# Cambridge Public Local Inquiry 13th November 1959

*13 November 1959*

This transcription has been generated from the original scanned document using artificial intelligence (AI). It may contain transcription errors; quotations should be checked against the original.

Complete transcription of the supplied 66-page document, including the cover, index and printed pages 216–279. Revised by reading the page images. Original wording is retained; line wrapping and spacing are regularised. Original page numbers are shown in brackets within the continuous text. Fourth day of the inquiry, 13 November 1959. Version 4.

Original cover

COUNTY OF CAMBRIDGE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1947
ACQUISITION OF LAND (AUTHORISATION PROCEDURE) ACT, 1946

(1) PROPOSALS FOR ALTERATIONS OR ADDITIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE COUNTY OF CAMBRIDGE (2) THE CAMBRIDGE (No. 6) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER, 1959

CONCURRENT PROCEDURE FOR AMENDMENT OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE

PROCEEDINGS at THE PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY before J. G. BIRKETT, Esq., M.T.P.I. Inspector appointed by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER, 13th, 1959 FOURTH DAY.

Copyright reserved For personal use only

Original index

INDEX

BURROWS, Mr. T.V. called — Examined by MR BAIN — 217 BEBBINGTON, Mr. B.N. called — Examined by MR SCARMAN — 227 GIMINGHAM, Mr. C.C. re-called — Cross-examined by MR SQUIBB — 234 Re-examined by MR SCARMAN — 257 BURROWS, Mr. T.V. recalled — Cross-examined by MR SQUIBB — 258 GALE, Mr. L.C., called — Examined by MR SQUIBB — 260 Cross-examined by MR SCARMAN — 265 Re-examined by MR SQUIBB — 269 BARR, Mr. L.B., called — Examined by MR SQUIBB — 269 Cross-examined by MR SCARMAN — 271 ADDRESS BY MR SQUIBB ON BEHALF OF THE OWNERS OF THE LION HOTEL — 272 REPLY BY MR SCARMAN ON BEHALF OF THE PLANNING AUTHORITY — 277

*[Original page 216]*

(The Inquiry resumed at 10.5. a.m.)

THE INSPECTOR: May we resume please?

MR SCARMAN: There are two matters before I resume the evidence. The first matter relates to the evidence of the Chief Constable. I am hoping that we shall reach the Chief Constable in chief to-day and it has been represented to me that it would be in every way undesirable that the Chief Constable should have to remain in the vicinity of this room throughout the rest of the Inquiry, and I am wondering whether it would be possible for my learned friends to treat him as they treated Sir William Holford and Mr. Dulake, and cross-examine him all in one. If that course is taken I am told he will be available on Tuesday of next week for cross-examination. There is only one variation on that, that it occurred to me it might be desirable that Mr. Squibb's objection can be heard and concluded to-day and it may help Mr. Squibb should he wish to cross-examine the Chief Constable. He will be available to-day and he can certainly be cross-examined on my learned friend's objection, and I would like to be able to release the Chief Constable after his cross-examination, beginning on Tuesday and perhaps going into Wednesday. Perhaps my learned friends would let me know what they would like to do in due course.

The other matter which I desire to mention to-day is the question of finance. Certain questions on finance were directed to Mr. Dulake yesterday and there were references,

perfectly proper references, to a Minute which has been published of the City Council regarding the financial burden of the Lion Yard redevelopment area. I want to make it clear that the two Authorities are not submitting any figures for the consideration of the Minister other than the figures contained in that Minute, and that they are not submitting any such figures because they do not consider any further figures are relevant to the question which the Minister has to decide in dealing with this development plan proposal.

May I amplify that a little, so that the matter may, I hope, be absolutely clear. If one looks at the figures which have been published, and which I think certainly my learned friend Mr. Megarry referred to yesterday ——

MR MEGARRY: Not me.

MR SCARMAN: They were referred to at any rate by Mr. Widdicombe, I am told, one sees on reading Minute 379, to be found in the Council meeting Minutes of the 25th June, 1959, there the City Treasurer says in regard to the figures there published: "The figures were based on the District Valuer's then current estimate of the cost of acquiring the site. The District Valuer has now issued a revised estimate dated 23rd June of the cost of acquisition, and the City Treasurer submitted a revised estimate based thereon showing anticipated deficits and surpluses as follows", and then he sets out the figures on which my learned friend Mr. Megarry certainly did cross-examine, showing a surplus to arise not before the year 1961 and the deficiencies before that. The figures having already been given, and they there can be found, my respectful submission is that those figures are the only relevant figures at this stage of this Inquiry, and for this reason, that they are, of course, based upon the estimated capital cost of acquisition; the figures which Mr. Dulake indicated may have to be the subject of determination in arbitration or at the Lands Tribunal proceedings also include such matters as the

*[Original page 217]*

cost of the road improvements and other matters which do not directly really arise from this comprehensive development but from the road improvements shown already on the approved Development Plan. Of course what the City Treasurer has done is taking

these capital figures and setting against them the net income expected to arise to the authority from the ground rent, and he has worked out a balancing figure giving a deficiency for the first 60 years and a surplus thereafter. In my respectful submission further than that and greater detail than that is neither relevant nor in the public interest. In so far as the capital figures are concerned, they may be the subject of later proceedings concerning compensation and in so far as the accuracy of the calculation is concerned that must be a purely mathematical matter which it is the responsibility of the City Treasurer to deal with and one must assume in matters of this sort that the City Treasurer is competent and able to make them correctly. The basis of my submission is that those figures already published are alone the figures relevant for the Minister to consider and I, on behalf of the two Authorities, am not asking the Minister to consider any other figures whatever. I have made that statement and, no doubt, at the proper time that statement may either be applauded or criticised by my learned friends. I will now resume the evidence.

MR MEGARRY: I do not propose to either applaud or condemn my learned friend on his financial statement at this stage, but as regards the Chief Constable some of us might conceivably be in difficulties, I certainly may be, if the Chief Constable is only available for cross-examination on Wednesday morning or Tuesday, so perhaps some indulgence may be given to myself and my learned friends who may find themselves to be in difficulty.

MR SCARMAN: Perhaps my learned friend and I can discuss the matter during the mid-day adjournment and find a suitable time.

MR CHAVASSE: I wonder if I can add to what my learned friend has said. There are a number of Counsel for various objectors who are not even here at the moment.

MR SCARMAN: That is why I put it forward provisionally. Obviously it is a matter for consultation with all concerned.

MR CHAVASSE: Perhaps I can speak to my learned friend about it, as he suggests.

MR BAIN: I will now call Mr. Burrows.

MR THOMAS VALENTINE BURROWS, called. Examined by MR BAIN.

Q. Are you Thomas Valentine Burrows? A. Yes; I am the City Engineer and Surveyor to the City of Cambridge.

Q. What are your qualifications? A. Chartered Civil Engineer and Chartered Municipal Engineer.

Q. May I first deal with some comparatively formal matters relating to the Compulsory Purchase Order. I think, first of all, the land in the vicinity of the Lion Yard, which is subject to the Compulsory Purchase Order is shown on map No. 26.59.E.1. which is before the Minister and was prepared by the County Planning Authority? A. It is. That is the map accompanying the Written Statement.

*[Original page 218]*

Q. Then the land which forms the subject of the Cambridge No. 6 Compulsory Purchase Order is shown on plan No. C/4380/4/1 prepared in your department? A. Yes, that is the official map required by the Minister indicating each ownership of property in the Compulsory Purchase Order.

Q. Perhaps you would look at the designation map No. 39 for the Lion Yard. Can you tell us the acreages of the land in the respective portions marked A, B, C and D on that map? Deal first of all with A. A. There are four areas and area A is on the south side of Petty Cury and it contains an acreage of 1.35 acres. Area B is on the north side of Post Office Terrace and it is 0.06 acres. Area C, the large area to the West of St. Andrew's Street and the north of Downing Street is 2.71 acres, and area D on the east side of Corn Exchange Street is 0.15 acres, making a total of 4.27 acres.

Q. I think the contiguous land forming the subject of the Compulsory Purchase Order is land already in the ownership of the Corporation? A. Yes, the Corporation owns three parcels of land shown in the Written Report and analysis, and the sites are the site of the old post office and Alexandra Street which contains an area of 0.49 acres; the present Lion Yard area, 1.56 acres, and near to Downing Street the area known as St. Andrew's Hill, 0.25 acres, making a total ownership by the Corporation of 2.3 acres.

Q. So that the area of land owned by the Corporation and that forming the subject of the Compulsory Purchase Order is 6.57 acres?

A. Yes, that is the total and of that the Corporation own more than one-third — about 35 per cent.

Q. I think you are familiar with this whole area? A. Yes, I am.

Q. What do you say about it in general terms? A. In my opinion the whole area is one of bad layout and obsolete development and the proper way to deal with it is to replan and redevelop the area to a comprehensive pattern. Many of the existing buildings, but not all, are old and in poor condition and are ripe for rebuilding. Those that are not completely old and ripe are certainly wasteful in terms of central area values and I think they are ill-suited to modern centre town development.

Q. Does it follow from what you have just said that the purpose of the Corporation in seeking to secure this land by compulsory purchase, is in order to develop it as a unit as a whole?

Q. Yes, a comprehensive unit.

*[Original page 219]*

Q. Are there any particular reasons in your mind as to why they should do that? A. Well, in addition to developing it as a comprehensive unit the Corporation want to secure the new road, which is termed New Emmanuel Street. They want to construct a new car park in place of the present inconvenient car park. They want to have a site for rebuilding the public library and reference library and they want to make certain that the new development is properly linked with the existing shopping area, both to the north and to the east.

Q. Mr. Burrows, is it right that the appropriate resolutions regarding the Compulsory Purchase Order were passed by the City Council at a meeting held on 23rd April of this year? A. Yes, the proper and official resolutions were passed.

Q. And was it also resolved that the Council should apply for expedited completion procedure to be granted under the Sixth Schedule of the 1944 Act? A. It was.

Q. Now, let us turn to the nature of the development itself. I think you have been City Engineer and Surveyor for quite a number of years? A. Over 14 years.

Q. So you have been considering this matter in its present form since the Minister's decision was announced in September, 1954? A. Even before that; since 1947 or 1948.

Q. And have you looked at it among other things in the light of possible traffic congestion? A. Oh, yes, traffic has been one of the main considerations that must be watched in every form of the development.

Q. What are your views on the subject of congestion in this City generally. How do you analyse it? A. As regards the proposed development, the subject of this Inquiry, I am firmly of the opinion that the new development will not create any greater congestion than there today and, in fact, I would be so bold as to say that there would be less congestion.

Q. Can you analyse what you mean by congestion? A. Well, congestion can refer to a number of factors. You can have congestion of pedestrians, or congestion of cyclists, or congestion of delivery vehicles or congestion of moving traffic. They are all congestion, but they can be individual congestion.

Q. Now, you mentioned pedestrians. Let us deal with that first. At the present time on, perhaps, Saturdays, busy shopping days, do you find congestion on the pavements?

A. On Saturdays and several other days the pavements are more than congested because the pedestrians overflow onto the carriageway and shoppers are jostled and pushed about, and it is really most inconvenient to anyone who wants leisurely to go about any shopping business.

Q. In what particular areas does that apply? A. Well, mostly the whole of the central area because the footpaths are so narrow. For example, in Petty Cury the average width of the footpaths on both sides is only about 3 ft. 6 ins. and Petty Cury carries 'bus traffic as well as other traffic and highly dangerous conditions exist today.

*[Original page 220]*

Q. What about Sidney Street? A. Sidney Street is not much better. The footpaths are slightly wider, about 5 feet wide, but at the southern end of Sidney Street where there are several large shops congestion still occurs there, very serious congestion.

Q. Now are there any steps that can be taken without redevelopment to alleviate that situation? A. It is not possible to widen the footpaths at your own will. You have got to wait until property is redeveloped, and then it might be possible to secure the setting back of the property, perhaps, to 3, 4 or 5 feet and so gain that extra space on the footpath; but it is an intolerably slow process.

Q. We have heard that part of the scheme for the redevelopment of Petty Cury includes the provision of a very much wider footpath on the south side, is that right? A. Yes, it is felt that the opportunity ought to be taken now to provide more comfort for the shoppers when they are going to the new shops by setting back the ground floor of the shops in the form of an arcade, so that people gazing in shop windows will not interrupt the free flow of the pedestrians along the footpath of Petty Cury.

Q. What will be the position within the pedestrian precinct if this development takes place? A. The condition? The conditions will be most pleasant.

Q. I say, what provision will be made for ---? A. Well, the whole of the precinct will be free of vehicular traffic and there will be a very considerable area of footpath on which pedestrians and shoppers can move about freely without being in danger from traffic or embarrassed by petrol fumes or anything else; and actually, if you compare the footpath area of the shopping area after the new development has been carried out, you will find that the amount of footpath available to shoppers will be about 14,000 square yards, whereas today it is only about 5,500 square yards. So the mathematical calculation would seem to prove that after the new development shoppers will have two and a half times as much footpath space to move about in.

Q. Now, Mr. Burrows, I think you secondly mentioned cyclists. At the moment are there any substantial numbers of cycle parks available? A. No, I regret to say, because we cannot find places for them. We try to find every nook and cranny in which we can place cycle racks, but the accommodation we are providing is infinitesimal compared to the demand.

Q. What is the result in practice? A. Well, wherever you go there are heaps of bicycles piled up against shop windows, against the Guildhall and inside passages; in fact,

perhaps there will be eight or nine cycles leaning against the wall so that if you are the unfortunate person to have put your bicycle there first, you just cannot get it out.

Q. And as against that what do you propose in connection with the new development? A. Well, the new development is to insure that adequate accommodation for cyclists is provided and in numerous locations, so from whichever direction a

*[Original page 221]*

cyclist comes he will find a park convenient to him.

Q. Now, then, motor vehicles: can you give us some figures as to the present parking space available for motor vehicles in the centre of the City? A. Well, dealing with the centre of the town and ignoring Market Hill which, strictly speaking is a market although cars are allowed to park there, if the accommodation is available, there are only two car parks, the present Lion Yard surface car park which has an accommodation of about 220 cars, and New Square car park with an accommodation of 270 which, in total, means 490.

Q. Now, within the comparatively immediate future do you visualise any further car parks arriving? A. Well, the one in the Lion Yard, most certainly, and that will hold, as you have heard 500 vehicles belonging to the public and about 230 for the occupiers of the property. In addition we are actively pursuing a scheme for building a car park in King Street. May I point out King Street, Sir, or do you know it? (Indicated on Plan by Witness). It is hoped there that a multi-deck car park will be built which will accommodate about 265 cars. There is also another car park on which the Council have been taking the necessary procedure and that is situated at Park Street and as a surface car park that will hold about 110 cars, but ultimately it will become a multi-deck car park accommodating about 350 cars. So the new provision might be 1,345 total cars.

Q. 1,345 as against 490? A. Yes.

Q. And have you any further sites under consideration or not at the moment? A. Oh, we are continually looking for further sites, and I do not know whether we want to disclose them here this morning, but as an example New Square Car Park which I mentioned now holds 270 cars; it would be possible to erect a multi-storey car park

there, and that would hold a considerable number of cars, a considerable number, possibly four times what is there today.

Q. Can you tell us a little more about the immediate prospects, first of all in relation to King Street car park? A. Yes, the City and the County have been in close consultation in order to ascertain which is the quickest way of securing what we want, and I understand that at the last meeting of the County Council a resolution was passed to proceed by way of a Comprehensive Development Area in order to secure this land for a car park.

Q. So you envisage that going ahead quite quickly, within the limits of the Comprehensive Development Area procedure?

A. If everything goes well and not too many objectors appear I should think it ought to be finished in three years.

Q. And Park Street? A. Park Street has had a rather chequered career up to now as we had a Town Planning Inquiry on that and the Minister supported the application we had made to use that land for a car park. We then had a Magistrates' Court Inquiry under Section 68 and with the exception of one parcel of land it was cleared by the Magistrates, and I think within the next 10 days or so

*[Original page 222]*

there is to be an inquiry held by your Minister, Sir, into a Compulsory Purchase Order; and subject to that Compulsory Purchase Order being confirmed notices to treat will be served and I should hope that as a surface car park it will be in operation within 12 months.

Q. I think, as everyone knows, there is an obstruction caused from time to time in the centre of the City, among other things, by delivery vans? A. That is a very real obstruction.

Q. Yes; is there any rear access available to the shops in Market Street or Petty Cury or Sidney Street?

A. One or two of the shops in Market Street have a rear access from Green Street, but nevertheless it is very common to see two, three or, perhaps, four large delivery vans

parked in Market Street and sometimes drawn up with their wheels on the pavement in order that they can deliver the goods and at the same time keep the traffic moving. But they are a nuisance to pedestrians and traffic alike.

Q. What about Petty Cury? A. The same thing applies in Petty Cury. There is practically no rear access to any of the properties.

Q. As we have already heard and seen from the plans I think the Lion Yard proposals allow for all the new shops in Petty Cury to be serviced from an underground rear access?

