

7 October Planning Speaker Statements

#5 26/00039/FUL Land at Ekin Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire – Local Resident

I am writing regarding the upcoming planning meeting to be held on 7 October, and in particular item 26/00039/FUL: the redevelopment of Ekin Road. I am the freehold owner, and occupier, of 33 Ekin Road; a residential property abutting this proposed development. My family and I live here as our primary residence, and we hold no other abode. Between us we live, work, and study in Cambridge, and spend practically all of our time here. I write IN OBJECTION to this application, and in particular to the Construction Management Plan presented therein, which was uploaded to the planning portal on 20 August 2026. I completely object to this plan, for the following reasons:

This plan proposes a closure of the roadway on the southern side of Ekin Road to all vehicular traffic for a period of 57 weeks, as shown in “stage 4/5” of that document. This, by any measure, is an absurd period of time, for a process as straightforward as re-laying of services and road resurfacing, on a strip no longer than 90m. This is substantial overreach by the applicant, and they simply have no right to impose such a long and intrusive closure on the residents of Ekin Road.

Like my neighbours, my family and I rely heavily on deliveries throughout the week. This includes groceries, household goods, and other purchases. As my husband and I both work full-time, such deliveries are often scheduled after-hours. We see no evidence of an after- hours “gate man” anywhere in this plan, and conclude that vehicular access out of hours will simply be impossible. While it may be the case that the postal service is kept abreast of the closure and diversions, third-party delivery services such as Amazon, food delivery, or other non-postal services such as DHL, Hermes, etc. will simply get lost and give up on the delivery.

We have serious concerns about how emergency services will access our property during any such closure. The plan clearly shows that there

is to be “construction fencing” immediately adjacent to the footpath outside our house, thus making vehicular access impossible. Out of hours, we see no way that a fire engine, or ambulance, could get anywhere near our home; even during hours, such a “construction fence” means service crew would be unable to get hoses or ambulance trolleys to our property over that fence. This is simply unacceptable, and it is astonishing the applicant thinks this is a workable proposal.

Should our home need any emergency repairs or renovations during this 57 week closure, we see no way for tradespeople to bring any heavy equipment or skip onto our property, and it is unclear if the footpath would be sufficient for such access. And should we need any large delivery, such as replacement whitegoods, bedding, etc, footpath access is totally inadequate for such deliveries.

I respectfully request that this committee REJECT this application, or at the very least make binding conditions, so that the Construction Management Plan can be revised, and all residents re-consulted, before this committee (and NOT the applicant) decides on its suitability. I note that this is the SECOND iteration of this construction management plan, and it is still totally unsuitable. Between iterations, the applicant did not seek out any proper or meaningful engagement and feedback from Ekin Road residents. The applicant is clearly not acting in good faith here, which is why I insist this committee makes its own further evaluation of a revised plan at a later date; the applicant cannot be trusted.

I trust that the planning committee will take the concerns of myself and my neighbours into serious consideration as this proposal is discussed, and do what is right for the residents of Ekin Road.

.....

#5 26/00039/FUL Land at Ekin Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire – Local Resident

I am the freehold owner, and occupier, of 43 Ekin Road; a residential property directly adjacent to this proposed development, consisting of a semi-detached house. My family and I live here as our primary

residence, and we hold no other abode. I wish to lodge the following objection to this proposal.

1. Removal of vehicle access to properties in the southern edge of Ekin Road:

I must strongly object to the Construction Management Plan (on the planning portal dated August 20th 2026) in the current form. Despite the insistence that Emergency service access will be maintained at all times of the redevelopment process the plans for stage 4 of 5 clearly shows that a Construction Fence will be present just north of the pedestrian footway next to the retained houses for a period of at least 57 weeks. There is no possibility for an emergency vehicle to have direct access to the retained properties during this time, especially those towards the Eastern end of the row. This will also be the case if residents were to need emergency building work, to have new appliances or furniture delivered, to have grocery or online purchases delivered - for a period of more than a year.

To be absolutely clear we are referring to a stretch of road less than 100 meters long. To remove vehicular access for residents for more than a whole year for utility diversions and resurfacing for such short piece of road is ludicrous and that this was decided as the best plan to put forward shows the callous disregard towards the remaining residents on Ekin Road that has been on display throughout the planning process.

