

## Before

“Raylands”, the 1910 Edwardian house at 291 Hills Road (corner of Queen Edith’s Way) which is surrounded by trees.



## After

Demolish, replace with 15 modern flats and keep only 12 out of 29 trees



## Opposition from local residents – planning application amended!

We are grateful to the 104 Cambridge residents who objected to the original proposal. This groundswell of local opposition has had a real impact. Gibson Developments have now substantially amended their original planning application, because they realised it would be thrown out by the Planning Committee. You can see the revised plans at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) The reference is 17/1372/FUL. The DAS Addendum is a quick visual summary of the revised proposal.

## There are some positive changes

The flat zinc roofs have been replaced by conventional pitched roofs. The architects have made an effort to relate the development to the local environment. There is reduced overlooking from roof terraces, balconies and windows onto the immediate neighbours.

Hard landscaping has been reduced, and tree belts are to be retained and enhanced (although no details are provided).

## **The revised proposals are still unacceptable – every comment counts!**

Please send your comments to the planners by Friday 3 March. If you objected to the original proposal, you can of course still object to the revised proposal. Each person in a household can send in separate comments. The planners only consider comments which relate to “relevant planning matters”, so below we guide you to [10 grounds for objecting](#) within the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (CLP 2006).

### **1) There is no case for demolishing “Raylands” (section 5/4 of CLP 2006)**

This is the most important issue! The house has been continuously occupied as a family home since 1910, has interesting architectural features and is perfectly habitable. The developer hasn’t explored options to retain, convert and extend the building, which could remain a large family home or be converted into flats.

### **2) The plans do not safeguard environmental character (section 3/3 of CLP 2006)**

The landscape plan only keeps 12 trees out of a total of 29, with the felling of large trees and the loss of hedges, street frontage and shrubs. There are no specific plans for replacement.

### **3) The application doesn’t respond to the local context (section 3/4 of CLP 2006)**

The development of a very large modern block of flats doesn’t fit in with the Hills Road Character Area, which is one of detached and semi-detached villas from the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The proposal doesn’t harmonise with the period style of the four neighbours, with warm red bricks and white painted window frames.

### **4) Damaging impact on neighbouring properties (section 3/10 of CLP 2006)**

The creation of a basement may lower the water table, damage tree roots and result in cracking of the ground on a site where subsidence has been a problem in the recent past.

### **5) A negative impact on the local setting (section 3/12 of CLP 2006)**

A number of recent planning applications in the Hills Road area calling for the demolition of period detached properties and their replacement with flats or other forms of over-development have been rejected by the Planning Committee. Instead properties have been refurbished, extended or replaced with sympathetic moderately sized houses.

**6) Damage to trees (section 4/4 of CLP 2006)**

The excavation of the basement will lower the water table and probably damage tree roots. Also, the use of heavy earth moving equipment on a confined site would inevitably harm the few trees which are not being felled.

**7) Adverse effects on health and the environment (section 4/13 of CLP 2006)**

Adding to traffic congestion, caused by stationary vehicles at the busy Hills Road/Queen Edith's Way junction, and further increasing noise and air pollution.

**8) The plans don't meet local housing needs (section 5/5 of CLP 2006)**

The City Council requires a minimum of 40% affordable housing on-site, but this isn't mentioned in the application, which should provide 6 affordable units. The site is very close to Addenbrooke's Hospital and there are a number of schools nearby. So, huge demand for affordable housing for nurses, doctors, teachers and other key workers.

**9) Unacceptable transport impact (section 8/2 of CLP 2006)**

In 1990 a proposal to develop the same property was refused on traffic grounds. This development with 16 car parking spaces, right next to a busy junction, will have an unacceptable impact on traffic congestion, pollution and accidents.

**10) Inadequate drainage infrastructure (section 8/18 of CLP 2006)**

The huge increase in the impermeable area, the removal of trees and the creation of a large basement would together increase flood risk. Anglian Water and the Sustainable Drainage Engineer consulted by the Council have concluded that the plans are unacceptable.

**Exactly how do I comment?**

**Comment online** through [www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess) The reference is 17/1372/FUL. You can see all the documents and other comments. You have to register first, although this only takes a couple of minutes. If your comment is long, it is best to type it out first and then paste in, just in case the computer "times out".

**Or email** [charlotte.burton@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:charlotte.burton@cambridge.gov.uk) the Senior Planning Officer, making sure to quote the reference 17/1372/FUL.

**Or write** to the Head of Planning, PO Box 700, Cambridge, CB1 OJH, quoting reference 17/1372/FUL.

**Keep in touch**

Email us at [cambridgedeservesbetter@gmail.com](mailto:cambridgedeservesbetter@gmail.com) Some emails still haven't been posted on the planning website. Please send us a copy and we will make sure they are included.