

## CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

### NOTES OF A DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

22 February 2006

10.00am – 11.35am

**Application No:** 05/1335/FUL  
**Site Address:** 3 Sylvester Road  
**Description:** Erection of 48 Bed student residence and modifications to existing house.  
**Applicant::** Robinson College  
**Agent:** Julia Barker, IID Architects  
**Lead Petitioner:** Dr C V Jeans  
**Case Officer:** Tony Collins

#### Present:

##### For Applicant

Julia Barker (IID Architects)  
Jenny Page (Carter Jonas Planning)  
Alan Brown (IID Architects)

##### For Petitioners

Mr M Lunt  
Dr C V Jeans  
Mr S Forrester  
West Cambridge  
Preservation Society

#### Members of the Planning Committee

Councillors Baker, Blencowe, Dixon, Dryden and Hymans  
(Apologies were received from Councillors Reid, Slatter, R Smith, and Stuart *(Alt)*)

**Also Present:** Cllr Cantrill (as ward member)

#### Officers

John Summers (Head of Development Services) Chair, Tony Collins (Case Officer) and John Blunt (Committee Manager).

#### Text of Petition

The petition is in the following terms:

We, the undersigned, object to the development proposed for the Sellenger site, planning application 05/1335/FUL. We consider that:

- The density of development would be too high
- The proposed buildings are undistinguished and of a design inappropriate for the neighbourhood
- The development would not preserve or enhance the conservation area
- The development would cause harm to the amenity of the conservation area

#### Chair's Remarks

The Chair said that because it had been difficult to arrange a mutually acceptable date for the meeting, the officers' report on the application had been published before this meeting to meet national targets for determining planning applications. The report on

the application was to be considered by the Planning Committee on 1 March and copies had been made available to petitioners and applicants.

### **Case by Applicant's Representatives**

The applicants' case was accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation the text of which is attached as an appendix to these notes.

Following a Development Control Forum on the applicant's previous application on this site, and subsequent refusal of the application, the scale of the accommodation had been reduced and had sought to address the issues which had been given as grounds for refusal. Consultation letters had been sent to 75 residents and the current plans had been put on display for 2 days at Robinson College. Further to this and the receipt of four letters commenting on the application, changes had been made to the application to accommodate residents' comments.

### **Case by Petitioners**

The Petitioner's case was accompanied by a display on design boards and an overhead presentation.

A copy of the abridged text accompanying the presentation is attached as an appendix to these notes.

The proposal would be a gross over-development of the site.

The design of the proposed buildings and the overall scheme was not up to the standard appropriate for the area.

The applicant was seeking to introduce too much development in a limited area.

### **The Case Officer's comments:**

The Case Officer said that the application followed the refusal of an earlier application for the same site and reported on the number of representations received and the grounds for objection to the proposal.

Responses from statutory authorities and other consultees had not given rise to cause for concerns likely to cause opposition to the grant of permission. The following points were noted:

The Highways Agency and the applicant were in discussion over visibility splays and prevailing traffic speeds.

The Environment Agency requested submission of a flood risk assessment.

### **Members' questions and comments**

Was the difference between the previous application and the current one sufficient to recommend its approval?

*Case Officer: The report contained the recommendation and the reasons for it were complex and should be read to give a full picture.*

The petitioners had drawn attention to what they saw as poor design and use of materials, did the applicant's representatives have any response?

*The applicant's representatives: These matters were often subjective and in this case the representatives felt that materials used were appropriate to the area and not of insufficient quality for the buildings*

The same difference of opinion applied to the concern over the design issues raised by the petitioners.

Objectors had drawn attention to the visual impact of the proposed buildings, was there a specified distance within guidelines beyond which the impact was likely to be significantly lessened.

*Case Officer: Reference was made in the Draft Deposit Local Plan to impact in this area.*

What proportion of the site was occupied by the footprint of the building, given petitioners' comments on the lack of amenity space remaining?

*Petitioner: Approximately 40% of the site was occupied by building and hard surface.*

Would this provide sufficient garden space for the occupants?