I would direct the developers to the project on Rawlyn Close where a large development has taken place across the street from some retained houses and the road was not closed for any significant time, if at all. With due care, attention and consideration a better plan will allow the redevelopment to progress without a punitive reduction in the quality of life for the residents who still live on Ekin Road.

I respectfully request that the planning committee refuse this proposal as it stands until the issues raised here are addressed.

.....

#5 26/00039/FUL Land at Ekin Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire – Local Resident

I am writing to this committee in objection to the current application to redevelop Ekin Road.

I am a long-term resident of Ekin Road, living with my husband in 57 Ekin Road which is one of the retained semi-detached houses on the southern side of the estate. We have been in our house for many decades. I am well past retirement age, and now suffer from numerous health conditions severely impacting both my vision, and my overall mobility. My husband is a similar age and has health issues which affect his stamina and mobility. As such, smooth and uninterrupted car access to our home is of paramount importance, which I feel will be unduly and excessively disrupted during the construction of this project.

My concerns with this application relates directly to the Construction Management Plan, dated 20 August 2026, which states that the southern side of Ekin Road will be closed to car traffic for a period of 57 weeks. My husband and I completely object to this prolonged closure, as it will be extremely detrimental to our well-being and quality of life. We currently have close and easy access to our car due to work carried out by Occupational Therapist and Cambridge City Council in our front garden. This easy access to our car allows us to remain independent and active, as we rely on our car almost exclusively for transport, given our health conditions. Quite simply, if we are denied this easy access to our car and forced to park a distance from our home, we will become effectively housebound, which will severely impact our mental health.

As well the impact on our quality of life, such a closure would completely disrupt our ability to carry out essential day-to-day tasks. We receive all our medication by post, and all our shopping is delivered to our door as we are unable to navigate large shopping centres for general household purchases, clothing, and appliances. We have milk delivered twice a week, which would become impossible with a road closure. And even though my husband goes out in the car for supermarket shopping, his advanced age and stamina conditions means he is unable to carry

heavy groceries over any large distance, and doing so would also pose risk of falling and injuring himself.

We have additional safety concerns if our car needs to be parked a significant distance away; concerns for the car itself (which our lives essentially depend on), as well as our own personal safety in travelling to and from the car, especially in the dark, which is further compounded by the fact that this area is, as already highlighted by the applicant, an area with many criminal and antisocial behaviour issues.

We also have significant concerns regarding emergency service access to our house during any such closures. We have not seen details about how this will be managed, and we hold significant reservations about whether this can be done effectively and reliably, especially out of hours when the site crew have gone home.

We cannot stress how vital it is for us to have uninterrupted, unimpeded access to our house for road traffic throughout this construction process. We object to any closure of the road in front of our house for periods beyond what is absolutely necessary for the re-laying of services and re-surfacing of the road. These should be counted in days, not weeks. We ask that this committee either reject the application outright, or place a condition requiring the applicant to redo the Construction Management Plan, and carry out an additional consultation with residents in meaningful way. This would be best-done via a co-development process, where we and other residents can have input into the new plan before it is put forward again.

.....

#6 26/02109/FUL Christs College Library – Local Resident

This is a plea to the committee to read the result of the judicial review that granted a high court hearing for the 20th October 26. To read the three page Historic England submission for the previous application and the Victorian society objection to this application before coming to a decision.

I am told that this sheet will be published on the “meeting webpage” and is submitted in expectation that the committee's attention will be drawn to it before a decision is made and not added after.

The Objections raised in this Application were all available for the presentation of the previous application which was Approved. It is more than likely that Committee Members had little awareness of these since they were not referred to by the Presenting Officer and it is an impossibility for even one Objector to provide a reasoned case in the allotted three minutes. This is a serious problem with such an important application. This in itself has led to the Judicial Review and the granting of a Hearing which is due on the 20th October and raises the obvious question of why is this repeat of the withdrawn previously approved application being heard before the result of the Hearing?

There are many well considered Objections in addition to HE and the VS notably all the great effort of local Objectors CLAG, who themselves took the 2025 Approval to Court and obtained the Review.