A. No, I would not agree that they are all to be serviced from an underground access; but they are all, and I underline the word "all", to be serviced from a rear access or some other part than a public highway.

Q. I thought that the Petty Cury ones were by means of an underground passage? A. Petty Cury are to be serviced by an underground passage, but some of the others by a back access.

Q. Now, are there other schemes afoot to alleviate congestion on approaching the centre? A. One of the principal schemes is the new Chesterton Bridge and that is in the Development Plan, and if I may point it out, Sir, on the Development Map I can show you the route. From the London Road which is known in Cambridge as the Trumpington Road opposite the Royal Hotel, the Chesterton Bridge route will proceed along Lensfield Road, crossing over Hills Road, along Gonville Place, crossing over Mill Road, along East Road, crossing over Newmarket Road, over the River Cam at this point and so through to Chesterton Road and on to Milton Road which, as you know, Sir, leads to the Fens; so that it will be a direct connection between the Fen road, the Fen traffic and the London Road.

Q. Yes, and what stage has that proposal got to? A. The whole of the route has been surveyed and plotted to a scale of one over 500, and on the Plans has been shown the line and design of the new road, and those plans have now been submitted to the Divisional Road Engineer of the Minister of Transport, and pressure is being brought to bear to secure the utmost priority for this particular job; and, in fact, at the last

meeting of the City Council a Notice of Motion was put down on the Agenda paper, supported by several important members of the Council of

*[Original page 223]*

all political parties asking the Minister to give this his most urgent consideration. In fact, two days ago I received from the Divisional Road Engineer instructions to proceed with the taking of bore holes on either side of the River in order to determine the substrata and bearing capacity of the soil, so I feel fairly confident myself that the Divisional Road Engineer of the Ministry of Transport, having given that authority, that the scheme has a good chance of coming near the top of the priority list.

*[Original page 224]*

Q. Have you been able to form any estimate of how long it will take to build the bridge once authority is given?

A. I do not think it should take longer than three years to build the bridge and the necessary approach roads, but of course the whole of the road between the London Road and the Fenn Road, the road leading the fens is to be very considerably improved and in many cases made into a dual carriageway road, but as soon as the bridge and approach roads are built, within three years, the route could become useful.

Q. The fact is as we know there is a redevelopment area in East Road I think? A. That is the point the Minister has approved a re-development area which involves the demolition of quite an area of obsolent property, the first stage of the rebuilding is now taking place and the first stage is actually fronting the traffic route so at that point it will be possible to secure the widening.

Q. Is there another point of difficulty from a traffic point of view in Cambridge at Four Lamp Junction between Victoria Road and the Newmarket Road in Jesus Lane?

A. Yes, a great point of difficulty, do you know it, Sir.

THE INSPECTOR: No, I shall be glad if you will point it out.

MR BAIN: Let us deal with it in a little more detail, does traffic approach that junction first of all over Victoria Bridge and down Victoria Avenue. Victoria Avenue is north and south, the northern end being Mitchams Corner, the southern end being Four

Lamps, and all the traffic between the Midlands and the East coast makes use of that road, the route being along trunk road A45 to Mitcham Corner, down Victoria Avenue which is only a Class B Road, and then eastwards along A45 and of course the return traffic is in the opposite direction. A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Is there in addition to that traffic entering Cambridge down Victoria Avenue? A. The bulk of this large residential area to the north of Cambridge which is expanding day by day must make use of Victoria Avenue as there is no bridge to the east of it at all, so in effect all the residential traffic generating from the residential area wishing to get into town meets the trunk road traffic at Mitchams Corner and feels its way through Victoria Avenue and round the small roundabout at Four Lamps Corner.

Q. What is proposed by way of improvement at Four Lamps?

A. The present roundabout, I have not got the dimensions but it is one of the smallest roundabouts I know of and for a year or two a scheme and estimate has been before the Ministry of Transport for bringing that roundabout up to modern standards. It does mean the acquisition of land but I am hopeful, and I have reason to be hopeful, that we will secure authority to proceed with this improvement in the next financial year.

*[Original page 225]*

Q. An indication of what is intended is given, I think, in Map 9 of the Book of Maps accompanying the Plan? A. It is an indication but the final working drawings may not be quite the same.

Q. You have mentioned already Mitchams Corner on the other side of the River Cam? A. Yes.

Q. Are there improvements proposed there? A. Yes, The roundabout system at Mitchams Corner is quite a complicated one because there are five roads meeting at that point and at present the weaving angles on the roundabout very nearly approach a rightangle in one or two places, with the result that as soon as there is any increase in traffic, such as starting time in the morning, lunch time, or evening time, the traffic very frequently jams completely and in order to relieve that congestion which is very serious I have prepared a scheme for a very much larger roundabout system which will give the proper weaving angles and eliminate entirely any crossing over points.

Q. Have you any idea as to when that is likely to come to fruition? A. I cannot be quite so definite about the date for that, one is sure of Mitchams Corner, but I am sure that the Divisional Road Engineer is well aware of the difficulties which exist to-day and very sympathetic with the scheme for improving the roundabout.

Q. Mr. Burrows, just one other matter, you have mentioned on the Chesterton Bridge route the crossing of Lensfield Road over to Gonville Place, crossing Hills Road, is that known locally as Hyde Park Corner? A. The junction at Hills Road coming from the south and proceeding into Regents Street and Lensfield Road from the west proceeding into Gonville Place is known locally sir as Hyde Park Corner, and a scheme has been prepared and approved by the Council for the provision of an adequate roundabout to cope with the volume of traffic which uses that junction. The traffic at present is controlled by traffic lights, but a roundabout would be far better. May I say that at the junction of East Road and Chesterton Bridge Road there is a scheme for the enlargement of the small roundabout at that point and it is quite possible I think at the building of the fire station at this corner by the County Council, the roundabout will be enlarged in the matter of the next two or three years again, and similarly at the point where Newmarket Road crosses the Chesterton Bridge Road there is a large roundabout to be approved there.

Q. The majority of these improvements you envisage is coming within the next three years? A. I think Four Lamps will come within the next three years and the roundabout at Perse's School will come in three years although perhaps not in its final form, and also the larger roundabout at Mill Road Corner.

Q. When you consider the Lion Yard problems are you considering them also in the light of those road improvements outside the immediate area which are intended to be carried out?

A. Yes, I think a lot of the congestion in the town centre is caused by traffic wishing to get from one side

*[Original page 226]*

of the town to the other and these improvements will make alternative routes more convenient.

Q. Mr. Burrows, is peak hour traffic a problem at the moment?

A. It is everywhere, every town.

Q. Have you any ideas as to the solution of that? A. I have very strong views but I cannot understand, sir, why some determined effort should not be made to stagger the starting times and finishing times of large establishments. For example, in the City alone I should think we must have between 11,000 and 12,000 school children, and I suppose there is also 6,000 or 7,000 undergraduates, in addition, there is all the office workers and shop assistants, but why they should all start at nine o'clock in the morning, I do not understand.

Q. It is the fact that they all start at nine in the morning?

A. Yes, there are some shops which open earlier but the majority of the schools and university lectures start at 9.05 to be exact, as they have done for centuries.

Q. Do you anticipate that staggering hours by a matter of 15 or 20 minutes would make a material difference? A. I do a very considerable difference.

Q. It may be suggested that the advent of the development of Lion Yard would increase the problems of street traffic, what do you say of that? A. I do not see how it can, the whole Development Plan must be taken as a whole picture, and you cannot take one item out of it and deal with it separately. The Development Plan allows for a ring of car parks around the central area and when they are completed the difficulty of all cars congregating in the centre and all wishing to pass out at once will disappear because they will all start from several points around the ring of car parks.

Q. You have mentioned the possible need to stagger working hours, do you think that that need will be accentuated by the development in the Lion Yard or do you think it is something which will come anyway? A. The need to stagger starting times and finishing times is here now and it is here now in every town, the Lion Yard will have very little effect on it.

Q. Lastly let me ask you about the timing of the re-development. Mr. Dulake yesterday said that he considered the development should be done, as it were, in one major stage over a period of two years, as opposed to doing it in parts with a gap of a year, a gap of

a year and another gap, and so forth. Do you agree with that? A. I think it is most essential that you should start at one end of the site and move straight through it in one continuous operation.

Q. How is that going to affect, for example, the shopkeepers of Petty Cury, assuming that these properties come in to the Development area? A. There is a lot of detail still to be worked out, but I should imagine that the operation would commence from the south of the area and move northwards towards Petty Cury, so that by the time the demolition men are ready to tackle Petty Cury, there ought to be several shops already built and ready for occupation in the southerly part of the scheme.

*[Original page 227]*

MR SCARMAN: That is the evidence in chief of Mr. Burrows, and Mr. Burrows will be available for cross-examination as objections arise. I will now call Mr. Bebbington.

Mr. B. N. BEBBINGTON, Called Examined by Mr. SCARMAN

Q. Is your full name Bernard Nicholas Bebbington? A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Bebbington, are you Chief Constable of Cambridge?

A. I am

Q. Have you held that appointment since 1944? A. Yes.

Q. Are you Chairman of the Eastern Accident Prevention Federation? A. Yes.

Q. Member of the National Executive Committee of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents? A. Yes.

Q. Member of the National Public Safety Committee? A. Yes.

Q. Of the Safety Education Committee? A. Yes.

Q. And on the Minister of Transport's Committee of Road Safety? A. Yes.

Q. And for some years you were a member of the Road Users Committee? A. Yes.

Q. I think it is part of your responsibility as Chief Constable to deal with traffic matters and you have considered the Lion Yard proposals? A. Yes.

Q. And in so far as these proposals are based upon a concept of providing pedestrian precincts, what is your view of them in regard to the problem of traffic?

A. I welcome the pedestrian precinct in that at the moment the pavements in the City are far too small to provide safety for pedestrians especially on busy shopping days.

Q. And no doubt you heard what Mr. Burrows said about the precincts and the relief that it should give to pedestrians in the centre of the City and you agree with him?

A. I agree that it would give relief to the pedestrians, yes.

*[Original page 228]*

Q. You have also, of course, considered that part of the proposals which provides for a car park for some 730 cars to be put underground and the widening of Corn Exchange Street and the building of New Emmanuel Street? A. Yes.

Q. I would welcome your views about the car park and the widening of Corn Exchange Street, and the building of New Emmanuel Street? A. Well, of course, the car park as envisaged is larger than that recommended by the Ministry of Transport in a memorandum of 1946 which, amongst other things, stated that to avoid the congestion of street surrounding a car park, the capacity should generally not exceed 400 vehicles in a built-up area, unless it is clear the approach roads to the car park can safely carry the intake of cars exceeding this capacity. The widening of Corn Exchange Street and the New Emmanuel Street would be suitable to carry the traffic from the car park as planned, but I think it ought to be remembered that traffic getting there will have to pass still through many of the narrow streets in the City. For example, to approach the development area from Magdalene Street you might take perhaps one of three courses; you could come down Bridge Street into St. Johns Street and Pembroke Street, and then you could go via Market Square, Peas Hill, Wheeler Street, to the New Corn Exchange Street, or you could go along Market Street, Sidney Street, St. Andrew's Street, or, of course, you can go along Kings Parade, Trumpington Street, Pembroke Street, Downing Street, but along each of those routes you come across a certain number of difficulties and the route is congested. If you come from the other direction, Trumpington Road to reach the development area, you go along Trumpington Street, Pembroke Street and Downing Street, and the greatest difficulty is the turn from Trumpington Street into Pembroke Street, which is a very nasty one. Of course, to balance this, the New Emmanuel Street is going to make the entrance from the Hills

Road direction very much better in that in Downing Street at the moment you get great difficulties with the traffic, and so there will be an improvement at that point.

Q. I am not going to spend much time on statistics with you, although my learned friends may, but is it a fair estimate of the increase of traffic in the central streets of Cambridge over the period 1948 to 1956 an annual increase of about 3.5 per cent? A. That is so.

Q. And, no doubt, as Chief Constable, you do expect that you may have to deal with some increase of traffic if the Lion Yard proposals are implemented? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Now just tell me this, would you? Viewing your problem on the assumption that Lion Yard as proposed is redeveloped, is the traffic problem one of peak hour traffic or is it a problem of the whole 24 hours? A. At present the biggest problem, the great pressing problem, is the peak hour traffic.

Q. I would like you to tell the Inspector what are the peak hours in Cambridge where your problem is most acute? A. The morning peak is from 8.30 to 9.30 roughly; of course it tends to compress itself a little bit within that hour, and there are smaller peaks at one o'clock, for a shorter period, and then a return lunch-hour peak, also a small one, from about 2.15, around that period, and then there is a very large peak again in the evening when the shops and offices are closing and it may run from 5 o'clock until 6.

*[Original page 229]*

Q. Although, of course, traffic all the day is a problem in modern life, is your problem with regard to keeping it moving really acute during those periods you have indicated?

A. Yes, the speed of traffic in the City, which I have had tested during the daytime, is around 14 miles an hour, which is very good for a city of this sort, but it falls down very much at peak hours and may reduce on a normal day to eight miles an hour, and down again on really bad occasions to as low as three miles an hour.

Q. To summarise it, during the majority of the day, the off peak periods, the traffic, no doubt assisted by your police constables, keeps moving at a reasonable speed for the city, but during peak hours one does have a significant drop in speed and, therefore, delays and congestion? A. Yes. I would like to add that Cambridge being — I do not

want to be misunderstood by using these words — a peculiar place, it has problems which do not arise, I think, elsewhere, in which for example on certain days during the University term and some activity you will find that the traffic goes up to a peak at a time you would not expect it, but that is because of special functions. The normal mid-morning traffic is very much below the peak, and afternoon traffic likewise.

Q. I think it would be helpful if you would give some figures of a census you took in July of traffic approaching the centre from various directions during the peak hour period 8.30 to 9.30 a.m., and then the immediately ensuing period which, of course, is after 10.30 to 11.30 in the morning? A. Yes.

Q. Would you give us those figures and the place where the census was taken, quite slowly? A. This census was taken at the following points around the city centre: St. Andrew's Street, Magdalene Street, Emmanuel Street, Trumpington Street, Silver Street. They were taken in July and outside the University term. The figures that were compared were those of the hour between 8.30 a.m. and 9.30 a.m., and 10.30 a.m. and 11.30 a.m. and these figures refer only to traffic entering the city.

(For convenience the figures then quoted by the witness are set out in table form:-)

St. Andrew's Street. 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.: 620 cycles; 463 motor-vehicles. 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.: 249 cycles; 368 motor-vehicles.

Magdalene Street. 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.: 769 cycles; 506 motor-vehicles. 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.: 154 cycles; 272 motor-vehicles.

Emmanuel Street. 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.: 680 cycles; 257 motor-vehicles. 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.: 160 cycles; 143 motor-vehicles.

Trumpington Street. 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.: 210 cycles; 306 motor-vehicles. 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.: 102 cycles; 230 motor-vehicles.

*[Original page 230]*

Silver Street. 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.: 150 cycles; 182 motor-vehicles. 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.: 64 cycles; 96 motor-vehicles.

That does show, I think, quite a high peak, especially with the cycle traffic which, of course, is a particular feature of the city's traffic problem.

Q. How about motor-cycles? A. They are included in motor-vehicles.

Q. Of course, you told us that census was taken during the vacation. I suppose during term time one would expect certainly an appreciable increase in cycle traffic? A. There would be an appreciable increase in cycle traffic, yes.

Q. Again may one take it that the evening peak during the hours you have given us, 5.30 to 6.30. I think, although you have no census figures available, would be at least as high, if not higher, than those figures? A. Yes, it is quite as high because I do have some figures for October, 1957, for Magdalene Street, the only ones I have, between 5 and 6, and I see the hourly total of motor-vehicles north-bound in that road at that time was 509. I am afraid it is the only figure I have.

Q. It is an interesting comparison. Between 5 and 6, north-bound out of the city, that is to say the peak out of the city in the evening, was, in 1957, 509 and we have a figure for July, 1959, in-bound in the morning, the peak hour, of 506? A. Yes.

Q. And, of course, it is right to take note of the 3.5 increase, I suppose, in traffic in the years between 1957 and 1959?

A. Yes. You cannot altogether compare those two, because one is in term, and one out, and I want to make it clear it is the only figure I have got for a traffic peak recently.

Q. Does term time make a substantial difference to motor-vehicle traffic in the city? A. There are quite a number of lecturers who can afford cars and who come by car, but there are also a very large number who still cycle.

Q. Now dealing with the shopping traffic implications of the redevelopment scheme; does shopping traffic on the whole enter and leave the centre during peak hours or during off peak hours? A. No, I think it does not start, the shopping influx from the outskirts does not start before 10 o'clock in the morning at the earliest, and then again it starts some time after two o'clock and it may add slightly to the evening traffic going out, but it does not add to the morning peak.