*Petitioner: It was insufficient given the density of accommodation on the site, if it was to be regarded as the home of the students. 40% density was high in comparison to college provided accommodation.*

The issue of refuse and recycling collection from the site could be resolved if this could be done from the front of the site rather than using the road which the petitioners viewed as too narrow.

*The applicant's representatives: Vehicular access was possible on the site and it was an issue for the college to manage, following further consultation.*

The character of the conservation area and its treatment as a whole or within subdivisions had come under discussion; did the case officer have a view?

*Case Officer: The report referred to the previous application and its consideration for subdivisions of the conservation area. There was precedent for both forms of approaches.*

### **Applicant's Agent Summing Up**

There was evidently a difference of opinion on a number of issues. The current report detailed the reasons for refusal of the previous application and the efforts made to address the issues covered.

The arguments of objectors to that application had been taken into account and the recommendation in the report should be considered by members.

### **Petitioners' Summing Up**

The Case officer's comments that the new application overcame the objections to the previous application were noted.

There were still concerns about the application, which had the same problems as its predecessor, in that constituted overdevelopment in a sensitive location, was of poor design and should be rejected by members on similar grounds.

## **Applicant's Agents' Presentation**

### **JENNY'S INTRODUCTION**

Thank you Chair. My name is Jenny Page of Carter Jonas, Planning Consultants. Together with Julia Baker of IID Architects I will explain the planning context and design principles of the revised proposals for a new 48 bed graduate residence on the site of 3 Sylvester Road for Robinson College.

David Kerr, the Senior Bursar of Robinson College, and Alan Brown a Senior Partner of IID Architects, are also here to answer any questions which may arise.

In May 2005 the Planning Committee considered a previous application for this site. The application was refused. The potential for development of the site for new graduate accommodation of a lesser scale, however, was not ruled out.

Having given careful consideration to Members' concerns about overdevelopment and residents' concerns about density, the College has now significantly reduced the scale of accommodation proposed and has also sought to address the other reasons for refusal of the previous application.

In developing these revised proposals the College has sought to consult with the residents of West Cambridge. 75 letters were sent to local residents of the College's intention to submit a revised scheme in early November 2005. Preliminary proposals were placed on public display at the College for 2 days in late November and we were in attendance to discuss the proposals and listen to comments. Four letters were subsequently received. Nine changes were then made to the scheme to accommodate comments passed to us and the revised application was submitted to the Planning Authority in December.

Before Julia explains the design principles of the revised scheme, I wish to first outline something of the planning context for these proposals.

There is a shortage of student accommodation in Cambridge and in particular for graduates. Much of the future growth in student numbers is likely to be graduates. The principle of developing this site for graduate accommodation is in accordance with adopted Local Plan policy. The local Plan at policy HE8 and in supporting paragraphs strongly supports the use of suitable sites within the City for student accommodation and not just those which have been specifically identified in the Plan. The Plan also suggests, because of the limited land supply and the sensitive environment of the City, that sites in West Cambridge should be used efficiently. This site is located immediately opposite the main College site and is, therefore, close to its grounds and associated facilities. We believe that the proposal makes efficient use of this available land.

The College's current shortage of suitable graduate accommodation close to the main college site is outlined in some detail in the supporting statement which accompanies the application.

We believe, therefore, that the principle of and need for development on this site is established.

I will now hand over to Julia. I will then conclude this presentation by considering in more detail the manner in which the reasons for refusal have been addressed and compliance with planning policy.

### **JULIA'S PRESENTATION**

Thank you Jenny. I will now explain the design principles of the revised scheme.

The significant reduction in the scale of proposed development from 66 new study bedrooms to 48 (a reduction of over 25%) has, we believe, allowed us address the key concerns which were raised regarding the previous application. In considering the reasons cited for refusal, the following revised development objectives established with the College have formed the basis for the re-design of the scheme.