It is worrying that those the Committee looks to for sound advice on protecting our architectural heritage, the Planning Department, despite the many obvious concerns end up advising that “the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area”. This Application is a lot more than just a Conservation Area, it is part of the countrys architectural heritage.

Very clearly the Judicial Review found a “strongly arguable” case on all four grounds brought.

This is a large modernist building sitting amidst a nationally important part of our architectural heritage. The Presenting Officers Report was full of “no objection” and the Committee could be forgiven for thinking that there were few concerns. It is essential that the Committee reads the full three pages of the Historic England submission for the previous application. Yes the submission concludes by saying “they do not wish to object” but the document needs to be fully read to understand what is being said. Read the list of eight serious concerns. Read the references

to NPPF. Read their reference on the Local Authorities Statutory duties in section 66 of the 1990 Act. HE were advising many changes for areas they considered unsatisfactory and I imagine were led to believe that alterations would be implemented, hence their “we do not wish to object...” It reads as if HE were trying to nudge planning to make these adjustments themselves so avoiding them to have to formerly object. None of the concerns were acted upon. The fact that HE have confirmed “no Objection” to this reapplication is understandable, but it doesn’t erase their many concerns expressed in their original 3 page submission for the previous application which still remain.

Part of HE’s concerns must be the effect of the proposal on Bath Court but little detail is given. This is a 4 storey building rising two storeys above the eaves of the South Range only 4 meters away. This is purely a modernist design of a two storey horizontal tile hung block with a horizontal slit window running virtually the whole length and cantilevered out over two floors of glazing. The shallow pitched roof is terminated with a chevron profiled eaves all totally unrelated in both material and design to any adjoining building.

The very fact that a Judicial Review was granted on all four grounds brought must surely indicate serious concern. This Application is an unaltered re application of the previous application and it seems that the Committee is being put in the position of possibly challenging the Court.

.....

#6 26/02109/FUL Christs College Library – Local Resident

I object to application 26/01209/FUL and request the Planning Committee to refuse it. Otherwise I will be grateful if you can defer item 6 until after the High Court hearing on 20 October 2026.

I think that the Library building will have a lot of negative implications for the area that we live in.

.....

#6 26/02109/FUL Christs College Library – Local Resident

I object to application 26/02109/FUL and ask the Planning Committee to refuse it or, at the least, defer item 6 until after the High Court hearing on 20 October.

.....

#7 - 26/00672/FUL 23-27 Kings Hedges Road – Local Resident

Cambridge is one of the most expensive places in the country to rent or buy a house. If we are to create a fairer future for Cambridge and do our part to meet the Government's ambition of ending rough sleeping, we will need to build many more social and affordable homes. But we will also need more specialist accommodation of the type being proposed by Cambridge Cyrenians for this site.

To address the four key elements of Policy 47 of the Cambridge Local Plan:

We know from the Housing Needs Assessment that there is an urgent requirement for one bedroom affordable rented accommodation, and we know that supported accommodation of this nature can help people to move out of homelessness. There is therefore a demonstrable need for this form of development.

Modular homes are already successfully in use in Cambridge, and have proven to be more than suitable as a high-quality, innovative solution to housing need. On-site support and care will be provided.

There are local shops within walking distance, a nearby bus stop, and it's not too far from Cambridge North station.

The addition of five modular homes in the gardens of 23-27 King's Hedges Road is not excessive; rather, it is a practical measure which allows support services to be shared across multiple dwellings. There is no loss of existing residential space. There are plenty of houses in Cambridge, including in this area, with outbuildings and extensions in the gardens.

In conclusion, these homes are exactly what we need to help people to move from the streets into sustainable accommodation for the long term, and I hope that the Planning Committee will approve them today.

.....

#7 - 26/00672/FUL 23-27 Kings Hedges Road – Cllr Karen Young

I am a councillor for Queen Edith's in the South of the City.

I wanted to make a statement in support of this application as I am told that there is some concern from nearby residents about this project. This is understandable and so I thought it would be helpful to set out our experience in Queen Edith's which has been excellent.

We have four houses on the basis of a temporary planning permission on the site of a former garden right in the middle of a very residential area. The units look good, and fit well in the area. The actual construction took a very short time and was quite dramatic as the prefabricated units were lifted onto the site.

