

**IN THE MATTER OF THE CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL (HANOVER COURT AND
PRINCESS COURT) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2026
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY TO BE HELD ON 6 OCTOBER
2026**

Planning Inspectorate reference: CPO/PLA/10002

**SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF CASE AND EVIDENCE OF THE
OBJECTOR**

A INTRODUCTION

1. I am an objector to the Cambridge City Council (Hanover Court and Princess Court) Compulsory Purchase Order 2026 (“the Order”).
2. I do not object to the principle of regeneration of Hanover Court and Princess Court. I accept that the existing estate requires redevelopment and I do not seek to prevent the regeneration of the site.
3. My objection is to the confirmation of the Order on the present basis and in the circumstances now existing. My case is set out in full in my Statement of Case. This Summary is provided to assist the Inspector and is not intended to replace or amend that Statement.
4. My objection is based principally on five matters:
 - (a) there is no longer a sufficiently compelling case in the public interest for confirmation of the Order on the basis originally advanced;
 - (b) confirmation would impose a disproportionate and excessive burden upon me as an individual owner-occupier;
 - (c) the Council has failed to apply its published Regeneration Policy consistently to my circumstances and has failed to provide adequate mitigation;
 - (d) compulsory acquisition of my property has not been demonstrated to be a genuine last resort; and
 - (e) my individual circumstances have not been adequately addressed, including the impact of the proposed compulsory acquisition on my home and ability to remain in Cambridge.
5. I do not pursue the original objection that the CPO was premature because planning permission had not yet been granted. Planning permission was subsequently granted on 24 June 2026. However, the chronology and the changes in circumstances since the Order was promoted remain relevant to the assessment of the justification for confirmation of the Order.

B. THE CHANGE IN THE BASIS OF THE PUBLIC-INTEREST CASE

6. A central part of the public-interest case originally advanced in support of the Order was the provision of 72 affordable homes, representing approximately 44% of the proposed 165 homes. The Statement of Reasons also referred to a right of return for existing residents.
7. The planning permission subsequently granted on 24 June 2026 is materially different. It provides for 165 market homes and was approved on the basis that the only deliverable regeneration option available to the Council was a 100% market-led scheme.
8. The 72 Council homes are outside the scope of the planning permission and cannot be secured by planning condition or planning obligation. Their delivery depends upon external grant funding. The viability evidence considered by the Planning Committee assessed the development as 100% private housing and recorded a substantial residual deficit against the viability benchmark.
9. Accordingly, the development now authorised by planning permission is materially different from the scheme on which the original public-interest case for compulsory acquisition was promoted.
10. My case is not that the Council can never seek to provide Council housing elsewhere or that cross-subsidy is impermissible. My point is that the compelling public-interest case for this particular compulsory acquisition must be considered on the basis of the development that is now authorised and the circumstances now existing.
11. The Statement of Case therefore submits that it is open to serious question whether confirmation of the Order remains an appropriate exercise of compulsory purchase powers where the scheme now consented is wholly market-led and does not secure the affordable housing provision that formed a central part of the original justification.

C. THE POSITION CONCERNING THE PROPOSED 72 COUNCIL HOMES

12. The Council's aspiration to provide 72 Council homes was not secured within the planning permission and was dependent upon external grant funding. The position at the time of the planning decision was therefore materially different from the original proposal presented in support of the Order.
13. I understand that the position has subsequently developed and that government funding is now available to Cambridge City Council, making the delivery of the proposed 72 Council homes potentially achievable.
14. I recognise that this is a significant change and I do not suggest that the Council housing objective is impossible.
15. Rather, the subsequent availability of funding demonstrates that the circumstances surrounding the proposed Council housing have changed since the Order was promoted. The Inspector is therefore respectfully invited to consider what part the originally asserted affordable-housing benefit played in the justification for the CPO, what was actually secured at the relevant time, and whether the current circumstances provide a materially different basis for delivering the Council's housing objectives.

D. PROPORTIONALITY AND THE IMPACT UPON ME

16. The compulsory acquisition of my home would have a permanent and irreversible effect upon me.
17. I have lived in my property for more than twenty years and have established my home and community ties in central Cambridge. The replacement housing market in this part of Cambridge is materially different from the market for ex-Council leasehold properties.
18. The effect of the Order must therefore be considered not only in terms of the general public benefits asserted by the Council, but also in terms of the particular burden imposed upon me.
19. My Statement of Case explains why, without a genuinely workable right of return or equivalent mitigation enabling me to remain in the locality, the interference with my rights is disproportionate. The case engages Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 1 of the First Protocol.
20. I respectfully submit that the Inspector should consider whether a fair balance has been struck between the public interest relied upon by the Council and the serious and individual consequences of compulsory acquisition for me.