- An overriding objective is to ensure that the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. We have sought to do this by reflecting the development grain and scale of the surrounding area, by using high quality materials and by enhancing the existing landscape with new trees and shrub planting; considering the treatment of the whole site and not just of the new buildings. Within this overarching objective there are a number of more detailed design criteria.
  - To respect the immediate context and to achieve an appropriate size and scale of new build accommodation.
  - To increase the design articulation of the new buildings, and in the detailing to emphasise a high quality domestic character.
  - To respect the setting of the existing house, Sellenger, by retaining its relationship with the garden fronting Sylvester Road.
  - To carry out only minimal alterations to Sellenger, albeit that this was an issue raised by residents and was not actually cited as a reason for the refusal of the previous scheme.
  - To respect the views from Sylvester Road and to ensure that the mature trees at the rear of the site remain dominant and visible.
  - To ensure that the development does not have an adverse impact on these mature trees.
  - Our objectives were not only to protect but also to enhance the quality and diversity of the landscape and provide a sustainable long-term enhancing effect on the area.
- We also needed to minimise the visual and environmental impact on the amenity of neighbours, particularly those adjoining the northern boundary

Before exploring how the proposals preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area we would like to consider briefly what is the character of this area of West Cambridge.

Although views on this may vary, in the absence of specific planning guidance we suggest the following summary:

- Large detached properties on generous plots, set within mature landscaping.
- 
- Plots of varying sizes with varying densities of building and hardstanding.
- Significant numbers of mature trees which contrast with the reds and beige/grey tones of the existing buildings.
- Buildings that are both residential and institutional.
- 
- The residential buildings are a mix of single family dwelling houses, and flats and student accommodation.
-

- Vehicle access is generally to the edges of each plot close to the boundary and not located centrally within the plot.
- Buildings are generally set back from the street boundary.
- With the exception of Needham Research Institute, the 7 buildings along Sylvester Road all present a gable end façade to the street including the side elevations of no.s 6 and 7a Adams Road.
- 
- Some houses being set behind other houses, for example 15, 16 and 18 Adams Road (at the top of the image) do not present to the road at all.
- 
- Buildings of varying ages. Dating from the turn of the century to the present day and of varying individual styles, both traditional and contemporary. Indeed variety rather than consistency of style appears to be a specific characteristic of this Conservation Area.
- There is a mix of traditional and modern materials used within the area, however, most of the buildings display architectural elements and components of domestic scale and proportion.
- 
- A significant number of three storey properties with the third storey often located within a steeply pitched roof.

To meet the design objectives, which I listed a few moments ago, the revised development concept is of two houses, with space between and arranged around a central landscaped courtyard with vehicle and cycle parking related to each house.

This approach retains the long views through the site to the trees beyond.

The two new houses are similar to each other but considerate to Sellenger in terms of scale and design. Together they define three sides of what will be a pleasant domestic scale landscaped courtyard.

Each new building has a footprint of 327m<sup>2</sup> which is comparable in size, scale and proportion to the larger properties on Adams Road and Sylvester Road.

In order to preserve the existing and relatively high boundary hedge on Sylvester Road, considered an important feature, the entrance into the site for vehicles and pedestrians uses the existing access road.

The revised proposals comprise 48 new graduate rooms with en-suite facilities in two 3 storey houses – 24 bedrooms in each house.

The accommodation is arranged in groups of 8 students per floor sharing communal living, dining and kitchen facilities.

The entrance to each house is in the centre of each building facing directly onto the courtyard.

Each house will have a lift to ensure that all areas are fully accessible to wheelchair users.

The external spaces in-between the buildings are designed to provide maximum amenity with variety of character moving from the more formal centre to the informal and natural perimeter.

When compared to the previous scheme the revised proposals:

- Reduce the total number of new graduate bedrooms by 27%.
- Provide 2 separate houses with space between and not a continuous linked building.
- Reduce the overall building footprint by 30%.
- Provide 500m<sup>2</sup> more green amenity space.
- Retain 60% of the site area as external amenity space.
- As before, the proposals will provide fully accessible and inclusive accommodation which has again been positively supported by the City's Access Officer.

