
Application Number	15/0009/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	12th January 2015	Officer	Mr Tony Collins
Target Date	9th March 2015		
Ward	Castle		
Site	Garret Hostel Lane Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1TJ		
Proposal	To install a bollard and rail fence on the narrow quay running alongside Garret Hostel Lane slipway and the approach to Garret Hostel Bridge.		
Applicant	Mr Dave Prinsep The Guildhall Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 3QJ United Kingdom		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site is the slipway and quay at the north-east corner of the bridge where Garret Hostel Lane crosses the river. It is wholly within City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.1 (Central). The bridge itself is listed Grade II. Nearby sections of Trinity College are listed Grade I, and nearby buildings at Trinity Hall to the south are listed Grade II. None of these are adjacent to the site, and the proposal would not have any impact on the setting of any listed buildings other than the bridge

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The proposal is to erect a bollard-and-rail fence along the north edge and west end of the quay. The fence would extend 12m along the north side of the quay, and 1.5m across the west end. There would be two rails, the uppermost at 850mm above the quay surface.

3.0 SITE HISTORY: None

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions
(Annex A)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1 Sustainable development
3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/9 Watercourses and other bodies of water
3/11 The design of external spaces
4/10 Listed Buildings
4/11 Conservation Areas

5.3 Material Considerations

City Wide Guidance

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk
Assessment (November 2010)
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)
Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)
Cambridgeshire Design Guide For Streets and Public Realm
(2007)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 Comments awaited.

Urban Design and Conservation team

6.2 Supported subject to conditions to control details and
archaeological investigation

Cam Conservators

6.3 No objection

6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting:

25 Ashfield Road
56 Bateman Street
10 Cook Close
39 Kerridge Close
44 Lantree Crescent
320 Milton Road
17 Petworth Street
33 Priory Road
B3 Riverside Mill, Godmanchester
2 Beedon Drive, Bracknell
23 Somerville Road, Eton

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Unnecessary
- Unlawful
- Tyranny
- Action resembles fascist Italy
- Hostile to business
- Will not stop punt operators
- Doesn't benefit locals
- Waste of council tax payers' money
- Ensuing Judicial Review will waste more money
- Blocks public access
- Health and safety risk
- Obstacle to disabled river users
- Ignores history and tradition
- Stated justification is not the true reason; therefore application fraudulent

7.3 A petition of 114 signatures objecting to the proposal on the grounds that it blocks off the last public access point to the middle river has been submitted.

7.4 Cambridge Past, Present and Future have submitted representations which do not object to the proposal.

7.5 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Supported in principle, but should have conditions to control materials, add lockable gate, and improve paving.
- Railings should not be attached to the bridge

7.6 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

8.1 Representations suggest that the proposal would limit access to the river and would therefore be contrary to policy 3/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The proposal would not block access to the slipway and would not prevent the launching of boats. Were gated access through the fence to be provided, there would be no restriction of access to the river from the quay either. Subject to such a condition, I am of the view that the proposal would not be in conflict with policy 3/9.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.2 In my view the fence is of an appropriate design. I do not consider it would have any negative impact on the conservation area or the setting of the listed bridge. The conservation officer does not object.

8.3 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11 and 4/11.

Disabled access

8.4 I am uncertain of the extent to which this quay is actually likely to be used by disabled people wishing to board boats. This facility could be safeguarded by the incorporation of a gate, lockable both open and closed, as suggested in representations. The inclusion of such a gate would eliminate

concerns about disabled access. I recommend a condition to secure this.

- 8.5 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Highway Safety

- 8.6 I do not consider there to be any highway safety implications of the proposal. I await the highway authority's comment. I will report any comment received on the amendment sheet, or orally at Committee.

- 8.7 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Third Party Representations

- 8.8 With the exception of those relating to access to the river, for fully abled and disabled users, which I have addressed above, the representations all relate to the motivation of the applicant, the likely efficacy of the scheme in preventing unsanctioned punt operations, and the impact on public finances. I do not consider any of these issues to be material planning considerations.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, no development shall take place until a revised drawing providing a gate in the fence which can be locked in both the open and shut positions, have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure safe access to the river (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/9)