

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Design & Conservation Panel**

**Extract from the notes of the meeting Wednesday 29th July
2009**

Present: -

Patrick Ward	(Acting Chair)
David Grech	English Heritage
Tony Nix	RICS
Jo Morrison	Landscape Institute
Carolyn Gohler	Cambridge Preservation Society
Jon Harris	Co –opted member
Ian Steen	Co –opted member
Mac Dowdy	Co –opted member

Officers: -

John Preston	City Council
Susan Smith	City Council
Lindsey Templeton	City Council
Catherine Linford	City Council
John Evans	City Council
Tony Collins	City Council
Angela Briggs	City Council
Jonathan Brookes	City Council

Councillors: -

Cllr Alan Baker	City Council.
-----------------	---------------

Item 3.

Presentation – Redevelopment for ground floor retail with 8 flats at 44-45 Burleigh Street. Presentation by Jenny Page of Beacon Planning.

The Chair declared an interest as he occasionally acts for WT Snooker & Sporting Club at 39b Burleigh Street. The club currently have permission to extend.

Panel's comments are summarised as follows:

- Insufficient drawn information has been submitted to enable the proposals to be properly examined particularly in relation to the adjacent properties to the rear. The second floor plan was thought to be inaccurately represented with areas of restricted headroom not represented. Panel queried the absence of any external amenity space, which could have been provided with balconies or 'Juliet' balconies. The Panel questioned the density of the proposal, particularly on the Adam & Eve Street (south side). The accommodation here seems prejudicial to the re-development of adjoining properties.
- Elevations. Panel observed that efforts had been made to produce interesting elevations echoing elements of the former John Lewis building further up Burleigh St. However, it was felt that the elevations were generally unnecessarily lively and that some simplification could improve the proposals. Panel thought that the two small windows on the east elevation should be eliminated as they would unreasonably restrict the neighbours right to re-develop in the future.
- Panel were not in favour of the 'box-dormer' features and would prefer to see true 'dormers' which could be achieved by raising the eaves line.
- The need to project party walls above the roof line was questioned as it tends to make the roofscape look fussy.
- Narrow access to cycle store, disabled access and bin store were all queried.
- Sustainable drainage? With no sustainability statement seen, the Panel felt further key information was missing.

Conclusion.

The Panel does not object in principle to the scheme, however, there are two key issues: 1) overdevelopment; and 2) overcomplicated detailing . The former can only be assessed with more complete drawings and possibly addressed with the loss of one or two units. The latter could be tackled by some simplification and rationalization of the elevations.

VERDICT – AMBER (7), GREEN (1) based upon the general appearance and quality of materials, not the density or massing.