



York House  
7 Dukes Court  
54-62 Newmarket Road  
Cambridge  
CB5 8DZ

Amit Patel  
Planning Department  
Cambridge City Council  
The Guildhall  
Cambridge  
CB2 3QJ

**PLANNING**

t +44 (0) 1223 326806  
f +44 (0) 1223 329346  
e jmb@januarys.co.uk  
w januarys.co.uk

Our ref: JMB  
Your ref:

25<sup>th</sup> July 2014

Dear Amit

**14/0607/FUL CONVERSION AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING FRONTAGE BUILDING FROM OFFICE TO 1NO. FLAT AND 1NO. STUDIO FLAT; AND ERECTION OF 4 STUDIO FLATS TO THE REAR (FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDINGS), TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
1 GREAT EASTERN STREET, CAMBRIDGE**

Please find attached the following set of amended plans regarding Gt Eastern Street.

P50	1:100	A3	Proposed Ground Floor Plan
P51	1:100	A3	Proposed First Floor Plan
P52	1:100	A3	Proposed Second Floor Plan
P53	1:100	A3	Proposed Roof Plan
P54	1:100	A3	Comparative Floor Plan
P55	1:100	A3	Proposed N & S Elevations
P56	1:100	A3	Proposed E & W Elevations & Sections C-C & D-D
P57	1:100	A3	Proposed Sections A-A & B-B
P63	1:100	A3	Proposed N Elevation Comparison
P70	-	A3	Enhanced Comparison Shadow Studies March (Equinoxes)
P71	-	A3	Enhanced Comparison Shadow Studies June (Midsummer's Day)

Following on from the published minutes of the DCF which records Members asking two particular questions which arose from comments made by the petitioners, namely:

*51. Queried if the applicant would consider providing additional land to No 3 Great Eastern Street to extend the size of the courtyard to reduce the feeling of enclosure.*

Directors: A list of Directors is available on request.

Januarys is a trading name of Januarys (Cambridge) Limited registered in England No. 02604913  
Registered Office: York House, 7 Dukes Court, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge CB5 8DZ VAT No. 844 2715 27  
Office also at: Coach House 2, Lamport Manor, Lamport, Northampton, NN6 9HF

*52. Questioned if a compromise could not be met in extending the boundary of the courtyard to No 3*

As indicated in the minutes from the DCF, the applicant indicated that they would reflect on the points raised.

After careful deliberation the applicant is willing to amend the boundary adjacent to the rear courtyard of no.3, thereby increasing the depth of their courtyard to by 2m (from 2.5 m approx. to 4.5m). This is reflected in the amended plans. In the event that planning permission is approved and the scheme implemented, the land would be transferred to the neighbour's ownership for a nominal fee. The applicant would expect to deliver the scheme in accordance with the amended plans, which clearly show a revised boundary being 1m from the proposed building.

This alteration should not affect officers' key assessment of the sense of enclosure of the proposed development on the rear court yard of no. 3. However, when considering the amenity of the neighbour in more general terms, the extension of their courtyard by 2m (from just 2.5m) will be beneficial and will enhance the level of amenity afforded to the neighbouring occupier, providing a much more useable open space, and enhancing the feeling of space within the courtyard.

Please note we will be informing no. 3 of this alteration, but it is not a point of negotiation. They will comment on the application as they see fit. In the event that it is decided that the land is not wanted, the applicant will have to regularise this through a revised submission to the LPA. The applicant has made this commitment in good faith as part of the mediation process which is integral to the DCF. The land in question is currently occupied by a single storey building. To avoid any misunderstandings, the land can only be delivered upon the implementation of a planning consent.

As agreed as part of the DCF, we also have some enhanced shadow studies, included in the table above, which show in closer detail, shadowing resulting from the proposed two storey building (focusing on the courtyard garden of no.3) compared to that created by the existing arrangement of buildings. The previous appeal scheme was considered to be acceptable in terms of its relation to no. 5 and this scheme can be regarded as a betterment. Similarly, shadowing of the rear courtyard of no. 3 was previously not regarded as being grounds of concern when the previous appeal scheme was assessed, but hopefully the information now provided is considered informative.

Yours sincerely



Justin Bainton BA (Hons), Dip TP, MSc, MRTPI  
**Associate Director**  
Enc.

CC. Tony Collins