



# Cambridge City Council

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM 10.00am 23 September 2009**

**The Guildhall, Cambridge**

**Contact:** Martin Whelan

Tel 01223 457012

## Agenda

### **10.00am – Travelodge 219 Bed Hotel – PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE:** Councillors Al Bander, Baker (Chair), Blair, Blencowe (Lab sp), Dixon (Vice Chair), Dryden, Hipkin, Reid and Stuart

Alternate: Zmura

#### **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 application 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**

#### **4 Application and Petition Details**

Committee: Planning  
Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009  
Application No: 09/0708/FUL  
Site Address: 180-190 Newmarket Road, Cambridge  
Description: Erection of 219 bed hotel and restaurant (following demolition of existing buildings), together with associated infrastructure.  
Applicant: Eastern Gate Properties Ltd  
Agent: Januarys  
Address: 7 Dukes Court, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge, CB5 8DZ  
Telephone: 01223 326812  
Lead Petitioners: Mr Harry Goode on behalf of Riverside Area Residents Association  
Address: 8 Godesdone Road, Cambridge CB5 8HR  
Telephone: 01223 560950  
Case Officer: Tony Collins  
Text of Petition: We, the undersigned, object to the proposals contained in the above planning application and request that the Planning Department make all necessary arrangements for holding a Development Control Forum in respect of this application for the following reasons:

- The application fails to address the issues of excessive height and bulk raised by residents and expert consultees on application 09/0297/FUL, specifically the adverse impact on the local streetscape and the nearby Conservation area.

- The extant planning consent for an office block does not justify a hotel of equivalent or greater height. The resulting capacity is excessive for this area.
- The Transport Assessment methodology is flawed and seriously underestimates:
  - (i) the true likely increase in traffic on congested local roads and junctions.
  - (ii) the true likely increase in demand for parking in nearby streets.

It thus also fails to address the impact on pedestrian and cyclist safety of increased traffic on local junctions – which area already accident clusters with little or no safe crossing provision – and of a 5-lane Newmarket Road.

- The application fails to make a significant contribution to the public realm.

## 11.45am – 369 Cherry Hinton Road – EAST AREA COMMITTEE

**EAST AREA COMMITTEE:** Councillors Benstead, Blencowe (Chair), Bradnack, Ellis-Miller, Hart, Herbert, Howell, Lynn, Walker, Wright, Shah, Smart

### 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 application 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

### 4 Application and Petition Details

Committee: East Area Committee  
 Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009  
 Application No: 09/0701/FUL  
 Site Address: 369 Cherry Hinton Road  
 Description: Extension of care home for the elderly and demolition of 2 houses.  
 Applicant: Mr John O'Kane  
 Agent: Mike Bunyan  
 Address: Progress Business Park, Whittle Parkway, Bath Road, Slough, Berkshire, SL1 6DQ  
 Telephone: N/A  
 Lead Petitioner: Linda Craft  
 Address: 34 Kelvin Close, Cambridge  
 Telephone: N/A  
 Case Officer: John Evans  
 Text of Petition: We, the undersigned, object to the proposals contained in the above planning application and request that the Planning Department make all necessary arrangements for holding a Development Control Forum in respect of this application.

**PLEASE SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT ATTACHED FOR REASONS**

10.08.09

To John Evans,  
Planning Officer,  
Cambridge City Council

Application reference 09/0701/FUL

We were very surprised to see the new plans for the Care Home on Kelvin Close as they are almost exactly the same as those that were rejected last year (the only change is to move the front door, rather unconvincingly one might add). We are opposed to the extension to the Care Home on Kelvin Close for exactly the same reasons as before and request that the plan be rejected. We welcome a Hearing to express and clarify our objections. Our opposition is based on the following reasons.

