



park/outdoor play facility and associated works (following demolition of existing building).

**Applicant:** St Faiths School  
**Agent:** Justin Bainton of January's 7 Dukes Court, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge  
**Lead Petitioner:** John T Green  
**Address:** 40 Newton Road, Cambridge  
**Case Officer:** Amy Lack  
**Text of Petition:** See attached letter from Mr J T Green, the Lead Petitioner

## **Football Field, rear of 17 Trumpington Road, Cambridge**

**South Area Committee:** Councillors Baker, Blackhurst, Dryden, McPherson, Newbold, Sanders, Slatter, Stuart, Taylor.

**Application No:** 08/0285/FUL  
**Site Address:** Football Field, r/o 17 Trumpington Road, Cambridge  
**Description:** Gravel access road with provision for 22 parking spaces  
**Applicant:** St Faiths School  
**Agent:** SMC Covell Matthews (Justin Bainton of January's will cover this application).  
**Lead Petitioner:** John T Green  
**Address:** 40 Newton Road, Cambridge  
**Case Officer:** Tony Collins  
**Text of Petition:** See attached letter from Mr J T Green, the Lead Petitioner

### **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.*

**Information supplied by Dr Green, on behalf of the Petitioners, in response to a request from the officers for the planning reasons for requesting a Forum.**

1. Before further development is allowed there needs to be a holistic Traffic Management Plan for both sites (0285 & 0337) because - the accompanying traffic assessment with 0337 takes account of traffic movements associated with only one small part of one of the sites' boundary neglecting the interaction and knock-on effects between the sites

- 0285 has no traffic assessment submitted with it
- there are safety issues were these applications approved (particularly at Latham/Trumpington Roads, 0285; at the bend of Newton Road in conjunction with Nuffield deliveries, 0337)

2. Before further development is allowed there needs to be a Parking (and associated drop-off / pick-up) Management Plan for both sites because

- the approach to parking on both sites is piecemeal (0285 & 0337)
- the proposals for parking alongside the boundaries of residential properties (0285 & 0337) is unacceptable in environmental and amenity terms
- cars parking in roads surrounding the two sites (including Newton Rd & Trumpington Rd bus lane) is dangerous (0337)

3. Before further development is allowed there should be an integrated masterplan for both of these sites (0285 and 0337) which, inter alia, includes a holistic sports provision strategy across both sites.

4. The impact on trees (particularly the lime trees in Newton Road, 0337)

Our objectives for the DCF are to influence the Planning Committee into deciding that:

- a) the siting of the Sportshall should be set back from its proposed position (0337)
- b) the massing and design of the proposals (0337) are inappropriate to the neighbourhood and deserve reconsideration
- c) a condition of approval (subject to the above) for both 0285 & 0337 is that, within one year, the School submits a holistic masterplan for the development of their sites, as well as holistic Traffic and Parking Management Plans for dealing with the traffic and parking problems resulting from their business, which plans would require approval by the appropriate bodies before the works could be undertaken.

We emphasise that we are not against the proposed developments but would wish them to be approved only with the above conditions attached.



## 40 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL, UK

Tel: home # 44 1223 353756; mobile & messages #44 705 0203 795; office #44 207 594 1512

Email: [j.green@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:j.green@imperial.ac.uk) Fax: # 44 1223 353756

Development Control, Environment & Planning  
Cambridge City Council  
The Guildhall, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

2 April 2008

Dear Sir

### St Faith's Planning application 08/0337/FUL

I have been asked by my membership to write in my capacity as Chair of Bentley & Newton Roads Residents Association (BENERA), which has around 100 member households, comprising over 80% of households eligible to be members in this area (which covers Newton Road, Bentley Road and their side roads). We object to the above application.

The attached letter (dated 2 March 2008), from myself to the Bursar of St Faith's, sets out our initial, pre-application reasons for objecting. I also enclose her reply (dated 5 March).

I have also been asked to make the following additional points following sight of the actual application submitted.