•

In this way, we believe that we have addressed concerns about overdevelopment and density.

The form of each house has been conceived as two 'pavilions', linked together with lower, more transparent structures containing the communal facilities and central circulation.

To ensure an appropriate relationship to Sellenger, attention has been paid to the roof profile and ridge and eaves levels of the new buildings. The lower roofs over the communal facilities and central lobbies will sit lower than the ridge to Sellenger - House 1 by 1.7m and House 2 by 1.2m.

Only the apex of each upper pyramid roof will sit just above Sellenger's ridge line; House 1 by 0.8m and House 2 by 1.3m. The chimneys of Sellenger will, therefore, remain the tallest features on the site.

Defining the bedroom groups with distinguishing pyramid roofs will create a scale and character of development which we believe is appropriate to the existing setting.

In the design of the individual houses, we have sought to create a lightness and a contemporary quality. The greater solidity of the bedroom sections, is complemented by the more transparent treatment to the communal areas and central lobby. The articulation of the corner windows against the larger, sliding windows to the study bedrooms will provide good daylighting and a variety of outlook.

We have also sought to achieve a design with domestic scale, character and proportion to architectural elements whilst maintaining a respectful relationship with Sellenger. The detailing of the houses will emphasise high quality craftsmanship through the use of traditional and carefully selected materials characteristic of the area including; high quality brickwork with recessed joints, painted rendered storey, high performance sliding timber framed windows and doors, red plain clay roof tiles, stained timber fascias and soffits, and pre-patinated zinc rainwater goods. These materials will mellow and mature

with age and will provide an important reference to the materials of Sellenger and the area as a whole.

The relationship with Sellenger and the appearance from Sylvester Road are recognised as being extremely important.

The gable end of House no 1 has therefore been set back 28.5 metres from the back of pavement and has been aligned with the rear façade of Sellenger.

The space around Sellenger has been preserved maintaining its open relationship to the cultivated lawn area at the front.

House 2 is 75 metres from the back of pavement and is nearly 50 metres from the rear façade of Sellenger.

Although not cited as a reason for refusal of the previous scheme, changes to Sellenger have been kept to a minimum and are now confined to the simple enclosure of the existing loggia to allow the ground floor rooms to be connected.

As already mentioned, trees form an important element of the local character. The mature boundary trees on this site and important native/feature trees will, therefore, be protected.

Although this was not cited as a reason for refusal of the previous scheme, the impact of the revised development has been reviewed by Dr David Brown, a local landscape architect, in accordance with the revised BS 5837 (2005). The trees to be retained will be fully protected by fencing as shown on the slide which is in accordance with this revised standard.

The over-mature fruit trees at the centre of the site will be removed to allow for the development, and the buildings have been sited with a clearance from tree protection zones to meet the requirements of the new British Standard. A no-dig area along northern boundary has also been defined in accordance with the regulations and the cycle area for House 2 and refuse enclosure will be located on an existing area of concrete hard-standing.

Four ash trees will be removed to allow the native existing limes to the southern boundary to prosper. Two hawthorns (one dead and one in Category 3) will be removed from the northern boundary. The existing liquidambar on the site will be moved a short distance and grouped with two new liquidambar trees. Our specialist's advice is that this tree is young enough to survive relocation.

12 additional new semi mature native trees including a specimen beech tree are proposed.

During construction, access to the site will be through the centre of the existing hedge to avoid damage to trees. On completion this hedge will then be reinstated.

In the development of the proposals careful consideration has been given to the views from the rear of the properties on Adams Road and to the overall impact on the amenity of these houses.

As can be seen from this slide the proposed siting of the new houses still maintains substantial distances between the new accommodation and the existing residences on Adams Road and Sylvester Road and shows, we believe, appropriate respect to the visual amenity of these properties.

As noted earlier the existing boundary trees will be retained and fully protected, and in addition some supplementary planting of hazel whips to the northern boundary with 8 Adams Road and in north-west corner of the site is proposed.