Q. So in so far as the Lion Yard redevelopment may add to the shopping traffic, that traffic will be added, with the possible exception of the evening, to off peak hours

where you already maintain a satisfactory flow of traffic? A. It will be added to off peak hours, yes.

Q. With regard to any additional traffic that the Lion Yard redevelopment may bring in regard to office traffic, that plainly, if there is such an addition, be an addition during peak hours? A. Well, a good deal of it will be peak hours because of the extra people working in these offices. Some of it would be off peak hours because of business done — it is very difficult to determine what traffic will come unless you know who is going to take the offices.

*[Original page 231]*

Q. So that a person working there, employed there, will be coming and going at peak hours and the persons resorting there for business reasons may be in off peak hours? A. Yes.

Q. Is it possible, in your view, to make any evaluation as to extra traffic that may be originated by reason of the University accommodation in the redevelopment and also by reason of hotel provision in the redevelopment? Could you assist the Inspector on those two matters? A. I find it exceedingly difficult to assess any of these figures of traffic especially, after listening to this Inquiry, so much seems to be supposition. If you do not have the three towers there then presumably you will have less accommodation, I do not know — or divided up differently — and it is extremely difficult to assess the traffic increase until you know the sort of occupancy, but if suppose the University has something like 100,000 square feet, that would of course mean probably a staff of say 100 and undergraduates of about 1,000. When you come to the question of a hotel, here again we are in some difficulty until you know what sort of hotel it is. If it is an extremely attractive hotel with very good cuisine it will attract more traffic than if it is just an ordinary middle-class hotel without any special attraction.

Q. Really it has, as you say, at this stage to be largely a matter of estimate. A. I would have thought that with a hotel of good type it would be reasonable to expect there would be some 100 to 200 extra cars brought in by that hotel, that sort of thing.

Q. I want to pass to another aspect of these proposals. You, no doubt, are aware that the proposals do make provision for off street facilities for the loading and unloading of goods to shops and business premises in the area? A. Yes.

Q. The existing facilities or lack of facilities for loading and unloading in the central shopping area, do you consider the proposals to be an advance upon the existing conditions in that respect? A. Any provision which allows for delivery and supply to the back of premises to get these vans and lorries off the road is, of course, a great advance.

Q. You have given us your views as to the provision of parking facilities included in the scheme, but I would like your view just generally as to the wisdom or unwisdom of providing extra parking facilities in the centre, and your views as to the value of the provisions contained in the proposals?

A. I did say earlier on that the maximum number of cars for a car park in a built-up area was recommended by the Minister of Transport as 400, but in view of the development which is proposed here one would have to accept a much larger car park because it is quite obvious that it would be needed in this particular area, and so I think that the provision for 730 cars in view of this development would be very necessary. It is interesting to note that a car park of that size will take all the cars at present parked on the Lion Yard at 9.30 in the morning, plus all the cars which are parked in the street at that time in the central area, so it will be a very efficient unit for off street parking.

*[Original page 232]*

Q. I think Mr. Gimingham, in the course of his evidence some days ago now gave his view that it would be necessary to have some comprehensive controlled parking plan for the centre of the City anyway, that is to say, control of street parking. What are your views on that, Mr. Bebbington? A. Well, I think, of course, that street parking will have to be controlled because if you do not have control you will not get people to use the car parks. They do not use them at present, and yet we are told that we hound the motorist in order to make him use the parks, but as I see it, with the new scheme for controlling the streets, then that sort of restriction will have to be tightened up very

much. It will make some difficulty for us, but the new car parks will have to be used if they are to be workable from an economic point of view.

Q. I think I can take this shortly. You were in the room, I think, when Mr. Burrows was describing the present proposals for road improvements in the City. You know, of course, that those proposals are going ahead and no doubt you think them necessary and look forward to their implementation? A. Well, I think they are vital to the development of the centre. I did not hear, perhaps, all that he said because I do not think I was here all the time. Can I deal with the difficulties?

Q. I should like you to indicate the ones you regard as vital?

A. The difficulties that occur at the moment, certainly at peak hours, are at Hills Road, the Gonville Place–Lensfield Road junction, referred to as "Hyde Park Corner", and the scheme I did hear was put forward for that. They also build up at the Victoria Avenue junction with Chesterton Road and the Victoria Avenue junction of Newmarket Road, and also I heard the suggestions with regard to that. They build up at Magdalene Street: I did not hear any suggestion for Magdalene Street — there may have been one — and at the junction of Fen Causeway and Lensfield Road they build up now at peak hours. Internally we get hold-ups at a number of points including Downing Street at its junction with St. Andrew's Street which, of course, will be dealt with under the Plan by the New Emmanuel Street, and at the other end of Pembroke Street at a junction with Trumpington Street, which is a very bad junction indeed. The other hold-ups, I feel, can only be remedied by, perhaps, new bridges and new roads. I did hear Mr. Gimingham mention during his evidence that the Downing Place proposal would be carried through to Regent Street.

Q. To Regent Street? A. That would assist, and the widening of Tennis Court Road would assist.

Q. Now there is one matter I want to put to you on a certain hypothesis. Will you assume, Mr. Bebbington, that there may have to be — it is not for you to say whether there will be — a choice between a unified comprehensive development of this area, with its provision for off-street loading and unloading of vehicles, in the car parks and so forth, or piecemeal normal development as and when the economic interests of

various owners and tenants in this area lead them to put forward proposals. Can you tell me whether, from a traffic point of view, you would prefer one or the other, and if so which? A. Well, of course, if the development can take place piecemeal and to the same extent that is proposed under the Development Plan, then without

*[Original page 233]*

the blessings of the new roads and the car park the state of the centre of the City would be very much worse. You would be left with this development with no roads — no new roads and no car parks to take the traffic in. I think that one has got to look forward in the next 10 years to a great period of difficulty in all City centres, much greater than you have got at the moment, due to the natural increase in traffic. It is nothing to do with development, but when you put hotchpotch development on the top of that in a city centre and make no provision for parking or new roads, then your centre will strangle itself and die as it indeed has done, of course, in America.

Q. So that I am not saying it is, but if the choice be between comprehensive development under the guidance of a central authority in the centre and normal commercial redevelopment under no such guidance, do I take it you would prefer the former? A. If I had but the choice of two, I would accept the first.

THE INSPECTOR: There is one point I was rather hoping Mr. Bebbington would comment on. I do not know if it would be appropriate now. In the Conditions it does state, with regard to Petty Cury, that at some future date this street may be closed to vehicular traffic other than that necessary to serve the shops and other buildings and the public services. I wonder if he could comment on that.

MR SCARMAN: I will ask him to do so. You heard the Inspector's remark. Would you comment upon the possibility of closing Petty Cury to wheel traffic? A. Well, my view is that at the moment Petty Cury should be closed to wheel traffic because it is far too narrow and the pavements are too narrow. We have tried to take some of the traffic out of it without a great deal of success, but, of course, if it is to be widened, and very considerably widened, and the pedestrian accommodation much improved, the need for closing it to vehicular traffic is not as great as it is at the moment.

Q. Just to see I understand that, Petty Cury as it is at the moment, because of the narrowness of the pavements and so forth you would like to see closed to wheel traffic?

A. Yes.

Q. But if, of course, there was a redevelopment scheme providing extra space for pedestrians to move about in and look at the shops and so forth, then it might not become so imperative in your view to get it closed to wheel traffic? A. No; and a further thing is, of course, that if you have shops there which provide a rear access you take a lot of the obstruction of Petty Cury as it stands at present away.

Q. Yes, of course; you, concerned as you are with traffic flow in the centre, would like to have an effective channel of traffic in Petty Cury? If Petty Cury was so improved that wheel traffic benefited indirectly from the pedestrian benefit, that would be all to the good?

A. Yes, anything that splits up the traffic into streams of flow helps.

MR SCARMAN: That probably meets your point, Sir.

*[Original page 234]*

THE INSPECTOR: Yes, thank you very much.

MR SCARMAN: I do not wish to cross-examine Mr. Bebbington now, so that really brings me to the conclusion of the general case subject to cross-examination of the two authorities that I represent. No doubt I can say this. There is no need for Mr. Bebbington to remain here for the rest of today unless my learned friend Mr. Squibb requires him, in which case he will be here this afternoon.

MR SQUIBB: At the moment I do not have it in mind to cross-examine Mr. Bebbington at all, but I should like him to be available in case I have second thoughts.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER CHARLES GIMINGHAM re-called. Cross-examined by Mr. SQUIBB

Q. Mr. Gimingham, there was reference yesterday to four plans, A, B, C and D, and as I understand it A and B were the plans which we marked J and K and you did say you

were going to produce C and D? A. That is not right, Sir. K is not one of those. Mr. Dulake's Plan is not one of those four.

Q. I see. Well, J equals A, is that right? A. J equals A.

Q. All right. Now can you produce B, C and D? (Plans produced and handed to Counsel). Now, I suppose we had better letter those additional plans in a sequence to follow on what we have already had. We have got as far as L, I think.

MR SCARMAN: We have got to M.

MR SQUIBB: Yes, Scheme B, that will be M.

MR SCARMAN: No, it will be N. C will be O and D will be B.

THE INSPECTOR: Would you repeat those?

MR SCARMAN: Sir, Scheme B will be N, C will be O. Scheme D will be the letter P. Scheme A is already the letter J. J and K, indeed, are both of them Scheme A, J, so far as I recollect, being submitted to Mr. Dulake and K being his response to J.

MR SQUIBB: While we are still on the mechanics of the thing, Mr. Gimingham, Plan J which we had yesterday is dated the 9th January, 1956. The four plans which were put in this morning which include Scheme A which you say equals J are all dated 15th April 1957. Those are, I presume the dates when they were actually drawn?

MR SCARMAN: That is right, Sir. I was indicating, I hope, in conclusion yesterday that one can be misled by the dates on these drawings. Mr. Gimingham can indeed, I am sure, if my learned friends wish, give a chronological sequence of these schemes. One must not be misled by the dates on the drawings.

MR SQUIBB: Yes; well, now, Mr. Gimingham, can we get those in actual chronological order? Scheme A, I take it

*[Original page 235]*

is the 9th January, 1956. That was the date when it first came into existence? A. Yes, of course, Scheme A is basically the Holford Scheme.

Q. I want to get the dates right? A. Yes, that would be about the date.

Q. Scheme B, when was the first edition of that? A. I am afraid I cannot tell you exactly. I would say it was during 1956 sometime.

Q. Sometime in 1956. And C? A. C would be certainly at the end of 1956 or the beginning of 1957, and the same with D. They were prepared at the same time with very, very slight modifications.

Q. Thank you. Mr. Gimingham, how long have you personally been concerned with this matter? A. Since 1952 or 1951. I came to Cambridge in 1951. I will say from 1951.

Q. I see. You were here at the time of the last Inquiry?

A. I was.

Q. And Mr. Waide has been here throughout? A. Yes.

Q. I observe that Mr. Waide has signed the various reports and so forth, but we are not to have the pleasure of hearing him? A. Well, the County Planning Officer naturally signs reports coming out from the Department.

Q. Does that mean that although these documents are signed by Mr. Waide in the ordinary constitutional manner they are, in fact, your work? A. I am here as a witness for the County Planning Committee — the local planning authority — and I therefore represent the County Council in that way.

*[Original page 236]*

Q. I will repeat the question I put to you, Mr. Gimingham, perhaps I had better do it one by one, the Report and Written Analysis is that your work? A. The work of the department, I have been personally responsible for this document, but I am not saying I wrote every word of it.

Q. But it was you and not Mr. Wood who was responsible in a colloquial sense of the word "responsible"? A. Mr. Wood approved it before it was published.

Q. You were the man who did the work? A. I think that is fair.

Q. No doubt you had assistants but you did the work? A. Yes.

Q. You examined the proposed re-development areas yourself carefully? A. Oh, yes.

Q. I ask because there is one property that I am instructed about in detail and that is the Lion Hotel? A. Yes.

Q. Would you turn to p.4 of this Report and Written Analysis, para.20, where you say: "One of the properties affected by the redevelopment is an hotel of some 44 bedrooms which also provides accommodation for functions of various kinds." Do you produce that statement? A. That statement refers to a survey of hotel accommodation in Cambridge which was taken in 1951 and I regret it was not checked when this publication was produced and I understand now that the number of bedrooms has been increased?

Q. I do not know whether it has been increased, Mr. Gimingham, but the number is now 57? A. So I understand.

Q. Have you any reason to believe that they have built additional bedrooms? A. I do not know about built, they may have adapted it since 1951.

Q. So that although the report is dated 1959 the information can be dated back to 1951? A. In that case only.

Q. That is the one exception I have hit upon? A. Yes.

Q. And everything else is to be relied on implicitly? A. As you will see the difference, generally speaking, of the maps and details are stated where they apply, they are mostly 1955.

Q. As you realise you cannot have a Comprehensive Development Area under the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 just because you would like one, you have to bring yourself within the statutory provisions which regulate the case in which you can have one? A. Certainly.

Q. And that is why you put para.3 into the Written Statement?

A. Yes.

Q. That shows why you say that this case falls fairly and squarely within Sect.5 of the Act? A. Yes.

Q. You say it is intended that the development area should be re-developed as a whole in order to deal satisfactorily with conditions of bad layout and obsolete development and to provide a new road, a car park as specified in the Town Map of the City of Cambridge and the Written Statement Part I? A. Yes.

Q. You say as specified in the Town Map, City of Cambridge, and the Written Statement Part I, these documents do not provide for a Comprehensive Development Area such as you are now proposing does it? A. No.

Q. Why did you put that Paragraph into the Written Statement? A. Under the terms of Sect.5, there are certain reasons for defining a Comprehensive Development Area and one of them is to provide for works and uses specified in Development Plans.

Q. You know perfectly well, Mr. Gimingham, what I am putting to you is what you have stated is not correct in so far as it refers to the Town Map and the Written Statement Part I and I understood you agreed to that? A. The Analysis I feel should be read in this way, it is intended that the land contained within the boundary of the Comprehensive Development Area should be re-developed as a whole in order to deal satisfactorily with bad conditions, that is reason 1. Reason 2 is to provide for new roads and car parks, etc.

Q. And the Comprehensive Development Area which this Written Statement is dealing with is not specified in the Town Map of Cambridge or in the Written Statement Part I? A. No, it is before the Minister now.

Q. Why did you say it is in this Report? A. I did not say so, I said the car parks were specified.

Q. That is what you intend it to mean? A. Certainly.

Q. If we turn back to your Report we find in para 2 that proposals for the redevelopment of the area were first put forward by the County Council's consultants in their Report "Cambridge Planning Proposals" published in 1950, and if we look back to para.1 we find that the area is a Comprehensive Development Area? A. Yes, that could be a capital A in that case.

Q. That again is not correct is it? A. In para.2 it is a small a, I am not referring specifically to the development area with a capital A.

Q. So para.2 is referring to a different area from that in para 1? A. I think that is the correct interpretation of the context.

Q. Para.2 goes on to refer to the Development Plan and the Minister's letter accompanying the approval of the Plan?

A. Yes.

Q. And these documents refer to a smaller area than that which is the subject of this Inquiry? A. I was not aware that the Minister's letter referred to any particular area in detail smaller or larger.

*[Original page 238]*

Q. The Minister's letter was approving the Plan was it not? A. Yes, this Plan and the Written Statement.

Q. And the plan referred to an area in the Lion Yard and immediately round it behind Petty Cury? A. You say the Plan?

Q. The Development Plan which the Minister was approving?

A. No, the Plan the Minister approved did not comprise any Development area.

Q. That was left to be done in the future, but the Comprehensive Development which was envisaged in the Report, the basis of the Plan was an area behind Petty Cury? A. That is the area which is referred to in Sir William Holford's Report which as you say is part of the Written Analysis, but not on anything which the Minister approved.

Q. And when the previous Inquiry was held and the Development Plan was put before the Inspector, it was never suggested to him that there should be a Comprehensive Development Area including the south side of Petty Cury? A. I do not think any suggestion as to the precise area of a Comprehensive Development Plan was made in 1952.

Q. But you see in your Report you are putting forward a scheme which is now being adumbrated as though it were the fulfilment of something which had already been approved in principle by the Minister? A. We are putting it forward certainly in terms

of principle, the details, the boundaries of the area are for consideration to-day in this Inquiry.

Q. And you are not suggesting, I take it, Mr. Gimingham then, that the question whether or not the south side of Petty Cury should be included in this Development Area as has been in any way concluded or prejudiced by anything which has gone before? A. No.

Q. You start with an entirely clean slate so far as this is concerned? A. As regards that point, yes.

Q. Turning back to your Written Statement in which you set out the purpose of the Comprehensive area, the development of new roads and a car park, you do not want the property on the south side of Petty Cury to proceed new roads or a car park do you? A. We do require some parts anyhow, I do not know how deep we go back from Petty Cury, but we require some part for the underground car park.

Q. The question whether the car park should be underground, above ground, or partly one and the other, is entirely fluid? A. I would not say entirely fluid now.