1. Whilst the neighbourhood was given a chance to look at the proposed plans at a meeting held by the applicant on 25 February it is clear that the meeting was not intended to be a pre-submission consultation meeting (as described in the Design & Access statement) since no amendments were made to the plans as a result of comments made at that meeting or as a result of my follow-up letter of 2 March (attached). We take serious issue with the misleading statements in §§2.30, 2.31 and 2.32 of the Design & Access statement which misrepresent the contents of my letter of 5 March, attempting to imply to the planning department that neighbours' concerns had certain priorities (not evidenced in my letter) and also claiming that neighbours' concerns have been addressed.

2. We are disappointed that the application fails to agree to our request that plans and elevations should include neighbouring properties (other than in aerial photos)

3. There is no attempt to address our concerns about overall traffic management on and around the site. Indeed it is noteworthy that the Traffic Assessment makes no reference whatsoever to the configuration of Trumpington Road and the overall traffic movements; the report acknowledges that the demands for parking at school finish times are greater than capacity but it fails to seek ways to address that. We believe this demonstrates that the Traffic Assessment is seriously flawed since it has not addressed the overall traffic management of the site and its associated activities.

4. It appears that no other ways have been considered in order to evaluate "impact on other parts of the school and our general organisation" (Bursar letter 5 March); this ignores two key points in our letter of 2 March which suggests:

- that the "development be seen in context and that if it is necessary to reorient the usage configurations of the field then that should be seen as part of an overall site strategy – to see development of one part of a site in isolation from the rest of the site, and more importantly in isolation from traffic problems, is not helpful";

- that "this development gives the School the opportunity to deal properly with managing the traffic problems caused by its business".<sup>1</sup>

5. We strongly urge that consideration be given to our suggestion (letter 2 March) for the siting of the preferred option to be set back from the road in order to allow an in-out drop-off. The School's statement (5 March) that "many official bodies with interest in a development such as this have influenced the siting" ignores the points made in our letter (2 March) in which we state, for example, "We note that you felt that Sport England would oppose a setting back of the

---

<sup>1</sup> We understand that in 2004, an LEA was held responsible for public nuisance in respect of cars obstructing the highway and for private nuisance for cars damaging verges as a result of parents collecting and dropping their children at a primary school; a court gave an injunction against the LEA to remove the nuisance and an order to pay for damage caused.

building from Newton Road. We believe that Sport England would not object to the siting of the building *per se*, provided that the appropriate provision of facilities is maintained through the current sporting provision being reconfigured, something which we are sure can be achieved within the overall site envelope.” The letter deposited with the application from Sport England confirms this; we are disappointed that the school has used Sport England’s letter tactically rather than seeing its requirements within the consideration of the site as a whole.

This again emphasises the need for a holistic view of the site to be taken, starting with an overall site strategy for development over the next decade or more.

6. We have noted above that there is no reference in the Traffic Assessment to other traffic flows on the site nor indeed to the traffic problems on Trumpington Road. We refer to our letter of 2 March and draw attention to the Bursar’s letter (in addressing the issue of an in-out off the Trumpington Road) which relays a conversation with just one County Council officer whose view was that such a scheme “would increase traffic held up behind parents wanting to turn onto the site.” This seems an ill-considered view. One has to ask why it is preferable to have permanent parking in the bus lane rather than traffic queuing to enter the site (if indeed that would be the case). Unfortunately the Bursar’s letter (5 March) ignores the evidence we presented from the Perse schools which have undertaken a thorough study of their traffic flows in order to achieve successful drop-off/pick-ups. In particular there is NO traffic back-up on Hills Road – that is because the Perse has developed efficient on-site schemes.

7. We are concerned about the impact that this development will have on the row of lime trees along the south side of Newton Road. We note that our suggestion (5 above) for the building to be set back from the road in order to allow an in-out drop-off would reduce, if not remove, the risk to the trees as well as addressing traffic and parking problems – and again we urge that consideration be given to it (together with the consequent reconfiguration of sports pitches, if necessary).

