

# CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

## MINUTES OF A DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

23 April 2003

1.40pm - 3pm

APPLICATION: **C/03/0143/FM - Cambridge Rugby Union Football Club, Granchester Road**

Present:

### **For Applicant**

Martin Howes, Lindy Livings and Howes

Jerry Otter, Cambridge Rugby Union Football Club

Gwyn Stubbings, Cambridge Rugby Union Football Club and Bidwells

### **For Petitioners**

Phil Jones, Resident

Boz Kempski, Resident

Penny Maddrell, Resident

Members of Planning Committee: Councillors Baker, Hipkin, Slatter

Ward Councillor : Councillor Reid

Officers: John Summers, Head of Development Control (Chair), Janine Barker, Planning Officer

### **Case by Applicant**

1. **Jerry Otter** spoke as the applicant and addressed :
  - a. the financial reasons behind the proposal which necessitated an increase in the capacity of the functions area for vice-president lunches during the 32 weeks of the rugby season from the current 150-200 guests to 250 and to increase the use to all year round. The additional events could include weddings.
  - b. subletting the fitness room to other sports facilities such as fitness, dance and theatre groups for which there was already planning permission
  - c. holding RFU sports clinics at the ground for members of the club to undergo necessary training
  - d. acknowledged the concerns of the petitioners about increased noise and car movements and said that the increase would be from the current 9000 movements per annum to 10,400 **which was still within the permitted level**. There was room for 550 cars off road; there would be no parking on the road.
  - e. The original plan was for an increase to the second floor level with disabled access, stairs and administrative offices but that a ground floor extension could be made instead if that were more acceptable to the petitioners.

## Case by Petitioners

Phil Jones, Boz Kempster and Penny Maddrell spoke on the petitioners' behalf for residents of Fulbrooke Road and Grantchester Road.

2. They supported the activities of the club which they used – playing Korf ball, volleyball, hiring the function room for birthday parties.
3. They had a good relationship with the club and they had supported the previous application for floodlights and the renewal of the existing facilities.
4. **Their major concerns were about frequent use at all times of the year, but especially in the summer.**
5. **The car parking along the access track to the clubhouse was only 20metres to the windows of the nearest houses. They were concerned about the noise from cars leaving after late summer evening wedding events.** The current hours allowed were 8am –11.30pm (12.30pm on Saturdays) and they thought these were not reasonable especially with increased use.
6. The entrance was at the narrow point of Grantchester Road and would lead to a lot of congestion on an already busy road.
7. The 2-storey building would be seen from the surrounding countryside unlike the present building which is mostly hidden by trees.

## Case Officer

8. The case officer confirmed that the premises application had been renewed in August 2002 to the hours the petitioners had described.
9. **The fitness room proposed in the approved scheme is restricted by condition to be used in conjunction with and ancillary to the Rugby Club and not by non-members of the Club.**
- 10.7 local residents had objected by letter, a petition with 45 signatures had been submitted requesting a Development Control Forum.
11. There were issues to be resolved concerning drainage and the risk of flooding; access to the site and its visibility.
12. The Environmental Health Officer had concerns about noise insulation and the hours.
13. The Highways Department had asked for clarification of the catchment area.
14. The application needed to comply with PPG 17 concerning the principle of development in Green Belts.

## Members Comments

15. The application could only be considered on planning grounds whatever the financial reasons behind it.
16. Was it a change of use?
17. The Case Officer said that there was a need to be absolutely clear what the intended use and scale of use were to be and whether these were over and above the use of the land for recreational purposes.
18. It was difficult to reconcile the small increase in car movements with the large increase in usage proposed.

19. what exactly were the sports conferences referred to?
20. the petitioners were suggesting that the access to the site and the car parking be moved to the south side – was that a possibility? To which outside bodies was it intended to hire out the facilities?
21. there was a need to assess the level of nuisance which could be addressed by planning regulations. There might need to be a ceiling on night time functions.
22. The Head of Development Control reiterated that clarity about the nature of the use of the facilities was essential.
23. The applicant responded to some of these concerns saying that re-siting the access and parking was prohibitively expensive; that the ground would be let as now to other sporting clubs; the club house would have an additional event about once every 3-4 weeks; that the main functions would be ones that supported the club such as sporting lunches and dinners; that the information about hiring the facilities posted on the website was primarily aimed at the local community.

### **Summing Up**

24. The Applicant stated that he was prepared to look at conditions on the use of the clubhouse which also allowed the club to be viable in the long term
25. The petitioners were still concerned about the proximity of the access and parking to their houses
26. they would welcome limits to uses at night
27. The Chair confirmed that these minutes would be incorporated in the report on the application to Planning Committee.