Q. You say not entirely fluid now, do you mean because you have had Stone Toms & Partners scheme? A. Yes.

Q. But we are not inquiring into that scheme? A. No.

Q. We are inquiring into the Comprehensive Development area, one of the intentions of the Comprehensive Development area is that you should have a car park? A. Yes.

*[Original page 239]*

Q. You can have a car park in the Comprehensive Development Area without taking the property on the south side of Petty Cury? A. Yes, I suppose so.

Q. And you could have your new roads there? A. Yes.

Q. So that the only justification, if justification there be to include the property on the south side of Petty Cury is because there are conditions of bad land and obsolete development? A. Yes, I agree.

Q. We turn to para.5 of your Report. I will read it: "The proposals now submitted differ from the earlier ones though the objectives in relation to the Central area as a whole

remain the same. They involve a departure from the Town Map in that, after extensive consultations with the City Council and other interested persons, the Planning Authority has decided to omit the proposed New Guildhall Street as a principal traffic road and shopping street and to rely on the widening of Corn Exchange Street to fulfil the traffic function of New Guildhall Street and to provide access to the new car park. Instead of fronting onto the new street, the shops, offices and other buildings will be developed round a space reserved for pedestrians. The proposed New Emmanuel Street is retained." There is not one word there about the necessity for taking the south side of Petty Cury? A. Not in the paragraph now.

Q. But that is the paragraph which tells us how this scheme was supposed to differ from the one put forward on the Town Map? A. I am quite willing to expand on that.

Q. All right, I do not want to stop you saying anything you want to say, Mr. Gimingham? A. I entirely accept the evidence given by Sir William Holford and Mr. Dulake on this subject.

Q. Let us come to that in more detail, I am not asking you to deal with the whole case generally? A. No.

Q. After you had the Minister's approval, you and your colleagues presumably set to work to see how you could best deal with this Comprehensive Development Area which has been to a certain extent left in the air? A. Until the Minister's decision was reached naturally no further substantial work was undertaken.

Q. You had the Minister's decision some time in 1954? A. Yes.

Q. And you set to work on it? A. That is so, yes.

Q. And the first thoughts you had were that you could produce a proper comprehensive development area by taking in the Lion Yard and its immediate surroundings and all the land which you are now considering, except the southern frontage of Petty Cury? A. Those were the early schemes.

Q. Those were your early days? A. Yes.

Q. And on the 29th August, 1955, Mr. Waide sent to Mr. Barr my instructing solicitor a Plan showing how a comparatively small part of the area owned by the Lion Hotel

would be required for a road and I think it was for something to do with the Post Office, do you remember it? A. Yes.

*[Original page 240]*

Q. That in your view was a perfectly practical and sensible proposition? A. I would say that at that stage we were in the very early stages of considering the proposals and as the planning schemes arose, we did not at that time include so much of Petty Cury.

Q. That was dated 29th August, 1955, the Minister's approval was dated 9th September, 1954, so you had nearly a year to think about it? A. Yes.

Q. And the result of your first year's thinking was to produce that plan? A. Yes.

Q. Then that suggestion made in the letter to Mr. Barr on the 29th August, 1955, was substantially the same as the treatment of the Lion Hotel property shown on Scheme A? A. Yes, I would say so.

Q. That was produced as we know now in January, 1956, and that showed, did it not, that Falcon Yard and Alexandra Street were to be used as entrances from Petty Cury to the back lands and that there was then to be provided along the backs of property in Petty Cury a service area?

A. Yes, the intention really was that access to the backs of these properties would be from New Guildhall Street along this narrow road linking Post Office Terrace, and then you will see where there is a line across, it would go underneath the building into the service area. and that was the way it was intended the property should be served, and Falcon Yard and Alexandra Street were intended to remain pedestrian access? A. Yes, I think so.

Q. At any rate, they were to remain as accesses to Petty Cury? That was as far as your thinking had got when Mr. Dulake was called in to advise about the economics and the estate management point of view? A. Yes, I think that is so, I must say, of course, in considering a question as complex as the Lion Yard all kinds of thoughts were in our minds at times during this period, 1954 and onwards.

Q. You had had four schemes before you, but there were many others in draft formation? There may have been a draft which showed taking in the south side of Petty Cury?

A. Yes.

Q. And having looked at it rejected it? A. If we did, we came back to it.

Q. And there were steps on coming back to it? A. I do not think at this stage we did consider that, but I would not like to be sure about it.

*[Original page 241]*

Q. Then Mr. Dulake came on the scene and he suggested to you "K" which differed from your Scheme "A" and suggested taking some further property? A. Yes. Of course plan "K" was not exactly a new plan; it was additional.

Q. It was an amplification of your scheme "A"? A. Yes.

Q. It also brought scheme "A" into it and provided for a new access to the back land at the eastern end of Petty Cury down by the side of St. Andrew's Church? A. No, that is in both schemes.

Q. I thank you for pointing that out. Scheme "A" which you produced this morning is not the same, as I understand it, as that which you produced yesterday, because "J" does not show that access from the eastern end of Petty Cury? A. I am sorry about that, there are so many modifications.

Q. I am trying to get it in chronological order. On the 9th July, 1956, the idea was plan "J" produced yesterday? A. Yes, I have said that.

Q. Plan "J" produced yesterday does not show any access to the back land between the eastern end of Petty Cury and St. Andrew's Church? A. Unfortunately I have not got a copy. (Copy handed) Yes.

Q. Since Plan "J" does not equal "A", shall we call it by another letter "JA"? May it be 15th April, 1957, on scheme "A", is the true date it was first drawn up? A. I do not think so because all these four plans have the same date and I do not think I drew them up on the same day; they are in fact reproduced on the same day in this form.

Q. Do you think we may be able to discover the true chronological sequence? A. I am quite sure we have it right as regards sequence, but not actual dates.

Q. It is fair to say that "JA" came after "J"? A. Yes — well, I think, looking at them again, there are a number of variations, but I do not think any of them we can regard as very very significant.

Q. Whether the variations are significant is a matter for the Inspector and the Minister, and the variation between "J" and "K", as Mr. Dulake suggested, in addition to taking property which you had suggested, provided a new access to the eastern end of Petty Cury? A. Yes.

Q. This is what I want to get from you. It is equally clear, is it not, when you look at Plan "K" that Mr. Dulake had no thought of providing any access to the back area through the property of the Lion Hotel? A. You say access to the back area?

Q. A road or pedestrian way, or anything else? A. I do not think so; whether he ——

Q. What he said was that, on his plan, additional land made available for development is shown coloured pink; what he had come to was knocking down the Lion Hotel and redeveloping the site; it is quite obvious, is not it? A. Yes.

Q. And even after Mr. Dulake had suggested including the Lion Hotel, you went on producing schemes which did not show its inclusion? Is that right, or am I getting the chronology wrong? A. That is true as regards these four, but in fact we were working on schemes including parts of Petty Cury, but these particular four, A, B, C and D, were prepared for a specific purpose.

*[Original page 242]*

Q. I suppose, like most planners, you explored every avenue and left no stone unturned, and having performed every existing operation, these schemes A, B, C and D, were the ones which most commended themselves to you and your colleagues? A. Yes, at that time.

Q. And as late as the 15th April, 1957, you took the trouble to have them all re-drawn? A. Yes.

Q. That was more than a year after Mr. Dulake had first suggested to you that you might take in the Lion Hotel for economic reasons? A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Dulake was concerned with economics and you were concerned with planning? A. Oh well, I do not think you can divorce planning from economics in that way. I certainly would not.

Q. You took economics into consideration as well, did you?

A. I think one must, yes.

Q. You had Mr. Dulake's advice that it would be an economic idea to include the Lion Hotel? A. Yes.

Q. Yet you went on preparing plans which showed the exclusion of the Lion Hotel? A. Yes. Of course, we originally asked Mr. Dulake to prepare his report on the basis of Plan "J", I think it was, and we specifically asked him to prepare his report on the basis of scheme "C", that was his second report.

Q. That did not include the Lion Hotel, apart from a few bits at the back and we will not quarrel about a few bits at the back? A. That is right, no.

Q. Mr. Dulake yesterday could not, because he had not got the material with him, say at what stage it was suggested by him that the whole of the Petty Cury frontage should be included; do you remember that? A. Mr. Dulake reported on scheme "C" and he made it absolutely clear that he thought that if the scheme was to be a success, particularly on the basis of pedestrian use, his original suggestion should be followed, in other words that there must be very very strong linkage with Petty Cury.

Q. So that for a period of about a year you had been resisting Mr. Dulake's suggestion about including the Lion Hotel, and then in the end he persuaded you not only should the Lion Hotel be included, but all the rest of the frontage of Petty Cury, except Heffer's end? A. I think, as he put it, he was not the only person concerned with the decision; it was a joint one.

Q. I suppose there was the usual give and take in discussion?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Dulake was advocating including the Lion Hotel and you were advocating leaving it out? A. I do not think so. I do not think we had formulated any such a strong view it could not be put in even though it is not included in these plans.

Q. At any rate you did not feel strongly enough about it to formulate scheme "J" which did include the Lion Hotel? A. Well we did later, yes.

Q. But at that stage? A. Not at that stage.

*[Original page 243]*

Q. When did you first formulate the scheme which included the Lion Hotel? A. It is very difficult to be precise on this, but I would say some time in 1957.

Q. By that time Mr. Dulake had won the day? A. I do not put it that way; that is your phrase.

Q. Would it be fair to put it this way then, that the economic aspect of the matter had, by that time, come to appear in your eyes to require the inclusion of the Lion Hotel and the rest of the Petty Cury frontage? A. Well, we naturally took very great heed of Mr. Dulake's advice upon this matter, but there was no question of being bowled over by him; we recognised this was a fair and right proposal and could reasonably be included in the comprehensive development area.

Q. It had never occurred to you that the Petty Cury area property was of bad layout and obsolete development until Mr. Dulake suggested from an economic point of view it should be included?

A. I do not accept that as a matter of fact.

Q. That is what the material which you produce now shows, is not it? A. It is not, no. These are schemes for the redevelopment of the Lion Yard area.

Q. The Lion Hotel property, as Mr. Dulake agreed yesterday, is an area of property which is not used to the maximum commercial advantage at the moment, is it? A. I think one can say that, yes.

Q. And in 1956, and indeed for a good while after, the city would have been able to acquire the Lion Hotel at its hotel value and dispose of it again at its full commercial value? A. When you say that — had they so desired?

Q. Yes, had they so desired. A. Under the law at that time that could have been done, yes.

Q. So that made the inclusion of the Lion Hotel a very attractive proposition from the economic point of view, did not it?

A. Yes; I think we were very slow.

Q. Now Parliament has seen to it that it is not such an attractive proposition from an economic point of view? A. Yes.

Q. May that not explain why the Lion Hotel alone was originally suggested as property to be taken in the property fronting on Petty Cury? A. No, I would not say that.

Q. It is just a coincidence? A. You are asking the question you put to Mr. Dulake; he was the one who suggested the Lion Hotel in the first instance.

Q. Then you discussed it with him? A. Yes.

Q. It may have been in Mr. Dulake's mind, but it was not in yours?

A. I would not say that.

Q. That it was not in yours? A. No.

Q. Of course, when you got to the stage when it was decided to include all the Petty Cury frontage on the south side, it then became essential to say that it was an area of bad layout or obsolete development, did it not? A. I would prefer not to put it in that way. I say it is a matter of fact whether this year is of bad layout or obsolete development.

*[Original page 244]*

Q. If the Minister came to the conclusion that you are wrong in that question of fact, he could not pass this comprehensive development area in its present form, could he? A. I do not claim to be a lawyer and I do not really know the answers sufficiently to give you a clear yes or no.

Q. I have a note of what you said in your examination in chief about the justification for including the south side of Petty Cury and that is the area might not, or that you

said that the inclusion of that property was essential if Petty Cury were to be an important shopping street? A. In the future.

Q. You said that, did not you? A. I did, yes.

Q. Now is not that an entirely immaterial consideration for our purpose? A. It is a very important one, looked at from the point of view of the success or otherwise of this redevelopment.

Q. It is not a matter which indicates whether Petty Cury is at the moment an area of bad layout or obsolete development, is it? A. No, it is a different point.

Q. So far as Petty Cury at the moment is concerned, you say in your report at paragraph 40 that it is already fully used. Let us look at paragraph 40. Having given in the preceding paragraph tables of the various use of land, you go on in paragraph 40 and say: "Thus less than half the block is used intensively for central area commerce, in contrast with 72% in the block immediately to the north between Petty Cury and Market Street and 95% in the block to the north-east between Sidney Street and Hobson Street. While the Petty Cury and St. Andrew's Street frontages are fully used for shops, offices and other Central Area purposes and there are a number of other individual buildings appropriate to the Central Area, the bulk of the block comprises poorer buildings devoted to miscellaneous uses unsuited to their location and the potential value of the area. The Floor Space Index Map overleaf shows that, with the exception of the small area adjoining St. Andrew's Church, the street block is less intensively developed than the area immediately to the north and this is confirmed by the Map of Comparative Central Area Values." You were making the point there about the area as a whole, were you not? A. Yes.

Q. But you said that the Petty Cury frontage was fully used for shops? A. Yes.

Q. And if you were considering it alone would you say that the figure, instead of being less than half, should be 100 per cent? A. No, it certainly would not be because of the existence of the Lion Hotel on that frontage.

Q. I thought you were talking about shops, offices and other Central Area purposes? Is not the Lion Hotel a central area purpose? A. I thought you were referring to shops alone.

Q. I was putting it rather compendiously, and what you say in paragraph 40 about the low density of the development does not in any way justify the inclusion of the Petty Cury frontage, does it? A. I think it does. I am making a specific point in this paragraph which is nothing to do with what you are asking me. I am dealing with the density in the street block.

Q. I do not want to read anything into the passage which you did not intend; if you are telling me that paragraph 40 is not intended to be a justification for the inclusion of Petty Cury let us forget about it; is that what you are saying? A. It is not designed to that end at all.

*[Original page 245]*

Q. Will you please indicate to the Inspector where in this report is there any justification for including the south side of Petty Cury? A. I regard the whole document as dealing with the whole comprehensive development area.

Q. The whole document deals with quite a lot of matters and in a fair amount of detail. Can you tell me where it is stated in this that the south side of Petty Cury is an area of bad layout and obsolete development and ought to be included in the comprehensive development area? A. It comes within paragraph 36, which is a general one; it is a statement to that effect.

Q. That is the only place you can put your finger on as justifying the inclusion of the Petty Cury frontage? A. I regard the whole document as dealing with the whole area; it did not deal with the south side of Petty Cury in isolation from the rest of the area but regarded it as part of the whole.

Q. But you must have realise when you started to draft this document that you were suggesting a comprehensive development area of a size which had never been suggested by anybody else previously? A. It is somewhat larger, not very much.

Q. It may not seem very much larger but it meant an awful lot to my clients? A. I appreciate that.

Q. Would not it have been a better thing to have explained possibly in some detail why you were making that extension?

A. Well, I can only say I did not wish to deal with any particular part, to pay any particular attention to any particular part of the area; I dealt with it as a whole.

*[Original page 246]*

Q. I know that one should not read the text without the maps, but if one looked at the text alone one would get the impression that all you were doing was implementing what the Ministry had already approved in principle, would one not? A. I must make the point once again that the Minister did not approve any particular area in principle or otherwise. He simply dealt with the principle of comprehensive redevelopment in this part of Central Cambridge. He referred to no specific area.

Q. You are suggesting that the area might have included the north side of Petty Cury as well? A. No, I do not suggest that. I think he was talking about the Lion Yard area and not any particular boundaries to that area.

Q. The Lion Yard area, that might mean the Lion Yard and the very small amount of property round it or it might mean the Lion Yard and a very large amount of property round it?

A. I think the Minister obviously did not intend himself to be tied down in any particular way, to any particular area, I should say.

Q. And paragraph 36(a) is, you say, the justification for including the south side of Petty Cury? A. I did not say that. I say that is the only particular paragraph where I refer to the area as a whole, but I regard the whole document as relating to Petty Cury as much as to any other part of the Comprehensive Development area.

Q. Where in the whole document is Petty Cury dealt with?

A. I cannot explain this any more in detail. I have not singled out any particular property or any particular street. I have dealt with the area as a whole throughout the document.

Q. I see. Now there is no doubt at all, is there, that the area behind Petty Cury is one of bad layout and obsolete development? A. Up to and including Petty Cury, yes.

Q. I said, the area behind Petty Cury — let us agree as far as we can? A. Would you specify more precisely which area you are referring to please?

Q. Well, the area, for example, which is shown on your Plan J.

A. Yes.

Q. And the reason why that is an area of bad land is because it is traversed diagonally by St. Tibb's Row? A. Very much more than that. That is one reason.

Q. Well, that is about all the layout there is in it at the moment? A. Well, all the streets are very narrow, are they not? All the streets are very narrow and inadequate for any redevelopment or any purpose whatsoever.

