of equivalent density, nor any buildings the same height as the largest proposed here. In particular, the five- and six-storey buildings in the centre of the site will have an immense negative impact on the existing homes overlooked by them. The change from the existing view will be startling, and can scarcely be considered to “respect the character of the site and the surrounding area”. In terms of building design, the resulting façade is ugly and completely out of harmony with the surroundings.
- There is a single means of access to the site, which must be shared with the Westbrook Centre, and which exits onto an already very busy part of Milton Road close to the junction with Chesterton Road. This will surely cause considerable traffic congestion during the peak hours, especially since there is already considerable incoming traffic at these times due to the presence of the Westbrook Centre. The situation would be made even worse if a residential development occurs at 1 Milton Road (for which we understand outline planning permission has already been granted). The conclusions of the Transport Assessment by Cameron Taylor – that there will be

no delay even during the peak period – are ill-founded. The Assessment argues that the current site accounts for over 900 two-way traffic movements per day, and that the new development will cause an additional 1000 movements, bringing the total to 1955 per day. The Assessment makes a number of basic errors, and in particular the figure of 900 is a gross overestimate, as we are prepared to demonstrate by actual traffic monitoring. It is clear to locals that the number of trips to/from the existing site during typical weekdays amounts to no more than 10% of this figure. Based on this more realistic picture, the developed site would cause an additional 1865 two-way movements per day. It is inconceivable that this would not cause problems.

- There are also major issues associated with car parking. The Assessment acknowledges that the number of planned parking spaces (241) is too little for the number of dwellings: even the County policy requires 258. Further, the Westbrook Centre will lose 216 spaces that it presently leases on the current site. Quite unrealistically, the Assessment assumes that since there are “limited opportunities for these users to find alternative parking in the confines of the Westbrook Centre or within the vicinity”, all these people will stop using their cars to come to work. What will in fact happen is that the developed site, and the frustrated drivers trying to get to work in the Westbrook Centre, will create additional car parking pressure on the surrounding streets or inappropriate areas in the development. And this outcome ignores the additional pressure that would arise from a high-density development at 1 Milton Road, for which the developers will no doubt use the same arguments to justify their under-provision of car parking spaces.
- The planned density represents over-development of the site. The influx of 400 or more new people into the area will put even more strain on local infrastructure and services. The schools, buses, GPs’ and dentists’ waiting rooms and shops are already full, and services will deteriorate further. The fact that Milton Road Primary School has an excellent reputation will encourage families with small children to move into the new housing, creating a demand for school places that cannot be met. We have absolutely no confidence that the monetary contribution required of the developers towards education, sewerage, water, public transport, health care, etc. will actually be used to make specific and concrete improvements in the area. Rather, the entire effect of the development will be to take things away from the community, contributing nothing concrete.
- The design is poor and ill-matched to Cambridge’s needs. We believe Cambridge needs more affordable family houses, not ever more flats, and this is especially true in a suburban area like West Chesterton. The redevelopment would be greatly improved by shifting the mix towards more houses. Moreover, the design itself is scarcely best-practice: a major development of this sort deserves more careful attention. The desire to maximise the number of units means large underground parking areas, implying a major environmental and social impact as the subsoil is excavated and transported off site. Moreover, it is unclear that the residents’ needs would be adequately met: flats have no private space such as balconies, there are inadequate areas for play or socialising, the whole site is within a few yards of one of the largest office complexes in Cambridge (and therefore empty outside office hours), and the overall impression is of an overcrowded and claustrophobic estate with a single route of escape.
- There would be a loss of recreational space to West Chesterton. We have already noted that the application does not appear to be consistent with policy on amenity and recreation areas. The Mitchams Corner Area Strategic Planning and Development Brief states that “the adopted Cambridge City Local Plan identifies the existing football clubhouse and ground as providing open space of recreational importance ... within an area where there is an identified lack of open space, an assessment supported by the results of consultation on this brief (particularly in terms of children's play space).” The proposed redevelopment makes very limited provision of recreational areas, especially spaces where children can play safely, and would shift the balance in the area by removing a major amenity from the community, without giving anything back.
- We have concerns about security. The site perimeter should be securely fenced (a

hedge would certainly be inadequate). It is vital that there is no pedestrian link between the site and Greens Road or other adjoining streets. The pathway alongside the fence adjoining Greens Road is also a potential problem. It is a dead-end without any through-flow of people, and therefore likely to become an area where children and youths gather. This may contravene guidelines on good estate design. It also compromises the security of adjoining houses in Greens Road. We understand that domestic waste bins will be stored beside this path and moved along it, which is likely to create noise and health issues. It would be better to have storage for these bins at the front of the houses, where they will be of most use to residents.

- We have concerns about the affordable housing, and in particular do not want these units to be concentrated in a single area of the site, which would be likely to cause problems, but to be distributed throughout the proposed development. We would also be anxious to ensure that the affordable housing be allocated to individual buyers (such as Key Workers) rather than housing associations – this latter would be likely to result in an increase in problem residents.
- We would require undertakings that any construction work will follow strict guidelines in order to minimize noise, dust, construction traffic, etc. There should, for example, be an explicit requirement that all piles should be bored rather than pile driven, to keep the noise levels acceptable.

