

STATEMENT TO BE READ ON 6TH AUGUST 2014

Re: Planning Permission for 14 Victoria Street, Cambridge

I wish to start by stating how disappointed I am in the council and, particularly in the conduct of the West and Central Area Committee in relation to the above planning application and subsequent permission process. I will relate selected points from this purely to ensure that we do not repeat the same errors going forwards.

I have been informed that this is a meeting to “consider the legal options”. This gives me little guidance on exactly what to address and, to ensure that nothing is omitted, I am taking a comprehensive approach in this statement. I will lay out what I hope and expect.

1. Victoria Street is in Cambridge’s Conservation Area, is listed and designated a Building of Local Interest. Despite frequent references to this fact, it has been overlooked to date: I do not expect it to be so in future. I have sent comments separately to Ms Dell about this particular error.
2. Had this error not occurred, I believe this planning permission would have not have been granted and so my expectation of today’s meeting is that a decision is made to remove the permission totally and in a way that ensures it cannot be resurrected at a later date. This is an **absolute minimum expectation** of this meeting. I believe this means that it needs to go to Judicial Review, but you would be more familiar with the process than I am.
3. I am somewhat disturbed by a comment in Ms Dell’s letter which says that my previous comments will be re-reported to this meeting. I would only expect this to be necessary if a new/ amended plan was being considered. I would not find this acceptable. I expect this planning permission to be completely overturned, with any new planning application heard afresh.

Following on from this point in Ms Dell’s letter I am reiterating points from several previous communications to state what I expect in regard to any future planning application:

1. As a BLI, I expect the Committee to follow its own rules in determining what is permissible. On your own webpage (<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/buildings-of-local-interest>) it states *Proposals relating to these buildings should pay special attention to preserving features that contribute to their character, maintaining proportions, preserving the setting and using appropriate materials.*

It also states....

- § *alterations or repairs to external elevations should respect the existing fabric and match it in materials, texture, quality and colour*
- § *brick and stone should not normally be rendered unless rendered originally*

And

- § *that repairs, alterations and extensions are sympathetic to their character*

All of these are points I have made previously, but repeat here to save you going through past documents:

- Size. This is far too large and obtrusive to be in the heart of a collection of small houses in a conservation area (original online objection, repeated in my letter to Ms Jackson)
 - It would encroach upon the space of others by its proximity.... (original online objection). Note this as reinforced in my letter to Ms Jackson when I explained how close this will be and how much of the green space will be taken
 - Materials to be Used. A glass and aluminium building is not the right material to use..... (original online objection)
 - It is not suitable for a residential area (this was a statement made by a member of the Committee on 24th April in reference to the material being used and was incorporated in my letter to Ms Jackson)
 - The extensions already erected do look like residential buildings and this is more like an office (stated in the Committee meeting on 24th April and referred to in my letter to Ms Jackson)
2. I also expect decisions to be consistent as this is the only way that they are fair. As stated repeatedly the decisions relating to 17 Victoria Street (a few months prior) followed all the BLI principles. I expect the decisions relating to no. 14 to be consistent with No. 17.
 3. I have repeatedly commented on the emission of light and noise from the proposed building. I do not expect a glass building to be approved, but anything likely to have a significant impact on neighbours must have expert reports undertaken and only then should a fully informed decision be made. The material of construction is a problem or I wouldn't have light and noise concerns.
 4. As the Committee Chairman repeatedly stated in the meeting which considered the application to extend no. 17, this should be about the relationship between buildings. I do not expect the applicant's medical condition to be mentioned.

Finally, I repeat that I expect this permission to be permanently removed through legal process, if necessary through judicial review, and that nothing else will be acceptable to me.