

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Notes of a Development Control Forum The Jubilee, 73 Catharine Street,
Cambridge

14th April 2010

10.00am – 11.15am

Application No: 10/0132/FUL and 09/0836/FUL
Site Address: The Jubilee, 73 Catharine Street, Cambridge
Description: Erection of 5 dwelling houses and two studio apartments with associated garden space (following demolition of existing 'Jubilee' public house)
Applicant: James Arnold
Agent: Paul Phelps
Lead Petitioner: James Smith
Case Officer: Tony Collins

Present:

| For Applicant | For Petitioners |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Paul Phelps (Agent) | James Smith (Petitioner) |
| Philip Kratz - Frank Shaw Associates | John Coleman (Resident) |
| James Arnold (Applicant) | |

Members of the East Area Committee

Councillors Blencowe and Wright

Other Members in attendance

None

Declarations of Interest by Members

Not applicable.

Officers

Peter Carter (Principal Development Control Manager - Chair), Tony Collins (Planning Officer) and James Goddard (Committee Manager).

Text of Petition

The proposal will not have a positive impact on the immediate area due to height, scale and form; and will overlook, overshadow and dominate the neighbouring properties.

The end houses in the proposal would have windows with direct views into the bedrooms of the existing houses at a significantly shorter distance than any existing properties, so affecting the current dynamic of “expected privacy” in what is a dense urban environment.

The plan also goes against the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 recommendations since it does not provide sufficient parking for the number of dwellings, providing only two on-site visitor spaces. The development as planned would have an unacceptable impact on on-street parking.

The proposal for the end three houses closest to Sedgwick Street creates access to the back-alley where no right of way currently exists other than for the Sedgwick Street properties.

Case by Applicant

Philip Kratz made the following points:

- 1) Reference was made to the previous application submitted to 28 October 2009 DCF.
- 2) The petitioners do not object in principle to redeveloping the site.
- 3) It is recognized that the development needs to be compatible with the surrounding area.
- 4) The following issues have been taken into account from petitioners’ previous comments:
 - Bicycle and bin storage.
 - Size of building (overlooking and overbearing issues).
 - Lessened the impact of gable at the end of the property.

Paul Phelps made the following points:

- 5) Referred to the presentation giving details of the current site design.
- 6) The site aims to be in keeping with the character of surrounding buildings.
- 7) Building plans had been changed to minimize overbearing neighbouring properties, particularly at the end of the property facing St Philips Road.
- 8) The frontage has been concentrated onto St Philips Road rather than Catharine Street.
- 9) Design images have been published in the Design & Access Statement.
- 10) To minimize overlooking neighbouring properties:
 - Fences screen ground floor windows.
 - First floor windows are arranged so that side windows overlook the car parking area, and other windows are high level to let light in rather than for viewing purposes.

- Velux windows in the roof are high level to let light in rather than for viewing purposes.

11) It is recognized there is a high level of on street parking in the area already. Scenarios have been discussed with Planning Officers. New residents would not have dedicated parking, but can do so on street. However, two spaces have been allocated at the back of the building for car club vehicles. The site is near good public transport links, which should reduce the demand for cars.

12) Bin collection access is via Catharine Street.

Case by Petitioners

James Smith spoke as a local resident and raised concerns about the development. He made the following points:

13) Acknowledged that that the developer has slightly modified the plans, but felt the changes do not address the major objections.

14) The objections concern:

- The height, scale and form of the Development.
- The associated impact on the surrounding area – development doesn't fit into the character/aesthetics of the area.
- The large development will be out of place – too many properties on the site.
- Privacy and overshadowing - the orientation will dominate and oppress neighbouring properties.
- The current design does not address the issues of each household having to place multiple bins onto the street on certain collection cycles, and the impact on pavement usage on Catharine Street.
- There are currently issues with on street parking. If any of the new houses are used for multiple-occupancy then it will have an even greater impact. Being able to park within reasonable walking distance of their home is an emotive issue for many residents, and the area is already congested in the evenings when people return from work. The proposal has no details of who will "police" the use of the off-street "visitor" parking.

15) An alternative design for the Jubilee scheme would be to turn around the orientation.