8. We believe that constructive dialogue is useful in these situations but are disappointed that the School has not responded to the following issues raised in our letter of 2 March:

- the design comments
- our suggestions that the site needs a holistic strategy (indeed the Bursar’s letter admits they haven’t one)
- the parking/bollard problems on the north side of Newton Road
- the safety implications of one or more entrances onto Newton Road, particularly near the corner, leading to no fewer than three major exits at or near the corner (the two from St Faith’s and the increasingly used entrance opposite for deliveries to Nuffield Hospital) – and that is ignoring the entrance to Applecourt flats
- whether or not they do have permission to use the current entrance from the hard surface play area as an entrance onto Newton Road
- that traffic management should be dealt with holistically

Finally we urge the planning authorities to take note of the above and of the dialogue detailed in the exchange of letters (2 and 5 March) between the Residents Association and the School.

We seek that this application be refused but emphasise that, as responsible neighbours, we would wish to enter into dialogue in order to help the school achieve its objectives - but only if it does so whilst managing the impact of its activities (and particularly the management of traffic) resulting from its business.

Yours faithfully

John T Green  
Chair, BENERA

Copies to:

Andy Blackhurst, 34 Foster Road, Cambridge CB2 9JR [andy.blackhurst@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:andy.blackhurst@cambridge.gov.uk)  
Phillippa Slatter, 82 Shelford Road, Cambridge CB2 9NF [pmslatter@ntlworld.com](mailto:pmslatter@ntlworld.com)  
Sheila Stuart, 1 Pemberton Terrace, Cambridge CB2 1JA [sheilastuart17@gmail.com](mailto:sheilastuart17@gmail.com)  
Anne Kent, 9 Latham Road, Cambridge, CB2 2EG [anne.kent@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:anne.kent@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

Mrs C A Smith  
Bursar  
St Faith's School  
Trumpington Road  
Cambridge CB2 8AG

2 March 2008

Dear Mrs Smith

### **Proposed sports hall/changing room development**

I write as Chair of Bentley & Newton Roads Residents Association (BENERA) which has around 100 member households, which comprises over 80% of households eligible to be members in this area (which covers Newton Road, Bentley Road and their side roads). Thank you for giving the neighbourhood a chance to look at your proposed plans at the meeting on 25 February. This letter has been seen by all our members who, without exception, support its content; never in my memory has an issue created such unanimity of feeling and such a high level of concern amongst residents.

The plans which you displayed at the meeting showed the site as an island with no context (i.e. it did not include neighbouring properties). Since all the options impact on neighbouring properties we would urge your application (in the detailed drawings as well as in the site plan) to contextualise all plans and elevations.

We note that your preferred option is to develop on the south side of Newton Road; it is this option which you intend to submit for permission and it is this option to which most of our comments refer, although many of our comments are generic to a development anywhere on the site. Your other options were in the middle of the site and alongside the rear of gardens of Rayleigh Close.

We note that the School is not promoting the option which would position the building towards the south end of the site; but this siting, if it became an option, would be opposed by residents because of its severe impact on properties in Rayleigh Close. Residents believe that siting the building in the middle of the grounds has shortcomings too; that site would destroy the open aspect of the school grounds and greatly diminish the sense of open space which is one of the characteristics of the neighbourhood. However, were you to choose to revert from your preferred option to the option of building in the middle of the site, this would allow the current hard-surface play area along Newton Road to be extended as a parking area to include the cleared site of the current gym & changing rooms. It would allow the entrance to such parking to be moved further west into the middle of the plot thereby alleviating some of the problems we outline below. You mentioned at the meeting that there are problems for this siting option because of a change in ground levels – we obviously are unaware of these but such issues are usually surmountable (and we can illustrate where significant level changes are catered for in similar building projects e.g. at the current Perse Prep development).

We now comment specifically on your preferred option. We note that the current hard surface play area which is used for parking at start and end of each school day will, both during and after construction work, be diminished in area. We also note that it is your intention to ameliorate this decrease in parking space by seeking permanent permission to add parking spaces along the eastern edge of the field (along the rear of properties no. 13 & 15 Newton Road); we were unclear as to whether you were seeking temporary (during building only) permission for additional parking on the field too. We are unclear as to whether, after completion of the building, there will be fewer or more parking spaces than currently available at start/end of school days in the hard play area together with those on the field. Clarification of these points would be helpful.

