

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

18 June 2003

1.35pm - 2.30pm

APPLICATION: C/03/0446/FP - Cherry Hinton Court/150 Cherry Hinton Road

Present:

For Applicant

Geoffrey Scott, Architect

Giles Dudley on behalf of the Management Committee

Gail Kenney

For Petitioners

John Parry, Resident

Ana Cerdeno, Resident

Members of Planning Committee: Councillors Baker, Blencowe, Hipkin, Schofield and Slatter.

Officers: Peter Carter, Principal Planning Officer (Chair), Justin Bainton, Planning Officer.

Case by Applicant

1. Giles Dudley described:
 - a. the development which would provide single rooms with en-suite bathrooms for student accommodation under proctorial control by APU, so there would be no car parking allowed.
 - b. The application had been reduced in scale and height; no overlooking of neighbouring properties.
 - c. There was a Tree Preservation Order on the walnut tree in the grounds and it would not be disturbed by the development.
 - d. Current Cherry Hinton Court residents had no parking rights so there was no change to the current arrangements and there should be no additional noise from vehicular traffic.
 - e. There would be cycle parking provision.
 - f. Since the Development Control Forum had been convened, the applicant had gathered 55 signatories to a petition supporting the application including the caretaker of the adjacent Quaker Meeting House.

Case by Petitioners

John Parry and Ana Cerdeno (Local Residents) spoke on behalf of the petitioners including the caretaker of the adjacent Quaker Meeting House:

2. The fact that 4 houses had been omitted from the plan indicated that the applicant did not know the neighbourhood.
3. They would like more information about which university would be involved.
4. As students worked to a different timetable to those who go to work, it was reasonable to anticipate a significant increase in noise and disturbance during unsocial hours.
5. They had found it extremely difficult to contact the management committee.

6. They found it difficult to understand why a revised application for 6 dwellings and communal space was better than the original 4 dwellings.
7. In addition, the accommodation was now to be on 2 storeys rather than one, with the communal rooms in the second storey with velux windows which were likely to be open especially in the summer with the inevitable increase in noise.
8. Current residents had been willing to rent the garages now set for demolition, if they were improved from their derelict state but the applicant was only interested in housing development.
9. Some tenants had been allowed, under the terms of their leases, to use car parking spaces at the rear of the property. The new development would reduce the number of those and so there would be more parking on the street.
10. They had little confidence in the record of management at the site since the fire alarm had been out of action for weeks and would not be available until July.
11. They were concerned that the access might not be wide enough for the fire engine and that there would be a great deal of disturbance from new residents moving their waste bins to the roadside underneath Ms Cerdeno's leased flat.

Case Officer

6. The following consultations had been held:
 - Highways Authority: ensure that the students were to be subject to a scheme of proctorial control of no parking.
 - Environmental Health: comments awaited.
 - Fire Service: comments awaited.
7. The following representations had been received:
 - Letters: 5 of objection, a petition objecting to the development with 27 signatures.
8. The Arboricultural Officer had raised no objections subject to the walnut tree being protected through conditions.

Members Comments

9. What were the arrangements for refuse collection? Had communal bins been considered?
10. Did the application respect the constraints of the site?
11. Clarification whether the development was single storey or two storey.
12. Why had the communal areas been located on the first floor?
13. Was the development not effectively a hostel and as such was it to be subject to proctorial control?
14. Had an alternative to open velux windows been considered such as had been agreed at the St Barnabas Road 6th Form College property where the windows did not open and air conditioning had been established?
15. What were the arrangements for heating and for air extraction in the kitchen and bathroom areas?
16. The Case Officer described the development as one and a half storeys and not single storey with student rooms on the ground floor and a communal area and kitchen above.
17. The applicant clarified the following points:
 - There would be proctorial control provided by APU.

- As a roof would have been incorporated in any circumstances on design grounds, the one and a half storeys were a way to meet objections to 2 storeys and to protect Cherry Hinton Court residents from being overlooked particularly in their communal garden. The roof was only raised slightly to provide the limited accommodation in the roof space. A new garden was planned for the new development.
 - Locating the communal space in the second storey with velux windows was intended to be less obtrusive.
18. Both applicants and petitioners needed to know what was involved in the policy of proctorial control as it was very clear and specific.

Summing Up

19. The applicants made the following points by way of summary:
- a. The development would tidy up an eyesore.
 - b. It would not affect the character of the road as there was lots of shared student accommodation..
 - c. APU implemented strict proctorial control.
 - d. The building would not affect the skyline nor deprive any neighbours of light.
 - e. The development was in line with government policy concerning housing provision in Cambridge.
20. The petitioners said that the building was twice the size of the current buildings, there had been no clear answer about parking provision and they thought it could provide poor accommodation for students.
21. The Chair confirmed that these minutes would be incorporated in the report on the application to Planning Committee.