Q. I do not know the area in great detail myself, but there seems to be only one street in it, apart from Alexandra Street and Falcon Yard and St. Tibb's Row, which runs diagonally across it? A. There is Corn Exchange Street on the one side, a very narrow street.

Q. Corn Exchange Street is not a piece of bad layout, is it?

A. In relation to layout I think one has to take into account all the streets, both bounding and within the area.

*[Original page 247]*

Q. The streets bounding the area are more or less a quadrilateral, are they not? A. Yes.

Q. There is nothing very much wrong with that? A. Except that they are narrow and inadequate.

Q. That is not layout, that is street ---? A. I regard that as part of layout, certainly.

Q. The bad layout is St. Tibb's Row. Anyone redeveloping here would want to get rid of St. Tibb's Row, would he not? A. Among other things. It is a bad feature but not the only bad feature.

Q. A lot of the property round in that area is, in so far as it is still standing, now obsolete? A. Yes.

Q. But when you come to the Petty Cury frontage the layout is extremely simple, is it not? It is just blocks of property fronting onto Petty Cury with boundaries more or less parallel, running more or less at right angles to Petty Cury, a very simple layout? A.

Well, it was rather to show that it was not quite as simple as that that I put in Plan A, I think it was.

Q. Plan A, you mean the roof plan? A. Yes.

Q. Well, let us have a look at that. Now, Plan A is rather an ingenious one. That shows the roofs, does it not?

A. I said it was unusual, yes.

Q. And it is limited to the roofs of those parts which are to be included in the Compulsory Purchase Order? A. Yes.

Q. It does not show, for example, the roofs on what one might call the Heffer block to the west? A. No.

Q. Did you ever make a drawing of the roofs of the Heffer block? A. Yes.

Q. And was it the same sort of effect as this? A. Somewhat, yes.

Q. But you are not including the Heffer block? A. No.

Q. So the picture of the roofs is not the reason for including it, is it? A. No, certainly not. I did not intend this just to be a picture of the roofs. The intention of putting in this plan, as I thought I explained, was to show the way in which this area now attempts to serve a central area function and the way it has been adapted from older buildings now outdated really for the purpose that they now serve; in other words, that it is a jumble of old buildings, oldish buildings, thrown together with one building knocked into another to serve a purpose as best it may at the present day.

Q. I thought you said that that Plan A was supposed to show that it was an area of bad layout? A. It contributes to that, yes.

Q. Do you remember Sir William Holford saying the other day that, in his view, layout was ground plan, not roof area?

A. Yes, I am not making a point about the roofs here. I

have put this Plan in because I think it shows, in a way that a simple plan at ground level would not show, the nature of the development there, because we are talking of bad layout and obsolete development.

Q. Well, let us deal with one thing at a time. I am talking about bad layout at the moment, and I understood your Plan A had been put in to illustrate bad layout? A. I think it does, yes.

Q. Would you agree that you would get a better idea of the layout of this property on the south side of Petty Cury if you looked at Mr. Dulake's Plan which I do not seem to have got a code number on, the one with the overlay which shows the ownership? May I suggest it may be H? It has got a transparent overlay.

MR MEGARRY: G is the freeholds with the tracing.

THE WITNESS: Are you going to refer to the overlay? I have not got that at the moment.

MR SQUIBB: I do not want the overlay. What I am putting to you is that you get a much better idea of the layout of this southern side of Petty Cury from Plan G than from your picture A? A. I do not think there is very much difference. However, I accept that is a ground floor plan and therefore it is more concerned with layout than the roof plan.

Q. Of course, the whole object of taking layout into consideration is to consider whether the ownerships are arranged in such a way that they would facilitate or impede redevelopment, is it not? A. I think it is very much broader than that, very much broader. The question of layout goes much further than the question of just considering whether the ownerships fit in right.

Q. I said the ownerships because that is the only relevant thing here. You may, in other places, have to consider the layout of the streets as well, but we are not concerned with the layout of the streets on the south side of Petty Cury, are we? A. I think we are.

Q. We have got a street on the north. What is wrong with that?

A. Falcon Yard and Alexandra Street running into Petty Cury.

Q. Both of which can be used to provide access to the rear area? A. No, not satisfactorily.

Q. Well, if it would not be satisfactory to use them for access to the rear area, why did you show them as being used for that purpose on your Plan J? A. I thought I had explained that. We were not doing that. The rear access was to be from New Guildhall Street. They were to be simply pedestrian accesses.

Q. Yes, pedestrian accesses, but it was not necessary to sweep them away in order to redevelop your back land?

A. The thought progressed over the years. We came to the conclusion it was necessary to bring in Petty Cury.

Q. Necessary to bring in Petty Cury in order to make a

*[Original page 249]*

better scheme of it as a whole. That was the idea, was it not? A. That is one reason, yes, certainly. It was most important that it should be a good scheme.

Q. Now the property on the south side of Petty Cury is of varying ages, but all of it has got quite a respectable life in front of it, has it not? A. Simply in terms that bricks and mortar will stand, yes.

Q. The Lion Hotel, I understand, has been there for hundreds of years. It has been altered from time to time, but it is still there? A. Yes.

Q. And in the ordinary course of events, if there were no Comprehensive Development Area legislation the shops in Petty Cury would be redeveloped in ones or possibly twos at intervals? A. They would, with the resulting difficulties in terms of servicing and setting back to new lines and so on.

Q. Well, that kind of redevelopment in one's and two's at long intervals has probably been going on for hundreds of years, because none of these buildings is hundreds of years old? A. That is so, yes, I think it has.

Q. And that process has been going on in the other old streets in the centre of Cambridge? A. Yes, of course it has, but it has also been given a considerable fillip on occasions by large areas being taken in.

Q. But it is because you have been having individual properties being redeveloped as and when it became necessary that you have got the general character of the central shopping streets of Cambridge now? A. I must qualify that. I do think it is necessary to recognise that, and particularly the Colleges have made rather more than just this sort of individual building change in the Central Area of Cambridge by redevelopment. They have done a good deal more than that. They have taken in complete sections, perhaps half a dozen, or, if one takes the most recent example between Emmanuel Street and Christ's Lane, there has been a very, very substantial change in character.

Q. If the whole of the central shopping area of Cambridge were treated in the manner of that new development in St. Andrew's Street the character of the centre of Cambridge would be completely altered, would it not? A. It would, yes.

Q. And to take one side of Petty Cury and leave it with it in that way would alter the whole character of Petty Cury?

A. It depends how it is treated.

Q. Professor Holford suggested you might have perpendicular divisions at suitable intervals. That would be to try and reproduce the present effect of individual building, would it not? A. I am quite sure that if, indeed, the design is left to Sir William Holford, it will be very much in character with Cambridge.

Q. In other words, the test of the goodness of this redevelopment will be how far it is in character with the present central area of Cambridge? A. Well, so long as we are talking about the same thing by character, because it is, indeed, an ever changing character in Cambridge.

*[Original page 250]*

Q. Well, the south side of Petty Cury at the present time is fully in keeping with the general character of the central area of Cambridge, is it not? A. I do not admire it.

Q. You do not admire it? A. As an elevation down that street, no.

Q. But then, you see, the central shopping streets of old towns are not designed as "elevations down a street", are they? A. No, I agree, and I accept the point that the narrowness of Petty Cury is what contributes to its character and, generally speaking,

that narrowness is going to be retained. The advantage will be gained at ground floor level by arcading the footway.

Q. I am glad you got onto that because that is a process which has already started in Petty Cury, has it not?

A. In a small way, yes.

Q. The individual shopkeepers are setting back their shop fronts when they put new ones in, so that the pedestrians can look into their windows without obstructing the narrow footway. I mean, take Heffer's, that has been rebuilt in that light, has it not? A. Yes; of course, it is a very small set-back compared with the improvement that is proposed here.

Q. But it is a set-back which is quite sufficient for people to look into Heffer's window without being jostled by people walking along the pavement? A. Yes.

Q. And the same has happened with other shops in Petty Cury. That is the trend, nowadays, is it not? A. I am trying to think of any other shop there.

Q. I do not know Petty Cury frightfully well, but I think Boots has been treated in that way? A. There is a sort of forecourt on the north side, yes.

Q. And one of the tailors whom Mr. Glover represents has got a window which is set back, not so far back as Heffer's I think, but it is set back? A. Yes, I think that is certainly a small advantage, but it cannot be compared with, say, the advantage you get by arcading which was contained in the Market Hill redevelopment.

Q. Assuming that arcading is the maximum desirable thing, it may be worth while going some distance towards it, may it not? A. I think every little helps, yes.

Q. Every little helps, and it may be a process rather comparable to throwing away the baby with the bath water to pull down a whole lot of buildings which have got a useful life in front of them just so as to provide an arcade for shoppers? A. Of course, I would agree if that were the only reason; I would agree with you, yes.

Q. I was just thinking about another reason which has been put forward by Mr. Dulake; that was to provide a vista down the eastern side of Heffer's. Do you regard that as a

justification for pulling down a whole block of property, to open up that vista down the precinct? A. No; I am not looking at it in quite those terms.

*[Original page 251]*

Q. One has got to look at it in terms of general public advantage, has one not? A. Yes.

Q. General public advantage requires that you do not, unless there is some extremely good reason, pull down buildings that have got a considerable useful life in front of them? A. Of course, owners very frequently do it themselves, I must admit that.

Q. They do it for their own profit, perhaps, sometimes?

A. Yes.

Q. But, of course, the City Council will not make any profit out of this, will it? A. In the long run it will, indeed.

Q. At the end of 99 years? A. I think before that.

Q. Another thing which Mr. Dulake suggested as a reason for pulling down these shops in Petty Cury was that some of them were very shallow. A. Yes.

Q. Do you regard shallowness of a shop as being a reason for pulling it down? A. I think you have got to look at this more widely than that. I think you have got to take into account the fact that Petty Cury is one of the most important shopping streets and that the buildings as they now exist are really inadequate, for one reason because the depth is so little to fulfil that function to the best advantage.

Q. You think depth is important, do you? A. I think so, yes.

Q. You remember producing another Plan B, attached to the Summary of Requirements for the Developers? A. Yes. (Plan handed.)

Q. That showed some quite shallow shops along the Petty Cury frontage, did it not, to the east of what is now the Lion Hotel? A. Yes; there are some smaller shops there. There are also some big ones.

Q. Yes, some big ones, and small ones; that is the position at the present time, is it not? A. I would not say there are any big ones.

Q. They are an assortment, are they not? A. They are mostly.

Q. Big and small are, perhaps, rather relative terms?

A. I think they also suffer from the same disadvantage of not really having an adequate depth of good building. I think that is where my Plan A does rather help to show it.

Q. You mean Plan B? A. No, I am sorry, my Plan A. It shows this question of the depth of the buildings.

Q. Yes, looking at the Plan B attached to the Summary of Requirements ---? A. Yes.

Q. --- some of those shops are no deeper than the existing shops along Petty Cury, are they? A. No, not in this particular proposal; well, not much anyway.

*[Original page 252]*

Q. So the fact that a shop is fairly shallow is no reason in itself for sweeping it away? A. I think it is fair to say that not on this Plan B which is not, of course, the Plan which was finally adopted.

Q. No, but it was a plan which you thought was a good one because it was to be the yardstick by which the developers' suggestions were to be measured, was it not? Or do you not remember that? A. Yes, we did say that certainly. It was put in as a suggestion.

Q. Yes, so if any developer had come along with that and said, "Well, really, Mr. Gimingham, your Plan B is such a good one; I don't think I can do any better than that; I will carry out that", you would have accepted it?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. Do you mean you would have had even some more second thoughts? A. I just do not know. I cannot answer that question. It is so hypothetical.

Q. One has to reach finality some time? A. Indeed.

Q. At any rate, your thoughts at one time were that you would have been happy with shops of the sort of depth shown on that Plan B? A. Some shops of that depth.

Q. And you have got some shops of that depth now?

A. Yes, most of them are rather less than that. They vary, yes.

MR SQUIBB: If you think this a convenient moment to adjourn, Sir, Mr. Gimingham will be here this afternoon.

THE INSPECTOR: Yes, I will adjourn until two o'clock.

*[Original page 253]*

THE INSPECTOR: May we resume, please.

MR SQUIBB: Mr. Gimingham, you referred us to para.36 of your Report in which you said you were dealing with this Comprehensive Development Area as a whole. Would you look at para.37 where you say both these things have been taken into account in defining the Comprehensive Development Area and "such other land is included as necessary to prepare a satisfactory redevelopment scheme, bearing in mind that properties excluded must continue to function satisfactorily." What do you mean by "such other land" are you there referring to the Petty Cury frontage? A. No, I think that refers to land within the street block included within these categories if it does not mean anything outside these categories.

Q. I find it difficult to understand the English "such other land", other than what? A. I think possibly the word "other" is not necessary.

Q. You must have had something in mind if you put the word in. Can it be thought that you meant land which was not badly laid out or was of obsolete development but you wanted to include it in order to prepare a satisfactory new development scheme? A. No, the whole of the area was as the Written Statement makes clear, defined as coming under A or B or both.

Q. And the only explanation you can give for the word "other" is that it is unnecessary? A. I think it must be, yes.

Q. Are you in the habit of using words which are unnecessary?

A. No, but I must make it quite clear that the Written Statement here is a document which of course makes it clear that the whole of the area comes within this definition in our view.

Q. You cannot give any other explanation of the expression "such other land" than that you used the word "other" quite without any meaning? A. I certainly was not intending to include land which was not within these two categories, I cannot explain it otherwise.

Q. Why was it necessary to consider whether the inclusion of land was necessary to prepare a satisfactory Redevelopment Scheme.

Q. I think the two things go together. One could not include in the Comprehensive Development Area land which was not in categories A or B, that is the first thing, we had to include a sufficient quantity of land in these categories to make a satisfactory redevelopment scheme, there are other parts of the central area which I think would also come under the category of bad land, but they would not come within the Redevelopment Area.

Q. You start by taking the two factors to define the Comprehensive Development Area, and then you include something which is necessary to provide a satisfactory Redevelopment Scheme, is that it? A. No, it is a question of the amount of land being within those two categories, but there is more land within these two categories which is not included.

*[Original page 254]*

Q. You were telling us this morning why you thought that the land fronting on to Petty Cury was bad land, now let us turn to obsolete development, you say it is obsolete development, do you? A. In the context of the words central shopping street, yes.

Q. What do you mean by obsolete? A. I mean not suited to its function at the present time and not provided with what is now required for use in this position. One must really add to this position.

Q. The primary function of the property on the south side of Petty Cury and if your ideas go through continue to be shops? A. Yes.

Q. In what way are the shops along the south side of Petty Cury not suited to their function? A. They are, broadly speaking, of inadequate depth, they are not provided with proper provision for rear access to serve them, they are not in my opinion shops which could be said to be suitable in size and facilities for such an important position in the centre of the city.

Q. Not suitable in size do you say? A. I think this plan A does indicate what I really have in mind, the way in which buildings have been added to one another, it is not

possible to regard it as satisfactory shop development in the terms that we must think of in the centre of a City such as Cambridge.

Q. Inadequate depth, we have already touched on this morning? A. Yes.

Q. What may be inadequate depth for one trade may be totally adequate for another? A. There are different requirements for different traders, I agree.

Q. How can you look at a whole block of shops generally and say they are inadequate in depth? A. Petty Cury is an important shopping street in Cambridge and there is not one shop there which has more than 40 ft., possibly there is one, which is more, but it depends on the depth you take there, they are 30, 35, 33, is the average depth of the shops there.

Q. How can you generalise and say it is inadequate, it is inadequate to some people? A. It is inadequate in relation to the position of Petty Cury as an important shopping street.

Q. Why does it position as an important shopping street affect the necessary depth, have you got the mind of the traders there, are they satisfied with that kind of depth? A. Some of them are not satisfied.

Q. Do they go? A. No.

Q. They went on their own valuation? A. Yes, in some cases no doubt it is sufficient, in others I would say it is not.

Q. Do the traders in Petty Cury tend to move away from there?

A. It has happened, it has happened recently.

*[Original page 255]*

Q. Do the shops remain vacant for any length of time? A. No.

Q. What is inadequate for one is inadequate for another?

A. I must agree, of course that in some trades the depth is all right.

Q. If your way of looking at it is right one should sweep away the Burlington Arcade? A. I do not think so, this is not an arcade, it is one of the important shopping

thoroughfares of Cambridge, I do not think the shopkeepers would think that their premises are unduly large.

Q. You would say that the Burlington Arcade is inadequate, I fear? A. Not for the kind of shop there.

Q. Whether a shop is inadequate or not depends on how you want to house it? A. And the position, an arcade is a special sort of shopping centre.

Q. But Petty Cury is a special type of shopping centre?

A. No, it is a good shopping street.

Q. In the heart of a University City? A. Yes.

Q. That is rather special? But it does not mean that you should not look at it from a commercial point of view of the shopkeepers.