**Lead Petitioner (3):** Rab Crangle, Cambridge City Supporters Trust, 40 Cobham Road, Wood Green, London, N22 6RP Tel: 07958 790877

**Text of Petition (3):**

1. This application contravenes many important aspects of both local and national planning policy and would put the existence of the football club at risk.
2. The application did not follow a process of consultation with the local community.

**BREAK**

**1:30pm FORUM 3: Cambridge University Press Site, Shaftesbury Rd  
Planning Committee**

**Application No:** 06/0584/REM

**Site Address:** Cambridge University Press Site  
Shaftesbury Road  
Cambridge

**Description:** Reserved matters proposal comprising 408 residential units (115 no.1bed and 293 no.2 bed units to include 122 no. affordable units), ancillary community building and associated infrastructure (pursuant to Outline Consent C/03/0611/OP)

**Applicant:** Crest Nicholson (eastern) Ltd and The Luminus Group

**Agent:** Januarys Chartered Surveyors, FAO Colin Brown/Justin Bainton, York House, Dukes House, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge CB5 8DZ  
Tel: 326826/326806

**Lead Petitioner:** Mr Michael Chisholm, 5 Clarendon Road, Cambridge CB2 2BH  
Tel366939

**Case Officer:** Mr Mark Parsons

**Text of Petition:**

- a) The proposals are an over development of the site at 148 dwellings per hectare.
- b) The scheme is not workable, both within itself and because it cannot be absorbed in the local context.
- c) The scheme does not preserve and enhance the immediately adjacent conservation area but is in fact detrimental.

**3.00pm FORUM 4 Howard Mallet Centre, Sturton Street  
Planning Committee**

**Application No:** 06/0567/FUL

**Site Address:** Howard Mallett Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge, CB1 2QF  
**Description:** Erection of a community innovation centre.  
**Applicant:** Citylife, Sturton Street, Cambridge CB1 2QF  
**Agent:** Carter Jonas, 6-8 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB2 1NH Tel: 368771  
**Lead Petitioner:** Glenys Malyon, 102 York Street, Cambridge CB1 2PY Tel: 570157  
**Case Officer:** Mr Tony Collins  
**Text of Petition:** Wish to see land reinstated as public open space.

## Agenda 27 July 2006

### 1.30pm **FORUM 5 Land rear of 163/167 High Street, Cherry Hinton** **East Area Committee**

**Application No:** 06/0534/FUL  
**Site Address:** Land Rear of 163-167 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge CB1 7BX  
**Description:** Erection of 4no. 2 bed flats  
**Applicant:** Optima  
**Agent::** Optima, 62 Park Road, Peterborough PE1 YA Tel: 01733 345278  
**Lead Petitioner:** M.A Nicholson  
**Address:** Burntwood House, 71 High Street, Teversham, Cambridge CB1 5AG  
Tel: 01223 292746  
**Case Officer:** Mr David Poole  
**Text of Petition:**

Objecting to:

1. The height of the proposed building.
2. The Closeness to the boundary fence of 162 Coleridge Road.
3. Noise coming from this type of development in summer with parties and music.
4. Unsafe access for fire engines.

### 3.00pm **FORUM 6 Cambridge Water Company, 41- 45 Rustat Road** **Planning Committee**

**Application No:** 06/0590/REM  
**Site Address:** Cambridge Water Company, 41-45 Rustat Road, Cambridge CB1 3QR  
**Description:** Reserved Matters for the erection of 153 dwellings pursuant to outline planning permission C/02/0582/OP  
**Applicant:** Charles Church Developments Ltd  
**Agent:** Marcus Lambert PPML Consulting Ltd., Kinetic Centre, Theobold Street Elstree, Herts WD6 4PJ Tel: 0208 3874074  
**Lead Petitioner:** Roger Crabtree, 18 Rustat Road, Cambridge CB1 3QT Tel: 522973  
**Case Officer:** Mr Tony Collins

Text of Petition:

1. There should be a greater element of family housing.
2. The height of the block does not respect its surrounds.
3. Density at around 130 dwellings per hectare is far, far higher than any other recent development in the area.
4. The additional traffic generated by so many dwellings will add markedly to traffic movements along Rustat Road.

## **Information for Petitioners' and Applicants' Representatives**

The aims of the Forum are to allow early discussion of the planning issues and to explore the scope for agreement and compromise between all sides.

Up to three representatives of the petitioners and up to three representatives of the applicants may attend and speak for a total period not exceeding 20 minutes.

The applicants' presentation is heard first and applicants are asked to start their presentation with a brief description of the application proposals.

For further information on the conduct of the Forum or the petition process, please see the Development Control Guidelines, a copy of this is available on the Council's website at <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/development-control/development-control-forum.en> or contact the Council's Committee Section (01223) 457012.

Please let the Committee Manager know if you would like a briefing on the procedures at the Forum, if you have any other queries, or if you require any special facilities (for example an overhead projector).

## ***Information for the Public***

*You are welcome to attend this meeting as an observer.*

*In the event of the fire alarm sounding (which is a continuous ringing sound), you should pick up your possessions and leave the building by the route you came in. Once clear of the building, you should assemble on the pavement opposite the main entrance to the Guildhall and await further instructions. If your escape route or the assembly area is unsafe, a member of Cambridge City Council staff will direct you to safe areas.*