With space between the new buildings the views of the mature boundary trees beyond will still be maintained from the Adams Road properties and from Sylvester Road.

10 controlled car parking spaces are provided. This is in excess of the Council's standards in order to accommodate concerns expressed by local residents. The spaces have been located away from the northern boundary to minimise any adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.

Because the gable to house no 2 is closest to the northern boundary, specific consideration has been given to the view from no 8 Adams Road. We would wish to acknowledge the co-operation of the owner of this house and thank her for allowing us access in order to assess the visual impact of the proposals on this property from the garden and from the house itself.

The upper view on this slide has been constructed using photographs taken from a first floor bedroom of 8 Adams Road in December 2005, when the tree screen was at its least dense.

We have then carefully superimposed the model of the proposed development, and have validated this in terms of its relationship to both Sellenger and the existing trees.

We believe this to be an accurate representation of this view of the development from the north, and illustrates that the appearance will be of a small group of pitched roofs appearing amongst mature trees. We believe this to be wholly appropriate to the character of the area, and do not consider that the proposed development will have an intrusive or detrimental affect on visual amenity.

I will now hand back to Jenny to conclude this presentation.

## **JENNY'S CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, after the refusal last year we have revised our objectives for the site by focussing on those reasons for refusal and residents' and Members' concerns. We believe that the principle of and need for development on this site is established and is in accordance with policy HE8. The reduction in new study bedrooms by 27% (a

significant reduction) has also enabled us to make real changes to the proposed development as a whole.

We believe that the scheme preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, as required by policy BE32, by respecting its context in terms of grain, type, scale, height, form, proportion and building line, as well as through the use of high quality materials and finishes characteristic of the area. In accordance with policies BE2 and BE4 we have taken our cues for the framework of the design from the surrounding area and from the on-site constraints.

The amenity of neighbours and the surrounding area is protected as required by BE2. Concern has been expressed about the occupants' likely activities. These activities will be domestic and academic. There will be some occupants working in their rooms by day and/or at night throughout the year. These students require quiet. Their fellow occupants understand the need for peace and that noisy activity is not appropriate in or near a building in which students are writing up a thesis or preparing for examinations. It is that academic requirement which lies behind the imposition throughout the College of 'rules' or its code of practice. These rules are policed by the student communities and by College staff on night security patrols.

Other significant factors should be considered here including the separating distances between the proposed buildings and the neighbouring properties and the revised layout with its central parking and dispersed cycle areas.

The increase in the external amenity space together with the variety and diversity of landscape treatment proposed will, we believe, provide high quality amenity space for the occupiers of the site in accordance with RL3 and provide long term enhancement and benefit to the area as this new garden grows and matures. This addresses the requirements of BE29.

The resulting scheme is, in our judgement, one which preserves the key characteristics of built form and layout of the Conservation Area as well as enhancing the treed and landscaped setting.

## Abridged Notes from the Petitioners' Presentation

A new plan needed was needed in the light of the failure of the amended proposal to meet the concerns expressed at the previous Forum.

Development density should be comparable to that which would apply to a domestic scale development.

There had been a lack of dimensions and perspective on some of the drawings resulting in misleading representations of the impact of the proposed buildings. Some of the tree illustrations were inaccurate

The previous application turned down for multiple reasons which were listed.

This application disappointingly addresses the topics identified as reasons for refusing planning permission but does not address the substance of **any** of them.

Addressing the specifics in turn:

The building(s) are of an unacceptable design on the following grounds:

- the two buildings have a comparable mass
- the scale of the proposed eastern gable
- they would be visually intrusive,
- have an unsympathetic impact on the street scene
- their proximity to the road
- their proximity to Sellenger
- their unrefined uniformity of design
- their architectural detailing
- their construction materials

The proposal was of insufficient quality to create acceptable new sense of place

Buildings with parking and other surfacing constitute overdevelopment of the site.

The proposal fails to recognise the constraints of the site.