Q. You employed Mr. Dulake to look at the commercial point of view? A. Yes.

Q. You are looking at it from a planner's point of view?

A. Yes.

Q. The second thing you said was that they had not got a rear access, that can easily be put right? A. Not so easily.

Q. You showed a way of doing it on your plan? A. Certainly. That would only provide it to one or two of the shops.

Q. I think it provides it to all the shops, it seems to go as far as the Lion Hotel which has already got a rear access, it does provide a rear access to shops now in Petty Cury? A. The rear parts of the shops do not extend down to this Court.

Q. Some do, others of them let out on to Falcon Yard and Alexandra Street? A. Some of them do not even do that.

Q. A few, how many? How many Mr. Gimingham do not either have an access on Alexandra Street or Falcon Yard or would be given an access on your proposals shown on Plan J?

A. I do not regard Falcon Yard or Alexandra Street as satisfactory back accesses.

Q. I see, you want to leave them out of account altogether?

A. You cannot pass through those streets if one vehicle is in it you have had it.

Q. They are not supposed to be through traffic streets? A. They are not nearly wide enough for back access, vehicles are bound to want to pass one another if they serve shops.

*[Original page 256]*

Q. What you show on Plan J would tend to give a rear access to some of the shops? A. It would mainly serve the new block A and B, it would to some extent serve other buildings, but it would not be really satisfactory.

Q. At any rate better than it is now, would you go as far as that? A. For some, not for all.

Q. Therefore it is really a combination of the two, is it not? A. I think it is a statement of fact in relation to a street such as Petty Cury, these are shop premises, I am not talking about the business which is done there but the shop premises themselves, they are obsolete.

Q. The essential thing about a shop is that it shall have three walls, a roof and a floor, and the shopkeeper puts in a front. A. We have now to provide much more satisfactory premises not only that the public can shop more conveniently, but the shopkeeper can service it satisfactorily without obstructing the highway. All these things have to be considered in planning.

Q. Supposing this new development comes about, what is going to be provided for the shopkeeper beyond three walls, a floor and a roof, and to give access? A. Very much more convenient floor space, in a modern building, which is a very different thing from the sort of floor space which you get from buildings thrust from one into another as shown on Plan A.

Q. If you look at the occupiers plan you find that all shop spaces are rectangular? A. Yes, I think one in looking over the buildings would find that there are satisfactory arrangements for stock rooms and so forth, provision for parking bicycles and so forth which is needed, in a street as narrow and congested as Petty Cury.

Q. You are suggesting that Petty Cury should be pulled down so as to provide a few more facilities, some of which doubtless you say can be provided on plan "J"? A. I think it is a wider point of view altogether in relation to the whole redevelopment scheme. This is, as Mr. Dulake said, an essential for the success of the scheme as a whole. You have to look at it from a wider point of view as well as detail.

Q. Why did not you look at it from the wider point of view in the first place? A. I think this was, as I have said, a progression of thought. When we had schemes in the early days they seemed perhaps satisfactory, but as we went into it in more detail and got more advice we found they were not as satisfactory as the scheme now finally adopted. That seems to me the way in which planning probably works; you try different solutions and eventually come to the best one.

Q. Is not the truth you thought this would make a very much better redevelopment scheme if you had the valuable Petty Cury frontage, than if you only had the land at the back?

A. That I think is certainly one of the reasons, yes.

Re-examined by MR SCARMAN.

Q. Just take your plan "A", will you, and, with that to assist you, do you wish in any way to change the view which you have already expressed more than once, that the south side of Petty Cury which is intended to be incorporated in this scheme is an area of bad layout? A. I am quite satisfied it is an area of bad layout.

Q. Again with that plan in mind, and having in mind the questions which have been put to you by my learned friends, do you wish to make any modifications to the evidence you have given that in your opinion it is an area of obsolete development? A. No. I still feel that is undoubtedly the case.

Q. Is it your view that there are planning reasons in support of the inclusion of this area in the comprehensive development area? A. Most certainly, yes.

Q. You have told my learned friend of the wisdom in your view of establishing, as Mr. Dulake put it, a linkage, a good pedestrian linkage, between the pedestrian precinct and Petty Cury? A. Yes.

Q. Is that a planning reason in favour of the inclusion of this area? A. Most certainly yes, it is. I think in the planning of shopping centres, just as from an economic point of view as from a strictly layout point of view, the linkage of one street to another, or rather especially a street with a pedestrian precinct, is vital.

Q. Were you in the room this morning when Mr. Burrows and Mr. Bebbington were giving evidence about pedestrian congestion in Petty Cury? A. Yes.

Q. You heard that evidence? A. Yes.

Q. Does the proposal before the Minister include the setting back of the ground floors, with the building of an arcading, the setting back of the floors on the south side? A. It does, yes.

Q. Mr. Burrows gave us the figure. Would that in effect provide in Petty Cury itself a substantial extra area of pedestrian way for pedestrians to use? A. Yes, it would make it very

*[Original page 258]*

much easier; it would make wider pavements possible on both sides of the road and would greatly facilitate the movement of pedestrians up and down.

Q. Is that also a planning reason? A. It is indeed. I think in any situation in which pedestrians are crowded off the pavement as they are in Petty Cury, it is something which should be put right.

Q. You were asked some questions about the Report and Written Analysis and the way it treats Petty Cury. Have you got that document in front of you? A. I have.

Q. I would like to refer you first of all to Paragraph 9, the bottom of page 2. Have you got that? A. Yes.

Q. It reads as follows: "Apart from the necessity to provide opportunities for new commercial development, more space is wanted for existing activities to allow greater freedom of movement and better facilities both between and within buildings." A. Yes.

Q. Is the incorporation of Petty Cury part of the area you had in mind when writing those words? A. The suggestion is certainly the improvement of Petty Cury will provide much greater freedom of movement; it is one of the ideas I had in mind.

Q. I would like you to turn to page 4, Paragraph 16. A. Yes.

Q. "All these factors, together with statistics of change in the use of Central Area floor space, have been studied and the conclusion reached that there is a need for more shops and that existing traders need more space to serve their customers adequately, to provide facilities for their staff and for loading and unloading goods." Whilst referring to other parts of the area, does that also refer to Petty Cury?

A. Yes, it definitely does.

Q. You will see a similar comment made in Paragraph 35, page 7; that also is apt to cover Petty Cury as well as other parts of this area? A. Yes.

Q. Look at Paragraph 36, and again Paragraph 44, page 9; you deal with the area as a whole? A. Yes.

Q. One may assume, therefore, you had also in mind the incorporation of Petty Cury when writing that? A. Yes, certainly.

(The witness withdrew.)

MR SCARMAN: Now, Sir, if my learned friend would like to have Mr. Burrows?

MR SQUIBB: Yes.

MR THOMAS VALENTINE BURROWS, re-called. Cross-examined by MR SQUIBB.

Q. Mr. Burrows, I take it you have been concerned with this suggestion of the redevelopment of the Lion Yard area from its very earliest days when it was first adumbrated in Sir William Holford's report? A. Yes.

*[Original page 259]*

Q. And has the idea always been that it will be the City who would acquire the land and do all the necessary arrangements?

A. Yes.

Q. So no doubt you have been consulted about this project at every step from the earliest? A. No, I would not say at every step — every necessary step.

Q. I suppose the way the area was to be laid out, or the consideration of the way the area was to be laid out, was a necessary step? A. Yes.

Q. And you were consulted about it? A. Yes.

Q. May I take it you were consulted about plan "J"? A. I have not had a copy of plan "J".

Q. You will probably recognise it when you see it. (Handed)

A. This was one of the plans under consideration.

Q. That was in January, 1956. That was shown to you by Mr. Gimingham, or somebody in his department? A. Yes.

Q. When you saw that plan, did you say: "Good gracious me; that leaves all the frontage of Petty Cury standing"? A. No; I said: "Good gracious me; this still retains the road through the area."

Q. What did you mean when you made that remark? A. I have always objected to the new road going through the area.

Q. Only to New Guildhall Street? A. Yes.

Q. So the comment you made was directed to New Guildhall Street?

A. Yes, that would be my first comment.

Q. Did you comment about the exclusion of the Petty Cury frontage?

A. I cannot really say. This has been going on for 10 years and to remember every comment you made is absolutely impossible.

Q. So far as you remember you were prepared to accept this plan "J" provided that the New Guildhall Street was altered?

A. Certainly not; you cannot just take out the street and let the plan stand as it is.

Q. What you in fact said to Mr. Gimingham was that "you had better have another think," is that it, "because New Guildhall Street is out and I do not like it"? A. In effect I said would not be a plan I would support.

Q. Then Mr. Gimingham did have another look and he produced scheme "B", did not he? A. No, he did not.

Q. He never showed you scheme "B"? A. I produced it myself.

Q. I am sorry, I did not give credit where credit was due. That was your idea? A. Yes.

Q. I suppose Mr. Gimingham did not like that? A. Quite right.

Q. And scheme "B", which was your idea, also shows the frontage of Petty Cury left as it is to-day? A. It shows the frontage left as it is, I quite agree.

Q. You were suggesting to slice a bit off the rear? A. It shows an access road along the rear.

*[Original page 260]*

Q. Then scheme "C"; was that yours or Mr. Gimingham's? A. I think this was originally drawn in the County Planning Office.

Q. That was Mr. Gimingham's come-back to your scheme "B", was it? A. Possibly.

Q. What did you say when you saw that? A. I said: "Oh, we are getting somewhere near it now."

Q. Because there was no New Guildhall Street? A. Yes.

Q. That is what you were interested in? A. One of the things.

Q. And scheme "D"? A. I thought this was getting a bit nearer to it still.

Q. Was that yours? A. It is not mine.

Q. Mr. Gimingham's? A. Mr. Gimingham had probably taken notes of what I said.

Q. So the position is only scheme "B" is yours? A. I accept full responsibility for scheme "B".

Q. All the others were Mr. Gimingham's which came gradually near and nearer your ideas? A. Exactly.

(The witness withdrew.)

MR SQUIBB: I do not think I need trouble Mr. Bebbington so I will call my evidence. I shall not be able to call Mr. Barr, who is not able to come because he is unwell, and

so my only witness will be Mr. Gale. I am now told there is just a possibility Mr. Barr may come.

MR LEONARD CHARLES GALE, called. Examined by MR SQUIBB.

Q. Are you Leonard Charles Gale? A. Yes.

Q. Are you a Fellow of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors and a Member of the Town Planning Institute? A. Yes.

Q. A partner in the firm of W.R. Davidge & Partners, Planning Consultants? A. Yes.

Q. Have you been engaged in practice in town and country planning for the last 25 years? A. Yes, I have.

Q. It goes without saying you have made a careful inspection of the Lion Yard area? A. I have.

Q. Using that expression in its widest sense, including the south side of Petty Cury? A. Yes, that is so.

Q. Looking first at the Lion Hotel, has that got a frontage of about 65 feet in Petty Cury? A. Yes.

Q. With a flank frontage to Falcon Yard? A. Yes.

Q. And part of it goes over Falcon Yard? A. Yes, it does.

Q. And the hotel has a rear entrance in St. Tibbs Row? A. Yes.

*[Original page 261]*

Q. And alongside that entrance is there a three-storey residential building which belongs to the hotel? A. Yes, that is so.

Q. Is the depth of the hotel ownership approximately 350 feet from Petty Cury? A. Yes.

Q. A total area of about three-quarters of an acre? A. Yes.

Q. If one looks at the designation map No. 39 does one find the Lion Hotel ownership represents just over half the area noted as "A" on that map? A. It does.

Q. I think the facade to Petty Cury is three storeys high? A. Yes.

Q. And the rest of the building is mainly three storey and some single storey? A. Yes.

Q. Is the building included in the Supplementary List of buildings of architectural or historic interest? A. Yes.

Q. So far as you can say, is the building of some great age? A. Yes.

Q. And indeed does the layout and the interior indicate it was originally a coaching inn? A. Yes.

Q. The yard now roofed over was quite clearly open at one time? A. It was, yes.

Q. Is it a hotel which has had a long association with the University? A. Yes.

Q. And was the first meeting of the Union Society held in one of the rooms? A. So I am informed. There is a room called the Union Room.

Q. Has the hotel 44 letting bedrooms? A. So I am told.

Q. And does it also provide accommodation for functions? A. Yes.

*[Original page 262]*

Q. And to the best of your knowledge and belief, Mr. Gale, is that kind of accommodation difficult to find elsewhere in Cambridge? A. To the best of my belief it is, yes.

Q. I suppose it is apparent, having regard to the considerable area and depth of the hotel that whether or not you include it in the Comprehensive Development Area is going to have a considerable bearing upon what redevelopment scheme can be carried into effect? A. It must have, yes.

Q. If the Minister should hold that it is not right to include the Hotel in the Comprehensive Development Area it means that the whole layout of the back will have to be substantially reconstituted? A. That is so.

Q. So it is not just a question of cutting out the Lion and leaving everything else? A. No, because it would mean an entirely new layout as I see it.

Q. Do you agree with Sir William Holford's view as to the great importance of safeguarding the character of that part of Cambridge which lies within the ring of University and College property? A. I do.

Q. Do you think that Petty Cury at the moment is of a character which is in keeping with the position which it occupies? A. I do, yes.

Q. Would you regard a completely new building, built all of a piece, along the Petty Cury frontage as being equally in keeping? A. I do not think it would be for that part of Cambridge, no.

Q. Well, there is an example of that type of development, is there not, in the Market Place? A. Yes, and in fact, it does stand out as being very different in character from what the bulk of the remainder of the Market Place is and what it must have been before.

Q. Supposing that this question of including the south side of Petty Cury in the present scheme had not arisen, what in your view would be the future of that property? A. I think the future of that property would be for it to remain in its approximate present use with redevelopment over the years.

Q. Would that in your view maintain its general character better than a redevelopment in one fell swoop? A. Yes, subject to careful control of the appearance of the buildings that would go up, of course.

Q. Now Mr. Gimingham has told us his view, that the area is one of bad layout and obsolete development, and I think you agree with him so far as the back land is concerned? A. I do.

Q. If only that was concerned, would you say that it was pre-eminently an area for comprehensive redevelopment? A. I would have thought so yes.

Q. Coming to the Petty Cury frontage, it is stated in the

*[Original page 263]*

Report and Analysis that the floor space index is below that of the generality in the central area? A. Yes.

Q. Is that true actually of the Petty Cury frontage? A. No, in fact it does say that in the Written Analysis that it is below, that only one corner of the Petty Cury frontage is of the same value as that area to the north. In fact, if you take the whole of the Petty Cury

frontage, including the higher and the lower, it does average out at a figure, a floor space index, rather higher than the area to the north.

Q. It works out at 21.98? A. It does.

Q. That is a matter of arithmetic, not a question of opinion? A. It is a matter of arithmetic. I hope it is correct arithmetic because it is mine.

Q. Mr. Gimingham also points out in his map comparing the central area values that the south side of Petty Cury is less valuable than the north side? A. That is so.

Q. Is that in your view a reason why it should be pulled down and rebuilt? A. No, I think it is natural that those values would be a little lower. I am not really speaking for myself but Mr. Dulake said obviously the higher values were just to the north of that where Woolworths and Marks and Spencers were present, so you would expect the value to be lower coming away from the hub.

Q. Taking the property on the south side of Petty Cury generally, would you agree that the description that it is of a bad layout and obsolete development can be properly applied to it? A. No, I do not, not considering its location and its surroundings.

Q. In so far as it has defects are they, in your view, capable of amelioration without a complete rebuilding? A. They are, and I must agree - everybody must agree - that the pavements in Petty Cury are over-narrow. It does seem prodigal in my opinion, to say the least, to demolish a whole street of buildings in order to increase the width of the footway, when the intention is as is stated, possibly to ban the street to motor traffic. But it may be, of course, claimed, that this ban on traffic may never be achieved and therefore the comfort of shoppers can only be obtained by wholesale redevelopment. As I have said, redevelopment can take place in stages and setting back can be achieved on the rebuilding of individual properties by redevelopment and a great relief to congestion on the footways can be achieved by the setting back of the shop fronts, as has already been done in the case of Messrs. Heffer's bookshop and Messrs. Boots on the north side of Petty Cury, and, in fact, others.

Q. Were those two examples you have mentioned both achieved without completely rebuilding the building? A. Yes, they are just an alteration of the shop front. I agree, of course, that such a method will never be as effective as a wholesale widening of the

footpath. It cannot be. But it does prevent window shoppers barring the way to other pedestrians and by giving more elbow room would do very

*[Original page 264]*

much to ameliorate present conditions.

Q. Pending the buildings now there living out their useful lives? A. Their useful lives, which, I think, could be quite long.

Q. -- would you say that as buildings they are obsolete? A. Not as buildings, no.

Q. The Lion Hotel property as we know is a somewhat odd shape and has a piece at the south end which turns out to give a frontage onto St. Tibb's row? A. Yes.

Q. If that southern appendage of the Lion Hotel was left, would that seriously interfere with the proper redevelopment of the land at the back? A. I would have said if that southern appendage was taken from the Lion it would give a very reasonable shape for redevelopment of the land at the back and would, at the same time, allow a rear service road which, I think, should be got in if possible in any redevelopment to the existing properties in Petty Cury.