John Coleman expanded on his colleague's points. He made the following observations about resident's concerns:

16) Car parking and congestion issues exist in the area already. It will be difficult to impose a car club on residents. Two spaces are allocated for car club parking within the development proposals, but it is unclear how these will be

accessed. The access doors do not appear to have enough space to open inwards and they cannot be opened outwards across the footpath. Another apparent problem is that vehicles entering or exiting these spaces would have to maneuver across the carriageway very close to the Catharine Street/St Philips Road 4-way junction.

Peter Carter referred to new Government legislation on multiple occupancy as this may have a bearing on parking issues. Multiple occupancy will require planning permission from 6 April 2010.

17) John Coleman asked if the sunlight daylight projections for the proposed buildings, the buildings on the south side of St Philips Road and my property been done, as recommended by the Chair at the previous Development Control Forum? If so, do they comply with the guide to good practice in BRE 209 for Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight?

18) Queried the impact of bike and wheelie bin storage on back gardens ie is sufficient room available?

Case Officer's Comments:

19) The current application was received 1 March 2010 after the previous iteration was withdrawn. Plans for the development have been received and circulated to local residents. From this, responses have been received raising the following concerns:

- Character of the area.
- Impact on residential amenities.
- Car parking.
- Highways issues.
- Public house use.
- Infrastructure.
- Waste storage.
- Biodiversity.
- Access.

20) Policy consultations have been undertaken with:

- Highways Agency - raised objection, due to visibility and safety of access. Also, a shortfall of car parking spaces will increase pressure for on-street parking. Asked for conditions to be imposed if application goes ahead.
- Head of Environmental Services - no objection, but conditions suggested if application goes ahead.

Members' Questions and Comments:

21) Clarification was sought concerning the risk to vehicles manoeuvring to access the site.

Philip Kratz felt the design offered the best safety compromise for pedestrians and car users passing over the entrance. Paul Phelps added that the design for gate access onto the street was being looked at in consultation with the Highways agency.

22) Clarification was sought on whether there was a precedent for car parking access on a corner.

Tony Collins was unaware of a precedent, but Philip Kratz offered to provide photos of other examples.

Philip Kratz stated that the Applicant suggested seven households would generate the same amount of traffic movement as the Jubilee Pub.

23) Clarification was sought concerning if the car club would be open to the community.

The car club would be open to new and existing residents. Philip Kratz suggested that the lease for new residents could include a mandatory clause to join the car club. Car club schemes are more popular in Hertfordshire Market Towns than Cambridge, and they offer an alternative to car ownership. Peter Carter added that parking issues could not be regulated through the planning system.

24) Clarification was sought on parking provision.

The site is outside of the controlled zone, so approximately two spaces are available per household.

James Smith suggested that two on street spaces would be lost so cars can access car club spaces.

25) Clarification was sought on whether existing buildings could be re-used as part of the development.

Paul Phelps said the configuration and structure of the existing buildings were not appropriate, thus it would be easier to demolish them and rebuild. The height of new buildings would be within 80cm of existing ones.

26) Clarification was sought on the size of proposed gardens ie was sufficient space allocated.

Paul Phelps said that sufficient area was allocated for small urban gardens.

27) Clarification was sought on the importance Councillors should give to the sunlight issue.

Tony Collins said there were no specific guidelines about sunlight in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. However, these issues needed to be considered in planning applications.

Summing up by the Applicant

28) The Applicant acknowledged resident's concerns and felt these had been addressed through a change in the design concerning:

- Height.
- Reconfiguring internal building planning to mitigate overlooking.
- Car parking issues.

Summing up by the Petitioners

29) Reiterated concerns previously raised with regards to:

- Over development of site.
- Size of building.
- Potential to overshadow neighbours.
- Configuration and orientation.
- Car parking.
- Queried if sufficient space had been allocated for gardens and bike storage.
- The new development will add a lot of waste bins to an already crowded pavement.

Final Comments of the Chair

30) The Chair observed the following:

- Minutes of the Development Control Forum will be circulated to relevant parties.
- Application to be considered at a future East Area Committee.

The Meeting concluded at 11.15am