There would be an unreasonable degree of loss of a mature garden and a loss of amenity.

The extent of site "development" is such that inadequate space remains for the amenity of prospective occupiers of the proposed accommodation. The applicant has requested "release" from Section 103 obligations on the grounds that the college provided open space way above government requirements.

There would be inadequate provision of public open space.

The cover of the buildings, cycle and car parking prejudices the contribution of the rear part of the site to that character and quality of the area.

The metrics rely on the space available within the main college grounds even though the rationale for the proposed heavy development of the site is driven by the desire to co-locate graduate students.

Development would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours and the constraints of the site, the reduction in accommodation would effectively result in only two fewer parties a year.

The proposal would result in increased light pollution and noise pollution arising from traffic and social activities.

The plan showing access routes is “endorsed” by lorry outlines that do not represent the vehicles actually used.

	Topic	Discussion	Illustration ?
1.	Segue to ML theme	Following on from Steve Forrestr’s points	Van outside 10 Adams
2.	Proximity of edge of entrance road to Sellenger front door	<p>This is the current entrance to the site. The roadway is to be widened to 5.5 metres.</p> <p>As far as one can tell from the non-dimensioned drawings, the proposed roadway edge passes about two foot six inches from the front entrance to Sellenger.</p> <p>The refuse collection lorries (three axle vehicles not the small two axle ones indicated on some of the plans) will pass this way.</p> <p>This is shoe horned.</p> <p>Contrast with the drive to the Warden’s Lodge</p>	<p>Photo along drive showing the “squeeze”</p> <p>Photo of entrance to #4</p>
3.	control of car parking	<p>Our concerns lie with those cars that do not have rights on the site.</p> <p>There is no doubt in the minds of those that live in the West Cambridge area that student owned cars substantially occupy the on-street free parking for lengthy periods. This one was resident for two weeks obstructing the dropped kerbs of two houses and making exiting dangerous..</p>	<p>Parked cars and rescue truck</p> <p>Car parked outside 7A on pavement.</p>
4.	Visibility splays when parked cars in the road.	<p>PL122 shows superb vision from the proposed entrance for some 40 metres on both sides.</p> <p>But Sylvester Road normally has parked vans and cars – <b>on both sides and traffic</b>. What would be the visibility splay with this <b>van</b> on one side of the entrance and an <b>SUV</b> on the other?</p> <p>Street parking is becoming more problematic. DYLS will be needed for student safe access and egress, <b>and</b> for lorry delivery and refuse collections – unless done at night with the consequent noise impact.</p> <p>Unlike most of the drawings though, there are dimensions on this one.</p> <p>So, while the splay lines shown are theoretically correct they do not reflect the real world – any more than does the representation of the trees in both the north-south elevations and the aerial perspective.</p> <p>What does this, along with lorry representation say about the reliability of the other information included with the application?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Copy of IID drawing with road width.</li> <li>2. Photo of Sylvester with cars.</li> <li>3. Van outside 10 Adams</li> <li>4. Range Rover</li> </ol>