- (i) **DESIGN:** The design of the new building and the destruction of two existing residential buildings (on Kelvin Close) does NOT respect the character and context of the surrounding area, a residential cul-de-sac comprising 1930s semis. The extension would result in one quarter of one side of the Close no longer being family dwellings but a profit-making private business. Thus the entire integrity of the Close as a quiet family residential area would be destroyed (along with the two houses) at a time when the City has a shortage of such housing close to Addenbrooke's Hospital.
- (ii) **CAR PARKING:** The Care Home car park has often overflowed and the extra cars therefore park on Kelvin Close (logs and photos can be provided to substantiate this and will be provided at a Hearing). The placement of the proposed car park behind the putative extension (with only 3 extra parking places despite an almost 50% increase in the number of beds) is not easily accessible. The obvious deduction is that even more parking associated with the Care Home will be on the street. This will increase the traffic blockages on Kelvin Close (see (iii)). The same concern was expressed in the Hearings in 2008, yet the Care Home has not seen fit to change this in the "new" plan.
- (iii) **TRAFFIC FLOW:** As noted a year ago, the cul-de-sac can barely cope with the existing traffic flow of its residents. As it is, ambulances have had difficulty progressing on Kelvin Close in the past (photos taken since the last Hearing can be provided to substantiate this and will be provided at any Hearing). It should be noted that the one time that the Care Home parking lot is relatively under-used is while they are seeking planning permission or are about to submit a proposal, the one advantage to us of their frequent applications! As soon as planning permission is denied, street blockage increases. The inference must be that street blockage is primarily, though not exclusively, associated with the Care Home. If the Care Home increases by nearly 50%, we can expect that the additional traffic associated with their commercial enterprise will only increase the difficulties entering and exiting between Kelvin Close and Cherry Hinton Rd (the former being the true location of the Care Home).

- (iv) DELIVERIES: The only new feature of this plan (as opposed to that of a year ago) is the placement of the main door. Though an improvement on the existing position, a more careful examination of the proposed placement demonstrates that this presents its own problems. Space for deliveries conflicts with the proposed parking spaces set aside for disabled persons. In reality, we expect that vans will be forced to park on the street or block the entrance to the Care Home. Thus the plan is theoretical and as unrealistic as those in the past. We have been requesting and urgently need a very thorough analysis of the traffic flow in the cul-de-sac by the County Highway Division, something that we feel has yet to be adequately done. The superficial assessment by them in 1995 (and subsequently) is part of the reason we face increasing traffic problems in the street.
- (v) INTRUSIVENESS: As we explained a year ago, facing and adjacent buildings will suffer invasiveness and loss of privacy if the extension takes place.
- (vi) REFUSE COLLECTION: The placement of the refuse collection bins would be very close to the front door of no. 3 Kelvin Close and will cause considerable disturbance to the occupants of this house. This was pointed out last year, but again they have not seen fit to change this.
- (vii) CONSTRUCTION DIFFICULTIES: Though this might only be a temporary annoyance, there will be considerable noise, disturbance and road blockage while any building takes place. This would put the residents of Kelvin Close in potential jeopardy since such vehicles would inevitably be parked on the street blocking access and egress to the cul-de-sac by emergency vehicles as well as our own vehicles. This was certainly the experience in 1995.

For all these reasons, we, the undersigned, think that the plan is totally flawed for all the above reasons. They formed the platform for our objections last year and were upheld by the Planning Council. Nothing has significantly changed and we urge that planning proposal 09/0701/FUL be rejected in 2009 as it was in 2008. We also ask that we all be notified of all further deliberations on this extension and invited to attend to air our concerns and opposition.

## **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 will be as follows for each application:

- Introduction by Chair and declaration of Councillor interests – **up to 5 minutes**
- Presentation of the application by the applicant/agent (up to 3 representatives) principally to address the issues raised by petitioners – **up to 15 minutes**
- Presentation of the views of the petitioners against the application (up to 3 representatives) – **up to 15 minutes**
- Presentation of the views of the petitioners in support of the application (where applicable) (up to 3 representatives) – **up to 15 minutes**
- Presentation by the planning officer – **up to 10 minutes**
- Member questions and issues arising – **up to 30 minutes**
- Summing up by the petitioners against the application – **up to 5 minutes**
- Summing up by the petitioners in support of the application – **up to 5 minutes**
- Final comments of the Chair

### ***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.*