Q. Yes, and if the Minister took the general view that the Petty Cury frontage property should not be included in this scheme, would you advise your clients to acquiesce in a scheme which took away from them that southern part of their property at the rear? A. I would, and the line I had in mind was the one in prolongation of the north western boundary of the present car park.

Q. That, I think, would run along several already defined boundaries, would it not, and link them up? A. Yes; and also I had in mind that a rear access road could follow along that line which would then link up with Post Office Terrace which, coupled with a yard somewhat on the lines of, I think it is, Plan J - my alphabet has completely disappeared from me with the plans, but I think it is on Plan J - coupled with a yard there would provide adequate service for the shops. Some would need a slight carry, but it is not unknown for a trolley to be used to service existing shops from a rear access.

Q. One other thing I want to ask you. You have seen this Plan A of Mr. Gimingham showing the roofs? A. Yes.

Q. Does that indicate to you that this is an area of bad layout? A. No, I think if it was intended that Falcon Yard and Alexandra Road should continue as vehicular access I think you might, but I would say that a roof plan gives the worst look of any building. It can make any building pretty well look, as it were, awkward, and I think if you were to look at an aerial photograph of the whole of the central area of Cambridge and draw it out like this it would not look very much different. But I think the best judge of whether it is bad layout is to really look at the ownership plans and the way it is divided, and the occupancy plans, where I would think it would be quite clear that having in mind this is not a formally developed area - that is, the whole of Cambridge - that this cannot be considered as a bad layout.

*[Original page 265]*

Cross-examined by MR SCARMAN

Q. Mr. Gale, when were you first consulted by the proprietors of the Lion Hotel? A. I would say about three weeks ago.

Q. Had you given any consideration to the Hotel and its general physical condition and likely life till a moment three weeks ago? A. No, I had not.

Q. Till the moment three weeks ago? A. No.

Q. You have told the Inspector that it is clearly a building of great age? A. From inspection I would have said it was of great age, yes.

Q. Would you think it fair to suggest that there must be very real doubts as to whether the building has got much effective life left? A. I would not care to say that it had a short life left.

Q. Would it be fair to say that the only reason for being careful in that way is that it has stood up for so long and, presumably, it can go on standing for some time yet? A. I think that is a fair statement.

Q. But it is more a hunch based on its old record than any belief in the soundness or modernity of the structure, is it not? A. I think it is certainly. I made no survey of its structure.

Q. I want to ask you a few questions about the building itself. Would you agree that the rear access, whether it be used for the delivery of goods or for the arrival or departure of visitors' cars is very bad indeed? A. Very bad.

Q. Would you agree that its drainage system is completely obsolete and requires radical renovation? A. I would be quite prepared to take it from you, seeing the building and how the buildings at the rear have been ---

Q. Yes; probably you would also agree, the building being as old as it is, that its arrangements are difficult for fire fighting purposes? A. Yes, I should not think it was easy.

Q. Just while we are on the condition of the building, have you been into the banqueting room? A. Yes.

Q. Would you agree that there are very considerable signs of the infiltration of damp in that room? A. Yes, I would have said not only in the banqueting room.

Q. No, so that it comes to this really that here is a building of great age of which the physical indications are that it is not really able to compete for long with modern standards or modern requirements? A. I think a fairly heavy expenditure on maintenance - I think it would be heavy expenditure - would bring it into line with modern requirements, having regard to what it is, an old coaching inn.

Q. Yes, but I think I was able to gather, from what you said in chief, that you really expect the Lion Hotel to be

*[Original page 266]*

redeveloped by demolition and the erection of other premises fairly soon? A. I did not intend to convey that impression.

Q. You said that you thought it would be available for redevelopment in another property on the south side of Petty Cury over a period of years? A. I was not actually referring to the Lion. I was referring to the whole of Petty Cury frontage which, I thought, could be redeveloped, either pulled down or altered to provide for certain facilities.

Q. Mr. Gale, I do suggest a man with your experience really does expect a building such as the Lion, in a principal shopping street sooner, rather than later, to go for shopping redevelopment? A. I would have thought that it would be very well worth their while retaining their entrance and developing their frontage for shops.

Q. So that insofar as these proposals suggest a shopping use for the Lion frontage to Petty Cury, you would agree that they are sound? A. I think the proposals, if I could put it this way, of the Supplementary Town Map are sound.

Q. Yes; just again, so that I can follow that answer and make sure you have gone all the way with my question, you do agree that insofar as these proposals are proposals for the redevelopment of the Lion Hotel frontage for shops, they are sound? A. Yes, I think the south side is shopping frontage and would be better wholly developed for shopping than it is at the present.

Q. And of course, if that frontage should be redeveloped so as to provide shops of reasonable depth and modern design and rear access for the loading and unloading of goods, you would say that that would be all to the good? A. Yes, and I would have said that it can be done without being included in the Comprehensive Development Area - all the things you have said. But I do hope the modern shop fronts are not too modern.

Q. Yes; well, that is a matter of architectural detail and taste which we have not yet ---? A. Yes, but you did say "all to the good". I wanted to cover that.

Q. Yes, subject to their being properly designed. Now, Mr. Gale, are you one of those who accept a shopping precinct on this back land which you say must be developed as a good idea? A. I do.

Q. Do you accept also that if one is going to have a successful and attractive shopping precinct on the back land, it is is prudent to link it with Petty Cury? A. Link it with the central shopping area and, in fact, you can only do that by linking it with Petty Cury.

*[Original page 267]*

Q. Surely if one is faced with the requirement of developing the Lion Hotel frontage for shops and one is faced with the wisdom of building on land at the back of a shop precinct, the wise planner and a sensible design would tend to link the two

developments? A. Yes, and in fact they will be linked with the existing Falcon Yard and Alexandra Street.

Q. I suppose you would say that Falcon Yard and Alexandra Street provides a link? A. But not sufficient for the purpose.

Q. Not sufficient? A. Not sufficient, together they add to a link, but they should be combined with some other link.

Q. So again I do not want to spend time on it because I think we are substantially in agreement, you are saying to the Inspector and the Minister that you with your experience approve of the idea of the shopping precinct on the back land, think that the Lion Hotel site must be sooner or later re-developed for shopping purposes and think it right to have a link between the shopping link and Petty Cury? A. Yes, and that shopping link cannot be attained without touching the major frontage of Petty Cury.

Q. But of course, again, I do not want to spend a lot of time on it, it would be a much better and sounder proposal altogether if you were to do that and include in it this south side of Petty Cury, would it not? A. It could be done. I do not see that it would be much sounder, I do not see that there would be all that advantage.

Q. Let us see if we can agree on one or two particular advantages and leave it. First of all, it would afford an opportunity for increasing the width of the footpath on the south side of Petty Cury? A. Yes, but there are ways of doing that without a compulsory demolition.

Q. But that would be one advantage? A. Yes.

Q. Secondly, it would provide an opportunity of giving to the shops on the south side of Petty Cury effective rear access for the loading and unloading of goods? A. Again, it could be done without that.

Q. But I am putting that as an advantage? A. Yes.

Q. Thirdly, it would give one an opportunity of letting out the shops to suit modern requirements of space and design? A. You could by doing that alter the present layout to give them a different design.

Q. And finally there could be no better way, I would suggest, of aligning Petty Cury with the shop precincts which you admit is necessary so that it fits in and is part of the south side of Petty Cury? A. The best way, and the way it has been included in the Development Plan is to have the main link between the central shopping centre where it has been sited alongside St. Andrews Church, that is, from the hub of the shopping centre into the precincts and that to my mind coupled with the use of Alexandra Street and Falcon Yard is quite sufficient for the purpose you mention.

*[Original page 268]*

Q. I am not quite sure, Mr. Gale, in the light of the answers which you have given to me what was the relevance of your answers to my learned friend about the character of the centre of Cambridge. I am asking you this question, is there anything in these proposals, that is the authority's proposals which in your view challenge the character of the central area of Cambridge? A. We are bringing out the blue booklet for the moment and whether it is an area to include in a Comprehensive Development Area -

Q. Let us take it by stages. You know as well as I do that the proposals before the Minister are in addition to the Development Plan and they include an area of consequential development and also a compulsory purchase order. First of all, do you see anything in these proposals which is in any way a challenge to the character of the centre of Cambridge? A. Development carried out under this would affect the character of Cambridge.

Q. So you do not see any challenge in that? A. No.

Q. I am obliged for that answer. Now we come to the point which it appears you had in mind, the blue book, the outline of Ston & Toms proposals in which they have conveniently in the front page included a drawing, have you got it? A. Yes.

Q. You are saying, I just want to understand what you are saying, that there is something in that scheme and in that drawing which in your view challenges the character of the centre of Cambridge? A. Yes.

Q. What is it? A. The three tower blocks are wrong and also I think the tower and I can only put it this way, I have a fear that a unified design for the whole of Petty Cury which is quite a long frontage can be such that it will be out of keeping with the

present character of the development of the centre of Cambridge which is a diverse and informal design. I have the fear, as I have said, that this frontage in a unified design will be out of character.

Q. It will be fair, therefore, to say Mr. Gale, with regard to your fears that they are fears which can be resolved by the sensible and proper architectural design and development? A. If I can make this safeguard, that I think it is most difficult in design to make a uniform design which will fit in with informal surroundings.

Q. I appreciate that, but in fact we have got it, I hope into its right perspective, your fears can be resolved by sound and successful design? A. I think there must be otherwise the modern generation of architects - perhaps I should not say that.

Q. Only one other matter. I do not think I need ask you, but I would like to make use of your advice, you would agree with the witness whom I have called that the character of central Cambridge is market town surrounded by these wonderful colleges and University buildings? A. Agreed.

Q. And the area with which we are concerned is market town? A. Yes, closely ringed by the University.

*[Original page 269]*

Q. And it would be extremely unfortunate would it not if the University should be submerged by the market town? A. Yes.

Q. Equally, it would be very unfortunate if market town was submerged by the University? A. Yes, but the general impression is University rather than market town.

Q. Yes, for centuries the University was here and planning was not.

Re-examined by Mr. SQUIBB

Q. You agreed that there were certain advantages to be achieved by taking down Petty Cury and that would of course involve sacrifice of buildings which have many useful purposes? A. Yes.

Q. Would you think the advantages would be worth the price? A. Most of the advantages can be obtained without the necessity for demolishing so if the price -

Q. In any case whether you got into the Comprehensive Development area or not, it is not a consideration of advantage of price, but whether the area is one of bad layout and obsolete development? A. Yes.

Q. So that this Petty Cury frontage could be got over the first hurdle? A. I think it could, it does conform with the requirements.

(The witness withdrew)

Mr. BARR, Called

Mr. SQUIBB: Mr. Barr has been unwell but he would like to make a special effort in case there is anything he can do to assist you with regard to detailed information with regard to the Lion Hotel.

The INSPECTOR: Thank you very much.

Q. Is your full name Laurence Bain Barr? A. Yes.

Q. A solicitor of the Supreme Court practising in this City and in addition to that you have been a Director since 1936 of Messrs. Moyse & Co., Ltd., owners of the Lion Hotel? A. That is so.

Q. And in that capacity have you been fully conversant with the property and all that has gone on concerning it for the last 23 years? A. Yes.

Q. Is it a hotel which is well known owing to its association with members of the University? A. Oh, yes, by correspondence all over the world who have been undergraduates here.

Q. Quite apart from its ordinary function of catering does it provide accommodation for functions and so on? A. Yes, it does a large amount of the functions in Cambridge.

*[Original page 270]*

Q. It has a large banqueting room? A. Large banqueting rooms.

Q. In constant use? A. In constant use.

Q. Take an example, in the current week, there was only one evening when there was not some function going on there? A. That is so.

Q. If these rooms were no longer available would it be a loss severely felt by the Cambridge public both town and gown? A. Yes, they would have to be substituted, there are not too many in the town.

Q. The hotel has 57 bedrooms, and they are generally full? A. Generally speaking, they are full.

Q. And its public rooms? A. Six public rooms.

Q. In addition to the banqueting rooms you have told us about, and the ordinary public rooms is there a room used for auction? A. Yes, all the auctions for the Cambridge properties and the district are held at the Lion, I do not think there is any exception.

Q. You know the proposal, that there should be a hotel of 80 or 90 bedrooms. Could you add to the hotel at the Lion bedrooms to that number? A. I do not think there would be any difficulty on the south side it lends itself to extension.

Q. Has your company had extension in mind for many years? A. Oh yes, since before the war.

Q. And also the adding of a new dining room? A. Yes.

Q. Would that not only provide additional amenities but reduce the overhead expenses? A. Yes, it would be an advantage to the hotel to do that.

Q. Have you felt unable to advance on any major project of improvement while the future of the hotel remained uncertain? A. Yes, it has been impossible to get anything since the war.

Q. First of all, there was trouble about licences? A. Cambridge was not a bombed town, and although I tried several times for licences to do repairs and even ordinary decorations, it was some years after the war that we were allowed to do anything as we were not a bombed city such as Norwich.

Q. And more recently, has it been planning which has stood in your way? A. Yes, it has been continuous because the yard was acquired by the Corporation. The first letter I got was in December, 1945, just after the war, and since then we seem to have been in jeopardy as to any plans.

Q. Have you been given a figure of over £3,000 for building new bedrooms at the hotel? A. I asked how much bedrooms for a new hotel would cost, and was told they would cost £3,000 per bedroom and I was informed it might be slightly over.

Q. Who was it told you that? A. Mr. Hunt of Edgar Investments.

Q. If it was a hotel of 80 or 90 bedrooms the total cost would be £300,000? A. Yes, it would.

*[Original page 271]*

Q. Would it cost you anything like that to add to the Lion? A. Nothing like that.

Q. I think you have a controlling interest in the hotel? A. My family have, I have not personally.

Q. You heard what Mr. Gale said just now that if the re-development area were allowed without the Petty Cury frontage, no objection will be raised to the appendix being cut out and thrown into the development area? A. No, I have been prepared to concede a little more, they took an acre from us, but we are prepared to allow a little more for development purposes. I have always thought it would have to come.

Q. You are sticking out for every square yard? A. No, I do appreciate the difficulties of the Corporation, I do not wish to be obstructive in any way.

Cross-examined by Mr. SCARMAN

Q. How long have you and your family owned through the Company the Red Lion Hotel? A. Since 1936.

Q. Have you between 1936 and 1959 carried out any works of major improvement to the old building? A. No, that is to the hotel face.

Q. So that we are at any rate considering at the hotel a hotel which is a building of great age and of which there is no major works of improvement since you or your family became interested in it? A. May I explain why, because major alterations would have been carried out at the hotel, the idea was to utilise the frontage of Petty Cury for shops and to carry out improvements on the south side of the hotel for hotel purposes without destroying the character of the hotel.

Q. In fact, and do not think I am criticising you, Mr. Barr, the hotel has really been for some years now suffering declining business? A. Declining in respect of business as a hotel? no, it has not.

Q. I am instructed that a reduction in rating was granted upon that very ground some years ago? A. I do not know how that is arrived at, there was a reduction from the ratable assessment under the new assessment, it was much higher than we thought it should be.

*[Original page 272]*

Q. You say that the Authority took an acre from you some time ago; is that a reference to the acquisition of the car park? A. Yes.

Q. When was that acquired? Can you give me the year? A. 1948. June the 30th, 1948. It was the day before the Act came into operation.

Q. What car parking facilities have been available to the hotel patrons since that date? A. Well, I should think about 25. I think I ought to mention -- I do not know whether it is relevant, but before the war, we are talking about any alterations done to the property -- I think it is right to say that we had in 1939 a scheme for an underground car park for nearly 300 cars, and certain parking on the surface together with shops and other premises, which were nearly ready when the war broke out, and since then there has been no opportunity to do anything to the hotel because of various circumstances.

Q. I do not want to press you, Mr. Barr, but it sounds like a little essay on a comprehensive plan to provide an underground car park? A. Yes, but this is 20 years later.

Q. And, therefore, of course, to-day you might expect it to be bigger and better? A. It should be a little more than it is to-day; it should be a multi-storey, I think.

THE INSPECTOR: There is one question I would like to ask. Can you tell me what the rateable value of the property is at present, or perhaps you can let me know the figure later? A. I think £2,400. I forget whether it is net or gross. I think it is the gross.

MR SQUIBB: If you are taking that figure, perhaps it may be as well to have the figure before the reassessment.

THE INSPECTOR: Yes.

(The witness withdrew.)

ADDRESS BY MR SQUIBB ON BEHALF OF THE OWNERS OF THE LION HOTEL

MR SQUIBB: May it please you, Sir; as I understand it there are three maps which are before the Minister. There is a Supplementary Town Map, a Comprehensive Development Area Map and the Designation Map. So far as the Supplementary Town Map is concerned, I have not one word to say. So far as the other two maps are concerned, I am opposing the Comprehensive Development Area Map in so far as it relates to the Petty Cury frontage, and in so far as the Designation Map is concerned I suppose my locus is only to object so far as the Lion Hotel is concerned, the other property owners objecting on their own behalf.