We are concerned that the entrance currently used in and out of the hard surface play area is dangerous with poor sight line visibility; we believe that it should not be relied upon as a permanent entrance – indeed it is not clear in planning terms whether the School has permission to use it as such (either currently or in the future). Our recollection is that it was brought into use after objections from neighbours to the impact of illegal parking. However, we understand that the intention is (albeit temporarily during building works) to open up a second entrance (to the field parking) nearer to the corner of Newton Road, whilst continuing to use the current entrance as a site entrance for

construction vehicles. We have serious reservations about the safety of this – as we have mentioned, the sight lines are currently poor (and impeded by parked cars surrounding the entrance); to compound that through having a second entrance with even closer proximity to the corner would, in our view, be dangerous. We have witnessed a number of accidents resulting from cars exiting from the current entrance. The Nuffield Hospital receives deliveries, and waste disposal, by lorries which use their entrance on the north side of the corner. We believe that the proposals are dangerous.

We are opposed to the permanent (but not temporary) parking of vehicles along the boundaries of 13 & 15 Newton Road since it will increase disturbance to those properties and adversely affect their property values. In particular, given the orientation of no. 13 on its plot, cars would be coming and going (and parking) within a few feet of the inhabited house making noise and pollution a significant problem.

We do not oppose the planned development and we wish to be seen as neighbours wanting to support the aims of the school, including any public benefit which may result from improved facilities and the need to achieve such public benefit. However, we believe that the design of the new block (which necessarily is very bulky) could be improved using architectural detail – for example by having brick below and cladding at upper storeys with innovative ways to lighten the visual impact which we believe is currently out of character with the area and the remaining buildings.

A recurrent theme over many years in the neighbourhood has been the poor traffic management of vehicles at start and end of school days. Indeed this was a recurrent theme at the meeting. We were never content with the concession to parking in the Park & Ride lane on Trumpington Road (and we can evidence some near fatal accidents caused by that, due to poor lines of sight around parked cars, particularly at the southern end of that strip, near Bentley Road). We have continued to express our concerns over the parking on the north side of Newton Road which is only controlled through the use of traffic cones, which are generally effective but unsightly both when properly set up and even more so when spread around at the end of the day by car impact, casual vandalism or the wind. We cannot accept this as a permanent solution and would seek that, as a condition of any planning permission, a Section 106 requires the School to erect small, permanent, low, wooden bollards along the northern side verge to replace the cones.

We believe that this development gives the School the opportunity to deal properly with managing the traffic problems caused by its business. We believe there are several possible solutions which we would urge the School to consider (and which we shall urge the planners to accept as a condition of the development). For example, the new building in your preferred siting could be set back from the road producing a continuous forecourt on the Newton Rd frontage (i.e. a lay-by as a stop-and-drop facility, not just a bigger enclosed car park with potentially hazardous 'in' and 'out' gates). We noted at the meeting that, when asked as to why (for aesthetic reasons) the building couldn't be set back from the road, you stated that it would not be possible to do so because it would interfere with the running track – with respect, we urge that development be seen in context and that if it is necessary to reorient the usage configurations of the field then that should be seen as part of an overall site strategy – to see development of one part of a site in isolation from the rest of the site, and more importantly in isolation from traffic problems, is not helpful. We note that you felt that Sport England would oppose a setting back of the building from Newton Road. We believe that Sport England would not object to the siting of the building *per se*, provided that the appropriate provision of facilities is maintained through the current sporting provision being reconfigured, something which we are sure can be achieved within the overall site envelope. You also mentioned that the existing trees would inhibit an in-out solution here: again this would easily be achievable by routing cars in and out through the tree gaps (as happens now) with the trees remaining an island (and with a new layby paved with open concrete blocking such that rainwater would drain through to the tree routes, as is achieved in many situations).

We also ask you to re-consider the feasibility of an in-out system off the Trumpington Road (using the gardens of the houses); this has been resisted by the School in the past. We noted at the meeting that you stated that permission for such a system had been sought from the planning authority but turned down; has there in fact been a planning application to test this possibility or was this view an impression gained from informal discussions? We would like clarification on this please.