We have had no problems with residents of the units at all. The units are clean and tidy and quiet.

I have no hesitation in recommending them for other sites in the City.

.....

#7 - 26/00672/FUL 23-27 Kings Hedges Road – Cllr Jenny Gawthroe Wood and Cllr Rachel Wade

I am a King's Hedges Ward Councillor since 2021 – so my role is to represent the whole community in the ward but also to consider the best for Cambridge. Prior to this from 2018 I was on the It Takes a City information and evidence committee and also one year as the Homeless and Refugee Lead Councillor in 2021-2.

In King's Hedges and elsewhere across Cambridge, we have small sites with about 5 modular homes, each housing single people who have been homeless - in this case, it really means rough sleeping or losing the safety net of a secure home. I have supported these and these seem to have been a great success – residents can reestablish their independence, with their own front door and facilities, but without the full pressures of running a flat or house. As a ward councillor, I have not had a word of complaint or issue raised from the existing modular homes sited in the heart of the ward.

Addenbrooke's medics would often say that providing secure housing would stop nearly all the homeless cases coming into A&E. However, for many good support levels are key. Those Addenbrooke's doctors thought that housing first would prevent and solve all the problems experienced by those who have been homeless. I would argue rather that we need charities like the Cyrenians, who are set up to provide ready a range of support and assistance in dealing with services, benefits and help people recover and move back into mainstream housing when ready. (I have two ex-Cyrenian neighbours.) I note that one of the modules will be office and therapy space and will free up communal space in the main houses.

King's Hedges is not a wealthy area, but certainly the north side has traditionally been owner occupied; on the south side and in Ramsden Square these are largely ex-council-owned properties. There are more private rentals and HMOs now. Nearby residents have contacted me and raised a lot of concerns about the application, how to object, how to ensure it came to the Planning Committee and it appears they were all able to submit their objections to the Planning Service. Some objections relate to the past state of the buildings which the Cyrenians renovated, with the owner's consent. This new project includes landscaping, parking, cycle and office space. Other residents concerns - and I do not take these lightly- include overlooking, parking, risk of anti-social behaviour, use of garden space, loss of biodiversity, privacy and noise and how this development fits in with our Local Plan. These objectors largely live on King's Hedges Road, and the north side of King's Hedges Road, and they are still worried. Underlying this is a

feeling that King's Hedges is the left behind North Cambridge, whereas we know that a good deal of investment and shared prosperity funding is coming to the area. I understand their concerns and this is an issue. I am pleased to see that the Cyrenians intend to engage with local residents in future (meetings at Brown's Field) as needed and have published on the planning portal the new management plan. If the Cyrenians can ensure their new management plan is monitored and evaluated; this may go a considerable way to allay some of the concerns.

I also note that only 4 modules will be housing – so only 4 more residents.

I do currently have and have had cases in KH of rough sleepers who cannot be housed directly or easily by the City Council and require considerable extra support, who with really need something like this.

Councillor Rachel Wade, West Chesterton, Lead Cllr for TU Liaison has also submitted a statement in support of 26/00672/ FUL modular homes Kings Hedges Rd .

I thank Cllr Gawthorpe Wood for lending me her voice today: I declare an interest as I have not only witnessed the positive changes enabled by the Cyrenians over the 25 years I worked front facing public servant for the DWP I have seen the support offered to those who fall between the cracks and between Agencies in my own family circle - the life enhancing service that offers dignity, hope and respect when individuals are at their most vulnerable & often defenceless in the face of our fast paced ,relentless society, we need to not leave anyone behind in our rush to move forward.

The Cyrenians offer a space to take a breath, recover our equilibrium & give purpose & validity to those momentarily lost in the storm of life which can be overwhelming at times.

By meeting people where they are & uniquely, living alongside them, the temporary modular homes will not be a detriment to their surroundings &

although the dwellings are essentially not permanent, the long-term benefits both to individuals & our Cambridge community can only be positive for our City alongside our new neighbours that will come to live in the new homes.

The management plan is sensitive to the needs of all Kings Hedges Rd residents I understand & speaks to innovation & the person-centred work that reflects the compassion, respect & integrity of the Cyrenians proven approach.

I fully support this application & urge the committee to do the same.

.....