



Cambridge City Council

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM 10.00am 20 August 2008

Planning Committee: Councillors Al Bander, Baker (Chair), Blair, Blencowe, Dixon, Dryden, Hipkin, Holness, Reid Alt: Smart

Committee Room 1, The Guildhall

Contact: Toni Birkin Tel 01223 457086

Agenda

1 Apologies

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 Declarations Of Interest

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests that they may have in an item shown on this agenda. If any member of the Committee is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they should seek advice from the Head of Legal Services **before** the meeting.

3 Introduction by Chair to the Forum

Former Brunswick School, Newmarket Road

Application No: 08/0871/FUL

Site Address: Former Brunswick School, Newmarket Road

Description: Erection of 195 dwellings and 253 student rooms (to be provided in lieu of affordable housing), community cafe (up to 130 sq.m), new public square and associated works and following the demolition of all buildings and structures on site in order to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment.

Applicant: Berkeley Homes (South-East London) Ltd

Agent: Januarys Chartered Surveyors, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge
CB5 8DZ

Lead Petitioners: 1 - Mrs Judith Gay 2 - Lynette Gilbert

Address: 7 Evening Court 47 Riverside
Cambridge Cambridge CB5 8HN
CB5 8EA

Case Officer: Angela Briggs

Text of Petition 1: Judith Gay - See attached submission

Text of Petition 2: Lynette Gilbert - See attached submission

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).

Format of the Forum

The format of the Forum is as follows, the times shown are the maximum for each section:

Introduction by the Chair	5 minutes
Presentation by the applicant/agent*	40 minutes
Presentation by the 1st petitioners* against the application	20 minutes
Presentation by the 2nd petitioners* against the application	20 minutes
Presentation by the case officer	10 minutes
Member questions and issues arising	30 minutes
Summing up by the applicants/agents	10 minutes
Summing up by the 1st petitioners against the application	5 minutes
Summing up by the 2nd petitioners in support of the application	5 minutes
Final comments of the Chair.	

* Up to three representatives of each set of petitioners and up to three representatives of the applicants may present their case.

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.

Mrs Angela Briggs
Senior Planning Officer
Environment & Planning
Cambridge City Council
The Guildhall
Cambridge
CB2 3QJ

10 August 2008

Dear Mrs Briggs

**Re Planning Application: Brunswick Site – Ref: 08/0871/FUL
Request for a DCF**

I am responding, in Mrs Sally Rose's absence, to your email of 7 August, when you requested details of issues/reasons supporting the request for a DCF. I have collated and summarised below the responses of Petitioners. It would appear that the timing of this meeting is unfortunate, as, it being the peak holiday period, attendance is likely to be very low.

Whilst the Petitioners understand and accept the need for more housing in Cambridge and, in particular, the use of the Brunswick CRC site for residential purposes in accordance with the Local Plan, they have concerns and comments which are summarised below. Most, if not all these concerns have been communicated to Berkeley Homes (the "Developer").

1 General issues, objections and concerns:

1.1 The Planning Application submitted would provide 448 dwellings accommodating approximately between 625 and 800 people. This density is nearly 15 times greater than the minimum stipulated by National guidelines and the Local Plan, and is clearly an over development of the site. Furthermore, given that the site is sensitive due to its location within the designated Central Conservation Area, and its proximity to Midsummer Common, which is a designated City and Country Wildlife Site, such overdevelopment would be particularly inappropriate in this context.

1.2 The design, mass and height of the buildings – at least four storeys, with five stories on sections abutting Midsummer Common to the north, and a tower block of seven storeys – do not respect the character and context of the site and surrounding area. The resultant noise, overshadowing by day and light pollution by night, would also impact the surrounding area adversely.

2 Particular issues for residents who live adjacent to the site:

2.1 Evening Court is not an appropriate access to the site. It is a cul de sac which is accessed by the families and guests of the 9 dwellings, plus the employees of and visitors to the Cambridge Building Society headquarters, located there. Sited almost opposite Wellington Street (access to the Grafton Centre), its access to Newmarket Road is already hazardous. This is likely to worsen with increased service vehicles, pedestrians (i.e. all residents and all visitors to the developed site), and potentially 1168 new cycle movements per day, PLUS all new bicycle and pedestrian traffic accessing a new cycle/pedestrian through route to Midsummer Common.

In addition, were plans for a café to be approved, access by commercial vehicles plus other associated traffic would be increased, with resultant noise, pollution and disturbance for residents of Evening Court.

2.2 If a general cycle and pedestrian route through Evening Court is approved, this will further exacerbate the problems above, especially around pub and lap dancing club closing times.

2.3 Such increased traffic will make it extremely hazardous for residents and visitors in Evening Court when reversing out of their drives. No. 9 would have particular difficulty due to the 8ft wall on its perimeter, part of which would be demolished by the Developers to access the site through Evening Court. No 9 residents would not see any traffic exiting the site until they (No 9 residents) had actually reversed onto the road.