It is difficult for residents to understand how the current chaotic and dangerous (yes chaotic and dangerous) situation whereby cars are parked in the bus lane at the end of school days is somehow preferable to a defined in-out system with no parking in the bus lane. We reiterate that the current arrangements are dangerous; there have been several near misses and several serious accidents along this frontage and at the Bentley Road exit (due to sight lines being blocked by cars parked in the bus lane). The dangers will be multiplied when the Meadowcroft flats are occupied since the exit to that property will be extremely hazardous, requiring those exiting Meadowcroft to exit through parked cars in the bus lane with severely reduced sight lines. We note that you stated that you had funds in reserve for parking in the

Trumpington Road garden areas. We shall urge the Councils to revisit this and consider whether an in-out solution would be safer.

We are aware that similar drop-off, drive-through systems work well at the nearby Perse Prep and at the Perse Pelican (both of which are more constrained sites). We are also aware of the extremely neat solution which the Perse produced for its recent planning application for its Hills Road site, responding to careful studies of traffic flows and dwell times. We urge you to take this opportunity to address these issues in a similarly analytical and constructive way.

We would be grateful if you could advise us of the date on which you will put in your planning application.

Let me emphasise that BENERA does not oppose the planned development and we wish to be seen as good, responsible neighbours wanting to support the aims of the school including any public benefit which may result from improved facilities.

Yours sincerely

John T Green  
Chair, BENERA

*Copied to Councillors:*

*Andy Blackhurst, 34 Foster Road, Cambridge CB2 9JR  
Phillippa Slatter, 82 Shelford Road, Cambridge CB2 9NF  
Sheila Stuart, 1 Pemberton Terrace, Cambridge CB2 1JA  
Anne Kent, 9 Latham Road, Cambridge, CB2 2EG*





St Faith's  
Cambridge CB2 8AG

Tel: 01223 352073

Email: [info@stfaiths.co.uk](mailto:info@stfaiths.co.uk)

Web: [www.stfaiths.co.uk](http://www.stfaiths.co.uk)

5 March 2008

Dr J T Green  
40 Newton Road  
Cambridge  
CB2 8AL

Dear Dr Green,

**Re: St Faith's Proposed Sports Hall**

Thank you for your letter dated 2 March 2008. It was good to be able to speak to a group of our neighbours and to answer their questions. We also met with Mr and Mrs Whitehead, Prof Stronge and Mr and Mrs Wilcockson at different times to the group. Mr and Mrs Firth are trying to organise a time when they are able to come to school too.

Part of the planning submission is a "Design and Access Statement" which has much more detail about the proposal than we were able to convey at the meetings. In it there are aerial photographs of the three different options for the position of the proposed sports hall and they show the relationship of these options with the neighbouring properties. We note your comments on the different options and confirm that option 1, over the footprint of the existing gymnasium and changing rooms, is our submission. If the other positions were favoured by the planners then we would need to reconsider because of the impact on other parts of the school and our general organisation.

We are submitting proposals to provide parent drop off and pick up parking [24 spaces] for the duration of the building work because we believed that is what our neighbours would want us to do. Similarly, the proposal for a permanent area which extends into the field behind No 13 Newton Road and which would be used for outdoor play and for parent drop off and pick up [24 spaces] has been included for the same reason. If the neighbours would prefer us to restore only the existing hard standing area or possibly square it off to the width of the proposed sports hall [16 spaces] then we would be happy to consider this request. The current hard standing has approximately 24 spaces.

There are many official bodies with interest in a development such as this and we have tried to accommodate as many of their initial comments on the proposal as we could which is why the option 1 position is exactly where it is. We are continuing to gather more information through various surveys – environmental because of the flood plain, ecological, archaeological, traffic and sustainability and these will form part of any discussions with the planners before the hearing date.

---

When the discussions were taking place about the bus lane on Trumpington Road we asked the Traffic Management Officer, I believe it was Mr Graham Lowe, about the feasibility of an in-and-out access from Trumpington Road onto the site. We were informed that a planning application would not be supported because, in the view of Mr Lowe, this would increase the traffic held up behind parents waiting to turn onto the site. We did not submit a formal application.

I have been informed by our consultants that the application will be submitted on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> March.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

**Carol Smith (Mrs),  
Bursar**