

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM

20 January 2016
10.00 - 10.55 am

Present

Planning Committee Members: Councillors Blencowe, Pippas and C. Smart

Ward Councillors

Councillors Ashton and Moore

Officers:

Principal Planning Officer: Toby Williams

Planning Officer: Sav Patel

Committee Manager: James Goddard

For Applicant:

TBC (Agent): Peter McKeown

P. Dudley

Nick Phillips

For Petitioners:

John Allison

Steve Jackson

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/13/DCF Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

16/14/DCF Application and Petition Details (15/2063/FUL 268 Queen Edith's Way, Cambridge CB1 8NL)

Description:	Erection of 3.No four bed houses, internal access road, car and cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping.		
Applicant:	Dudley Developments		
Agent:	Peter McKeown		
Address:	6-8 Hills Road	Lead Petitioner:	Resident of Queen Edith's Way
Case Officer:	Sav Patel		

Text of Petition:

Although there is still an almost insurmountable opposition to any additional development at this location, it is possible that the local community may accept some development having a far less impact on the very special character of the area in general and the adjoining residences in particular. It is possible that this may have been communicated to the developer in times-past had the developer bothered to engage with us in any way, and at any time – which did not happen.

Let us be absolutely clear, however, that as a community we are still totally opposed to the current proposal as it stands – a compromise solution may be possible.

Road safety.

There is a major concern on this issue and the new access provision. Access requirements that meet the statutory provisions at the University Primary School are believed now to be a substantial risk to children accessing the school and we have similar concerns for the far higher numbers accessing Netherhall. The school itself is opposed to the application on safety grounds

Protection of the urban edge of the City.

We believe that we can suggest revised proposals that could minimise the impact on residents' concerns in connection with the "green corridor". This is very much needed as the developer has not provided sufficient details on this issue in the planning application, and continues to assert that the whole development will be almost invisible from without.

Loss of amenity.

We believe that we have a number of proposals that could substantially address the loss of amenity of the residents, and at the same time make far better use of the development site with the possibility of larger units

Opening Remarks by Chair

The Chair outlined the role and purpose of the Development Control Forum. He stated no decisions would be taken at the meeting.

Case by Agent

Mr McKeown made the following points:

- 1) Summarised objections from residents:
 - Road safety.
 - Protection of urban edge of city.
 - Loss of amenity.
- 2) Summarised details regarding site location/background.
- 3) The current scheme was a single issue case as there was only one reason why the previous version of the application (15/0596/FUL) was refused.
- 4) Residents' objections and the reason for refusal were addressed through changes in the most recent application (15/2063/FUL).
- 5) The proposal was supported by statutory consultees.

Case by Petitioners

Mr Jackson spoke on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 6) Tabled a presentation setting out information held on public record.
- 7) Residents opposed development of Queen Edith's Way.
- 8) Expressed concern regarding road safety, and quoted concerns raised by Professor Mackay (University Primary School) and the Acting Head of Netherhall School.
- 9) Suggested the County Council should conduct a full analysis of potential dangers rather than conduct a desktop survey.

Mr Allison made the following points:

- 10) Concerns of Local Residents. The application:
 - Undermines the value of the green corridor.
 - Compromises plant and animal diversity.
 - Contradicts Local Plan policies.
- 11) Suggested four mitigations to the current proposal. The plans for the development should be revised to preserve and enhance the green corridor so that it:
 - Is invisible from Lime Kiln Road:
 - During the day and the night.
 - Throughout the year.
 - Does not introduce additional outside lighting (as recommended by the Environment Officer).
 - Does not impede the movement of local wildlife through and around the site.
 - Imitates the biodiversity of sister chalkland habitats nearby.

Mr Jackson made the following points:

- 12) The last application was largely refused due to overlooking.
- 13) Proposed an alternative layout for the Agent's consideration that should maintain the marketability of the site whilst addressing resident's concerns. This was demonstrated through a video presentation.
- 14) Residents suggested an alternative form of development could be considered:
 - 2 storey units with a larger footprint to maintain the overall area of each unit, the financial viability of the scheme for the developer, and substantially reduce the impact on the neighbourhood.
 - Allow for far larger plot-sizes to overcome the alleged "single issue" to be considered in this application, that being the "inter-overlooking" of the units. It was stated that the area available for development at the southern end of the proposed development site would readily facilitate this.

Case Officer's Comments:

- 15) Summarised the planning history of the application/site.
- 16) The current application received eleven objections and three representations in support referencing character of the area, amenity and highway safety.
- 17) It was expected to come before February 2016 Planning Committee.

Case by Ward Councillors

Councillor Ashton spoke as a Ward Councillor on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 18) He called in the application for discussion by Planning Committee in response to resident's requests.
- 19) Queen Edith's Way was a unique area that needed due consideration before being developed. For example it had a nature reserve nearby.
- 20) Traffic flow was a concern to residents. Traffic calming measures had been implemented in the area due to traffic levels.
- 21) Thanked the Agent for listening to resident's views, but they still had objections.

Councillor Moore spoke as a Ward Councillor on behalf of local residents. He made the following points:

- 22) A lack of formal objection to the proposal from the Highways Authority did not mean they approved it.

- 23) Queen Edith's Way was a dangerous and complex spot with existing traffic flow and safety issues. It was a busy area already as it was a route to school.
- 24) Biodiversity in the area needed to be protected, particularly in areas around nature reserves such as the Queen Edith green corridor.
- 25) Native species should be planted if the application went ahead, not non-native ones.
- 26) Requested that a 20MPH speed limit be enforced to improve highway safety.
- 27) Awaiting cycle lanes to be implemented through s106 funding.
- 28) Re-iterated that green corridors, bio-diversity of the area and road safety were issues that needed to be addressed. Acknowledged these were not reasons for refusal in their own right.

Members' Questions and Comments:

The following responses were made to Members' questions.

- 29) Mr Jackson said adverts were included in his presentation to show that the new houses proposed in 15/2063/FUL were superfluous as there were many existing ones all ready.
- 30) Mr Dudley said a bank and planting zone for trees and hedges was proposed along Lime Kiln Road to stabilise the area.
- 31) Mr McKeown said the
 - 15/2063/FUL site would be accessed from Queen Edith's Way.
 - River through Cherry Hinton Park originated from Giant's Grave (opposite the Robin Hood pub). It did not affect the 15/2063/FUL site.

Summing up by the Applicant's Agent

- 32) The application aimed to develop the site into a high quality contemporary development that responded to the character of the area.
- 33) The latest version of the application responded to previous concerns and the reason for refusal (last application). They should now be addressed.
- 34) No impact was expected on the local nature reserve or site of special scientific interest.

Summing up by the Petitioners

- 35) There was no evidence of positive support from statutory consultees.

- 36) Photos of the site referenced by the Agent were taken in the summer. The development would be much more visible in winter when trees lost their leaves.

Final Comments of the Chair

The Chair observed the following:

- 37) Notes of the Development Control Forum would be made available to relevant parties.
- 38) The application would be considered at the February 2016 Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 10.55 am

CHAIR