2.4 There will be a significant loss of privacy to houses in the terrace numbered 6 to 9, with No 9 suffering extreme loss, due to overlook by the proposed townhouses running immediately at right angles to that terrace. Although the Developer has, in part, responded to concerns, by changing some small windows in some houses, the large picture windows and balconies remain, making the adjustment token only and inadequate. In particular, the nearest new houses would have a direct view into the conservatory and kitchen/dining area of No 9 and would overlook all the houses and gardens in the terrace.

2.5 The proposed height and proximity of the houses and tower would result in overshadowing to Evening Court house numbers 6, 7, 8 and 9, with No 9 being most adversely affected. The Developer produced a plan showing the position of sunlight into these houses, and the garden and conservatory of No 9. However, they were only prepared on two days in a year and are not an accurate reflection of light and sunlight to house No 9. The gardens of numbers 6 to 9 only get early morning and mid to late afternoon sun in the summer, (the growing season and the times most likely to be enjoyed by residents) any loss of light or overshadowing would therefore be significant.

A wide range of suggestions by Petitioners have included the following (this list is not exhaustive):

- Alternative access routes to the site.
- Instead of a café, have a small meeting area which local community groups could hire for meetings, classes, seminars etc
- Vehicular traffic through Evening Court kept to a minimum, and no high-sided vehicles under any circumstances.
- Retention of the best of the existing buildings on the CRC site.
- A low-rise, traffic-free development with no private parking.
- The new development should be a flagship for green living.
- A Home Zone established in Evening Court to support rather than fracture the local community.
- No construction traffic through Evening Court.
- If there is to be some limited access through Evening Court, then the Developer should finance the protection of Visitor spaces in Evening Court by e.g. locked bollards.
- The Developer to contribute towards cleaning costs of nearby residents during any demolition/construction phases.
- Noisy construction activities, such as “piling” to be strictly limited to weekdays, and only allowed for a specified maximum number of hours per day, eg, the first 3 hours after 9.00am.
- Resite refuse/waste/recycling areas further from Evening Court.

Should you need further clarification, please contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely

Judith Gay (Mrs)
7 Evening Court, Cambridge, CB5 8EA
Tel: 01223 359514



John Blunt
Committee Manager
Cambridge City Council
The Guildhall
Market Square
Cambridge CB2 3QJ

Dear John

Riverside Area Residents wish to request a Development Control Forum to review the proposed Brunswick development, in particular the proposal to route 158 resident cars through the Riverside area into a basement car park. I attach supporting signatures from local residents.

This letter lists our main heads of objection. The brackets refer to the relevant policy in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. They are:

1. The unique nature and functions of the Riverside area have been insufficiently considered. The application is in conflict with these and with the Council's broader strategic aspirations for the area. (Policy 3/4, Policy 3/7)
2. It is not necessary to route traffic from a major road through these residential streets. The expected traffic volume is lower than that already using the existing Newmarket Road (west) entrance. The safety and congestion concerns regarding this entrance can be adequately addressed. (Policy 8/2)
3. The proposed route would unnecessarily increase traffic along a heavily congested stretch of the Newmarket Road (Policy 8/2)
4. The proposed route would generate unnecessary additional noise, emissions and fuel consumption, and adversely affect local environment. (Policy 3/1, Policy 4/11, Policy 4/13)
5. The proposed route would significantly increase congestion in narrow residential streets in a Conservation Area, which do not and cannot meet the design specifications of a Home Zone. (Policy 4/11, Policy 8/2)
6. The proposed route would unnecessarily increase congestion and safety problems at the River Lane/Newmarket Road junction. (Policy 8/2)

Riverside Area Residents Association

Chair: Lynette Gilbert, 47 Riverside, Cambridge CB5 8HN
Secretary: Cathy Curwood, 18 Saxon Road, Cambridge CB5 8HS
Treasurer: Tim Ensor, 21 Saxon Road, Cambridge CB5 8HS



7. The proposed route would increase hazard and inconvenience for cyclists and pedestrians using established cycling and walking routes (Policy 8/5):
 - (i) along Abbey and (especially) Beche roads (AM and PM)
 - (ii) under Elizabeth Way Bridge (AM and PM)
 - (iii) approaching from Midsummer Common
8. No information has been provided in the application to indicate how the applicant proposes to address the above traffic impact and safety risks (Policy 8/2).
9. Residential parking density is excessively high for a city site where lower car use can reasonably be expected, and exceeds that available to residents in the area (Policy 3/1, Policy 8/2, Policy 8/4, Appendix C).
10. The basement car park cannot be accessed when Walnut Tree Avenue is closed (eg for Strawberry Fair). It is also vulnerable to flooding. (Policy 4/16).

We will expand further on each of these points in our full response to the planning consultation.

I understand that the likely date for the Development Control Forum will be August 20th. Please let me know when that date is confirmed, or if an alternative date is selected.

Yours sincerely,

Lynette Gilbert
Chair, Riverside Area Residents Association.

Riverside Area Residents Association

Chair: Lynette Gilbert, 47 Riverside, Cambridge CB5 8HN
Secretary: Cathy Curwood, 18 Saxon Road, Cambridge CB5 8HS
Treasurer: Tim Ensor, 21 Saxon Road, Cambridge CB5 8HS