E. THE COUNCIL'S REGENERATION POLICY AND RIGHT OF RETURN

21. The Council's published Regeneration Policy provides for a right of return for leaseholders and freeholders displaced by CPO-driven regeneration, including consideration of shared equity or shared ownership where necessary to make return financially possible.
22. The Council expressly confirmed the application of this approach in relation to the Ekin Road estate.
23. Despite my repeated requests, the Council has not provided me with a satisfactory and workable right of return and has not adequately explained why my circumstances should be treated differently.
24. The Statement of Case explains that the right of return referred to in the Council's Statement of Reasons was not translated into a concrete and workable proposal for me. In particular, the document provided on 26 June 2026 was an incomplete template containing no identified property, value, date or financial terms.
25. I am willing in principle to return to the redeveloped estate. However, any such arrangement must provide a genuinely workable solution. In particular, I require full ownership of my replacement home rather than an arrangement under which the Council or its development partner retains an equity interest or charge.
26. I respectfully submit that the absence of a concrete and deliverable right of return is a material consideration when assessing the proportionality of the Order and the adequacy of the Council's mitigation.

F. COMPULSORY ACQUISITION HAS NOT BEEN SHOWN TO BE A LAST RESORT

- 27. The Government's compulsory purchase guidance requires reasonable steps to have been taken to acquire interests by agreement and treats compulsory acquisition as a last resort.
- 28. In my case, the Council's offer of 5 February 2026 was conditional upon completion of the surrender of my lease by 30 April 2026 and subsequently lapsed when I exercised my statutory right to object. No subsisting offer capable of acceptance has replaced it.
- 29. Discussions concerning my return to the redeveloped estate continued for a substantial period. However, no concrete or binding proposal was provided before the Order was made.
- 30. The first document described as a "Right of Return Agreement" was provided only on 26 June 2026, after the Order had been made and after the inquiry had been fixed. It was an incomplete template rather than an offer capable of acceptance.
- 31. I have engaged constructively with the Council and remain willing to reach an agreed solution. In these circumstances, I respectfully submit that the Council has not demonstrated that compulsory acquisition of my interest was, or remains, a genuine last resort.

G. MY INDIVIDUAL CIRCUMSTANCES

- 32. I am a long-term resident owner-occupier and the property is my home.
- 33. My individual circumstances make continuity of housing and the ability to remain in Cambridge particularly important. These circumstances have not, in my submission, been adequately addressed by the Council's standard approach.
- 34. The particular impact of the Order upon me should be considered separately from the general merits of the redevelopment scheme. The fact that redevelopment may provide wider public benefits does not remove the requirement to consider the individual and disproportionate impact of compulsory acquisition upon a particular resident.
- 35. I respectfully invite the Inspector to consider whether adequate regard has been given to my circumstances and whether the interference with my rights is necessary and proportionate.

H. CONCLUSION

- 36. I support the principle of regeneration of Hanover Court and Princess Court. My objection is not intended to prevent redevelopment of the site.
- 37. My concern is whether the compulsory acquisition of my home can properly be justified on the basis of the scheme and circumstances now existing.
- 38. The scheme promoted in support of the Order contemplated substantial affordable housing and a right of return for existing residents. The planning permission subsequently granted

provides for a wholly market-led development and does not secure affordable housing. The position concerning the proposed 72 Council homes and their funding has also developed since the Order was promoted.

39. At the same time, no concrete and binding right-of-return arrangement has been provided to me, and I do not consider that the Council has demonstrated that compulsory acquisition of my property has been used only as a genuine last resort.
40. For these reasons, and for the reasons set out more fully in my Statement of Case, I respectfully submit that the Order should not be confirmed on its present basis.
41. I respectfully ask the Inspector to consider my Statement of Case, this Summary, and the evidence produced at the Inquiry when determining whether there remains a compelling case in the public interest sufficient to justify the compulsory acquisition of my property.

██████████

Objector – Resident Owner-Occupier, 32 Hanover Court, Cambridge CB2 1JH

Email: ████████████████████ Tel: ██████████

15 September 2026