	Topic	Discussion	Illustration ?
5.	failure to take account of the architectural character of the locality	Virtually all three-storey houses in West Cambridge have a configuration similar to Sellenger. All along Grange, Cranmer, Herschel, Adams, Clarkson, and Wilberforce Roads, the houses are similar, not just as the Officer will tell you, Adams Road. The proposal is for this. Well it <b>does not</b> preserve the architectural vernacular of the area. We think that it does not enhance it	Photo of Sellenger Trinity houses across field Photo of relevant drawing
6.	West Conservation area is  Institutional	During previous meetings in this building, the Planning Officer clearly implied or even stated that putting institutional buildings on this site would be legitimate. Well I have walked around many of the institutional buildings in West Cambridge. By and large they are interesting and, most importantly, create a sense of place and space. I argue that the proposal fails the test that should be applied to institutional buildings in West Cambridge.	Blank  University Library pic  Pic of north/south elevation
7.	Sub-areas	More importantly though, the Planning Officer's assertion was incorrect. Courts have accepted that Conservation Areas can have sub-areas and, indeed, sub-sub-areas. Also, the Local Plan states that West Cambridge. is "not homogeneous". All the above must mean that not only is it legitimate to apply domestic density standards to this site, good planning requires it.	Map showing residential sub-area
8.	fails to reflect the area character fails to relate well to the surroundings	What is the sub-area character Large houses in large gardens with space around But the <b>views</b> between houses (eg behind building lines) are important to the nature of the Conservation Area. This is the view from Herschel Road across No 4 Sylvester to the rear of 7 Adams Road  The proposal reduces the views between buildings.	17 to 19 vista  Back of Adams Road  4 Sylvester to 7 Adams Sellenger as now  Sellenger as proposed
9.	Contrast packing density: proposed site and Robinson	The footprint density for this site is massively more than is the case for the main Robinson site. Why should this be so? The main site is beautiful and a credit to the college, as are its newer buildings. We do not believe that the Fellows would wish this development to be on public view across the gardens and lake.	Aerial of Robinson and site  Thurlow building  Proposed view to west

	Topic	Discussion	Illustration ?
10.	Robinson has other places in which accommodation could be provided	<p>The Planning Officer advised that the availability of other sites is not relevant to this application.</p> <p><b>However</b> the merits of alternative sites can be a material consideration – <b>this is settled law as evidenced in the textbooks.</b></p> <p>This is particularly significant because the site is not designated for college or university development in the Local Plans, notwithstanding the sophistry in Clause 8.42 of the Planning Officer Report</p> <p>Robinson College has planning permission already granted for a substantial block and could easily meet its accommodation needs from that block and a domestic scale development on the Sellenger site.</p> <p>We are advised that these <b>ARE</b> material planning considerations.</p>	Blue sky
11.	Precedent setting	<p>During public meetings here held to discuss the first application by Robinson College, Council Officers specifically referred to other sites as precedents for what was being proposed.</p> <p>Also, at Area Committee meetings, precedents are regularly used.</p> <p>Approving this application would set a precedent for <b>ongoing high density back-filling</b> of sites in the area, flying in the face of statements in the Local Plan.</p> <p>This would create an “open season” on the very characteristics that make the residential element of the West Cambridge Conservation Area so special.</p>	Blue sky
12	Exhibition and responses	<p>Approach welcome: but the reality was somewhat different.</p> <p>Exhibition held on 23 &amp; 24 November: I posted my comments on 28<sup>th</sup> November since they were requested by 1<sup>st</sup> Dec. None of them is reflected in the proposal.</p> <p>Drawings available were very limited  no dimensions (eg regarding building heights)  no information available for considered review</p> <p>The changes as reported as being incorporated are very minor except for roof height which the architect could not (or would not) define during the exhibition.</p> <p>Full planning application received by the Planning and Environmental Control on 20<sup>th</sup> December. Thirteen working days after the closing dates for comments.</p> <p>Timeline suggests and the changes claimed suggest it was not a serious effort to find a consensus with the petitioners</p>	
13.	Effort to create a consensus with the Petitioners.	<p>The main purpose of the DCF is to promote the exchange of views with the aim of moving to a consensus.</p> <p>We have seen no evidence that the applicant is really seeking to develop a proposal that is consistent with preservation of the West Cambridge ambience.</p> <p>We would support an appropriate development.</p>	
14.	Sum-up scene setting	<p>The walk or ride out from Cambridge is uplifting.</p> <p>It was developed over hundreds of years.</p> <p>So, a long term view should prevail.</p> <p>What would people say of the proposed development in eighty or a 150 years’ time?</p>	Needham Institute Kings College School

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Illustration ?</b>
15.	Sum-up: three liner	<p>Proposal would grossly over-develop the site: would you recommend approval a proposal for 16 three-bedroom flats on this site?</p> <p>Design of buildings and scheme overall are not up to the standard appropriate for the area.</p> <p>All the result of seeking to put a <b>quart into a pint pot</b>.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	