

John Evans
Cambridge City Council Planning Department
The Guildhall Cambridge CB2 3QJ

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 11/0664/EXP - 187 CHERRY HINTON ROAD

John,

Thanks for your help with the various documents.

I would like to register my objections to the renewal of 08/0125/FUL, 11/00664/EXP. I don't think that the Council should approve this application because it's overdeveloped: it's trying to fit too many people into a small space with very poor access.

1 Appeal Conditions

I assume that all the conditions listed in the Appeal Decision¹ would be incorporated in any future approval. If this is not so then I'll repeat the original design problems, some of which those conditions address.

Most of the conditions are only necessary because of the extremely cramped nature of the design. For example preventing occupants extending the houses acknowledges that the designs don't provide the space families will need².

2 Updated Plans Following Appeal

Without plans describing *what will actually be built*, the developer cannot demonstrate that there is sufficient space on the site to accommodate the development, and I'm commenting on something which is not drawn on a plan. I believe it's the responsibility of the developer to show how all this is going to fit: that has not been done.

We have already demonstrated that the existing plans *do not work*. For example the existing plans for the houses use bicycle racks which are 2/3 the council's required size; the bins are much smaller than real "family" bins; there is insufficient space to turn a buggy or hang out washing; the access arrangements don't work.

3 The Appeal and Planning Policy Statement 3

I feel that the inspector did not adequately take into account the serious planning issues raised by the Planning Committee³ regarding this application. Planning Policy Statement 3⁴ states (clause 73):

"There is no presumption that planning permission should be granted because of a previous approval, particularly if the original permission proposal did not deliver the policy objectives of this PPS.

There are multiple places where the design fails to meet the objectives of PPS3, for example clauses 13 and 16. Clause 17 makes it clear that "family" houses have *additional requirements*, which this proposal clearly doesn't deliver.

Clause 49 states:

"intensification need not mean high rise development or low quality accommodation with inappropriate space"

This application clearly falls short of the ambitions of PPS3 and the Cambridge Local Plan, sacrificing space and amenity value for the residents and neighbours whilst providing inadequate access.

The site should have been appropriately developed years ago: it needs a plan supported by those of us who will have to live with it and also the families who'll have to live in it. This is not that plan.