When I say that I am objecting to the Comprehensive Development Area Map so far as the Petty Cury frontage is concerned I am not necessarily saying my clients are in agreement with the whole of the rest of the Corporation's proposals. Those are matters which will be dealt with by my learned friends and their witnesses and nothing that I say is intended in any way to infringe upon those matters which are their own concern. What I can say, and I think everybody in this room agrees, is that the conditions on what I may call the back land are such as to justify making an area of comprehensive development, but the way in which that comprehensive development is to be carried out is a matter upon which differing opinions are held.

*[Original page 273]*

The Lion Hotel has at least the advantage that it was the only building which my learned friend, Mr. Scarman, in opening this Inquiry could describe as attractive and interesting and, indeed, it is not only attractive and interesting but, by virtue of its long subsistence on that site, it is now part, and has been for many years, of the life both of the University and the City. It is not just a place to which visitors can come; it is a place which is frequented and used, and I feel very much appreciated by people who are in Cambridge, and quite apart from the economics of the matter I would submit that the sacrificing of that hotel, pulling it down and throwing it away in order to replace it

by another hotel at the other end of the site, -- the result which would be thereby achieved would not be a replacement of the Lion Hotel which generations have known and been fond of. You cannot replace a building of that kind by something brand new run up in a matter of weeks.

I appreciate that while the Minister may have a certain amount of sympathy with it, he may take the view that that is not the way in which this matter should be decided, because the Minister is acting under the provisions of the Town & Country Planning Act, 1947, and Section 5, I think it is, of that Act lays down the conditions which must be fulfilled before an area can be declared to be a comprehensive development area.

It is well recognised by the County Planning Authority in this case in Paragraph 3 of the Written Statement, because there they adopt the words of the relevant section alleging that this is an area of bad layout and obsolete development and that it is necessary to redevelop it to deal with those conditions and to provide for new roads and a car park. So far as the new roads and the car park are concerned, they will be dealt with upon land with which I have no concern, and the south side of Petty Cury can only be brought into this area at all if the Minister is satisfied that it is one of bad layout and obsolete development and that, in my submission, is the crux of the matter.

The Minister will have to examine what case has been put before him by the promoters in support of that allegation because, after all, the burden lies upon them to prove their case. It is useful, I suggest, to the Minister to view this matter historically. The question of the redevelopment of what generally can be called the Lion Yard area was considered by Professor Holford, as he then was, and Mr. Myles Wright, as he then was, in the Report which they prepared in 1950, and it is apparent on the reading of that Report that all the authors had in mind was the redevelopment of the land lying behind the Petty Cury frontage, and unless there should any doubt at all about that, Sir William Holford, as he now is, was good enough to confirm it when he gave evidence on Tuesday, and that suggestion was incorporated in the Development Plan, although not in a very concrete form and was approved of, although not in a very concrete form by the Minister in the letter which is appended as an appendix to the Report.

When that had been approved, it then fell to the lot of Mr. Walde, whom we have not had the pleasure of seeing, and Mr. Gimingham, whom we have had the pleasure of seeing, to prepare a scheme for carrying that general idea into effect, and Mr. Walde or Mr. Gimingham prepared as their first thought, or at any rate their first thoughts carried them far enough to put on paper that scheme which is shown on plan "J", which was produced yesterday.

*[Original page 274]*

Plan "J", I need not remind you again, shows nothing being taken from the Petty Cury frontage except some property which was already in the ownership of the City Council, and I invite you, Sir, to note carefully what reaction that plan "J" produced in Mr. Burrow's mind when he first saw it. His comment was: "This includes the New Guildhall Street and I am opposed to the New Guildhall Street". He did not comment that it did not include the southern side of Petty Cury, and confirmation is given to that piece of evidence by Mr. Burrows because when he had seen Mr. Gimingham's first effort he went away and produced what he thought was a better one of his own which eliminated the New Guildhall Street but still did not include the Petty Cury frontage.

Then Mr. Gimingham, or somebody in his Department, had some further thoughts on the basis of Mr. Burrow's ideas and produced what we call schemes "C" and "D", neither of which contains any suggestion that any part (apart from bits at the rear which I will leave out for the present purpose,) of the Petty Cury frontage should be taken for the purpose of the Comprehensive Redevelopment Area. Petty Cury was to be left as generations of Cambridge people have known it and as the present generation of Cambridge people know it to-day.

Both Mr. Burrows and Mr. Gimingham were under a duty to consider this from a planning point of view, and I invite you, Sir, to regard those four schemes as being their causa causans. An entirely different consideration was brought into the picture when Mr. Dulake was consulted on the economic and estate management side of it. Mr. Dulake looked at Mr. Gimingham's first effort and he thought that it was not a very good economic proposition. He thought that he could make a better one, although you will remember that he told us yesterday that he thought that plan "J", Mr. Gimingham's first thoughts, was just about a feasible economic proposition but he thought he could

do better, and the way he thought he could do better was by including some more property which is shown in pink on plan "K". Most of that pink land we are not concerned with now, but we are concerned with this piece of pink which refers to the Lion Hotel.

We see from plan "K" that Mr. Dulake was not including the Lion Hotel property with a view to producing any better layout of this scheme, because he does not show any sort of way either for vehicles or pedestrians coming down through the Lion property. His only variation in that respect on Mr. Gimingham's effort was to say it would be a good idea to have an entrance into the back land down the eastern flank of Petty Cury between the Corporation's property and St. Andrew's Church, which would involve taking some of those properties over -- that is shown in plan "K" -- but so far as the Lion is concerned, that was a property which was to be available for development as part of what is described in the legend, as additional land made available for development and I invite the Minister to take very careful account in considering this matter of the legend, just what Mr. Dulake put upon his plan. What he said was this: (legend read). I do not know anything about other pink properties, but it is quite apparent the Lion was included amongst the pink properties, and Mr. Dulake told us that the Lion is not making the maximum commercial use of the site.

*[Original page 275]*

At the time when the Plan A was drawn in the early days of 1956 the compensation which would have been payable on Compulsory Purchase of the land would have been limited to its existing use value, whereas what the Corporation would hope to obtain for it would be not limited in that way, but would be its full commercial value for any purpose, presumably its greatest value is for shops, and that they could hope to realise. One can quite see why Mr. Dulake thought that it made a better economic proposition to include the Lion than to leave it out, as Mr. Gimingham has done, and it is rather significant that although Mr. Dulake included, or suggested the inclusion, of the Lion in this Plan dated 5th March, 1956, Mr. Gimingham still went on pondering on the problem of how he could do this redevelopment without taking in the Petty Cury property at all, not even the Lion, because, as you will have noticed, Sir, the plans

which we have had are Scheme A, B, C and D, were all redrawn on 15th April, 1957, so that shows that they were still live proposals at that time.

Now, Sir, my submission upon this aspect of the case is this: that Mr. Dulake might well have been justified on economic grounds for including the Lion Hotel in this Plan A, but, of course, economic reasons are not reasons which justify the inclusion of property in a comprehensive development area. What happened, I invite the Minister to find, was that Mr. Dulake persuaded the planners round to his point of view, not only that the Lion should be included but that the rest of the Petty Cury frontage should be included, and that when he persuaded them round to his point of view from the economics of the thing then it became necessary to find planning reasons to support it. I am not in any way suggesting that Mr. Gimingham does not now genuinely believe that there are good planning reasons for putting this Petty Cury frontage into the scheme. What I am saying is that he is mistaken. Indeed, Sir, I am saying more than that. I am saying that he is deceiving himself because one cannot, in my submission, place any reliance upon a view which he has formed when one has regard to the history and the circumstances in which he has come to form it. He approaches the problem whether this Petty Cury property is an area of bad layout or obsolete development with a prejudice from the word "go", that he must, if he can possibly do so, come to the conclusion that it is. He can do that, in my submission, perfectly genuinely without any intention to mislead the Minister. The only person he is really misleading is himself, and that, in my submission, is what has happened in this case.

You will have observed that when my learned friend opened the case, when he got to this question of including the south side of Petty Cury in the Development Area, he did not put it forward with any considerable degree of emphasis, nor, indeed, I think I may say, did Sir William Holford when he gave his evidence; and when Mr. Gimingham gave his evidence in chief he did not lay emphasis on the question of bad layout or obsolete development which is the really important point. What he said when he gave his evidence in chief was, if I got it noted correctly, that it was necessary to include the Petty Cury frontage in order to make a good scheme. Well, Sir, that is not the question at all. We are

not here considering how much property you have got to have in order to make a good scheme. What we are considering is what is the area in respect of which the conditions laid down in Section 5 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 properly apply to. They only apply insofar as it is relevant for our purposes to areas of bad layout and obsolete development. This Petty Cury frontage property, although it was laid out probably centuries ago, nobody knows when it was laid out, it is none the less not an area of bad layout, in my submission, for one of the principal streets in an ancient town.

If you look at the plan of the ownerships you will find that the main boundary lines of properties run more or less at right angles to the street, and probably reflect some extremely primitive layout many centuries ago. But, Sir, primitive though that layout may be it is, I would venture to suggest, an appropriate layout for a shopping street in the middle of an ancient town, and, indeed, the only appropriate layout, the division of the frontage into suitable layouts for shops with some plan behind. Then it is said that some of the shops have not got enough land behind the frontage, they are of insufficient depth. That is a matter which cannot possibly be put forward as a general proposition with regard to Petty Cury or any other street, because what is an adequate depth of a shop depends upon the trader who is going to occupy it, and there has never been any lack of traders to occupy the shops in Petty Cury.

Mr. Gimingham fairly agreed that once one becomes empty it is soon filled up again. In my submission it cannot possibly be said that these shops are of an inadequate depth. Then it is said they have not got proper facilities for loading and unloading at the rear. Well, that is a matter which can to a very large extent be cured when the land behind is redeveloped. Plan J shows one way in which it can be done, that plan which Mr. Walde sent to Mr. Barr on 29th August of 1955. It shows another possible way in which it could be done. I have not got a copy of that Plan, but if I may I will hand over to you the original together with a copy of Mr. Walde's letter. You would perhaps like to have that.

Then, Sir, there is the question of the obsolescence of buildings, obsolete development. All I can do is to invite you to go and look at these shops in Petty Cury. They appear, at

any rate, to one who has no technical knowledge of shops, to be pretty much the same as any other shops that one sees in a town. They have got shop fronts and they have got spaces inside where customers go and buy things. That has been the essence of a shop for a very long time now. In so far as one can see, it is the essence of a shop in the foreseeable future, or that is going to be provided in this redevelopment spaces where people can have shop fronts and somewhere behind in which the goods can be kept and the customers can go and buy them.

I would submit this expression obsolete development has really got no meaning at all in relation to a shopping area. Obsolete development, I venture to suggest, is applicable to some such property as a house which was

*[Original page 277]*

built without regard to proper sanitary considerations, without a damp course, without a bathroom and without any space in which a bathroom could conveniently be put and that sort of thing, a property which is just out of date and ought to be done away with on that account. The mere fact that a property is old, as some of these properties in Petty Cury are, does not, in my submission, make it obsolete. It is perfectly well fitted for the functions which it is designed to perform, and insofar as there are any shortcomings such as difficulties in respect of back access, they can be put right in very large measure in the carrying out of inevitable redevelopment of the land at the back; and so far as the land at the back is concerned, as Mr. Barr has told you this afternoon, he does not want to be obstructive. He realises that the back has got to be redeveloped and he is not standing in the way of that redevelopment just because a piece of his property sticks out of it.

So far as the Lion Hotel is concerned, it can continue to function without that appendage sticking out at the back, and no objection at all has been raised to including that in the Comprehensive Development Area. The bit that is objected to is the inclusion of the bulk of the property and, indeed, all the other property which fronts upon Petty Cury, and it is because I say that the statutory conditions requisite to be fulfilled before the property can be included in the Comprehensive Development Area have not been fulfilled in the case of the property that I am concerned with, I ask the Minister to reject that part of these proposals and, if he thinks proper, to confirm the

Comprehensive Development Area at all, to confirm it by the exclusion of the property fronting upon Petty Cury.

THE INSPECTOR: I take it your objections apply equally to the Compulsory Purchase Order?

MR SQUIBB: Oh, yes, certainly.

MR SCARMAN: I do not know if it would be helpful if I pursued the course which is often pursued at development plan inquiries of saying a few words in conclusion on each objection, but I will not, of course, go into the matter in any great detail.

THE INSPECTOR: I think that would be convenient.

MR SCARMAN: My learned friend has examined, I would say, with a surgeon's enthusiasm, the anatomical detail of the process of gestation of this plan. Exactly what the purpose of that examination was I do not know, except, perhaps, to found the suggestion which, with all respect, I say is absurd, that Mr. Gimingham is deceiving himself in taking the view that on planning grounds the incorporation of Petty Cury is an essential and wise part of this plan. Sir, if Mr. Gimingham is so deceiving himself I would respectfully remind you, Sir, and your Minister, so also is Sir William Holford, so also is Mr. Burrows, and such a concourse of self-deception would be exceptional, even in the rarified atmosphere of town planning. But, Sir, of course, it is in my respectful submission, quite unfair and wrong to dissect

*[Original page 278]*

the process of thought, to single out certain phases of that process and to say, because those phases differ from the final result of the thought, that the final result must be wrong.

In my respectful submission, the very fact that so many alternative schemes over a considerable period of time, were given consideration, and so many minds from different aspects were brought to bear upon it, that one may have very considerable confidence from those facts alone in the resulting conclusion, and, Sir, the resulting conclusion is that the incorporation of the south side of Petty Cury is vital to the scheme as a whole in all its aspects.

My learned friend was good enough to say that in opening I did not stress with any great emphasis the incorporation of Petty Cury as an aspect of the scheme. Sir, I do not propose to quote what I said in opening, but I would like to give you the references so that you and your Minister can form a judgment as to whether it is a fair criticism of the reports of it. Sir, they are Day One, pages 12 and 13 and pages 18 and 19. I will say no more of those passages in the opening except that I would respectfully submit it is plain to any detached and unbiased intelligence that emphasis was then placed upon the incorporation of Petty Cury in the Plan.

Now, Sir, I do respectfully submit that the evidence establishes that the south side of Petty Cury with which we are concerned is, indeed, an area of bad layout and obsolete development. I would say that is to be found quite plainly in the evidence not only of the witnesses that I called, but also the evidence of Mr. Gale himself. Indeed, when my learned friend was enumerating in respect of a dwellinghouse the various indications of obsoleteness such as: absence of a damp course and various structural failings, absence of a decent water system for baths, I was thinking of the various items of criticism of structure of the Lion Hotel and which Mr. Gale agreed with me a few minutes earlier, and what I should have thought is sauce for a dwellinghouse in a matter of obsoleteness might also be sauce for a hotel.

*[Original page 279]*

I would respectfully submit that it is abundantly shown that the only claim that the Lion Hotel can have upon our minds and emotions for its future condition is a sentimental one, certainly not one of efficiency in serving the requirements of modern life in the centre of a busy University and market town such as Cambridge.

So much for the layout and the obsolete development.

When one sees what the scheme comprises and thinks why it is right that Petty Cury should be incorporated, one appreciates that the scheme comprises a very real improvement of layout in the matter of accommodation for pedestrians on the south pavement of Petty Cury, a very real improvement in the layout and design in the matter of the shops themselves for what is there to-day, and a very real improvement in the matter of access to the shops for the purpose of loading and unloading of goods.

I would respectfully submit that these matters alone, with every one of which Mr. Gale agrees, are sufficient foundation for the incorporation of Petty Cury in the scheme.

The last remark I wish to make is that the matter does not rest there and it does not depend upon this particular physical advantage which the scheme will confer. I ask you to bear in mind the wider aspect of this matter, the necessity from the point of view of good civic design, as well as economics of incorporating and linking together the shopping precincts which Mr. Gale agreed were good, that Petty Cury which lies a little to the north and is one of the most important shopping areas of Cambridge and which clearly to give a Comprehensive unified and satisfactory harmony must be properly linked with these precincts, I would respectfully submit that on the grounds of planning and design as well as on the particular advantages which will be brought to Petty Cury, the case for the incorporation of the south side of Petty Cury is made out as vital to the scheme.

The INSPECTOR: Before adjourning the Inquiry I would like to give you the provisional programme for next week. Starting on Tuesday, and I propose to start at half-past ten, there will be the cross-examination of Sir William Holford, and of the Chief Constable, and then I shall hear the case for the University put by Mr. James and after that the case for Christ's College put by Mr. Canavasse and it looks as though that will take us through Thursday and I shall not be sitting, you will remember on Friday of next week.

I now adjourn the Inquiry until half-past ten on Tuesday.

Mr. SCARMAN: It might be difficult for Mr. James for the University to have to cross-examine the Chief Constable after the conclusion of his case and I would like to indicate that as far as I know it will be possible to fit Mr. James's cross-examination of the Chief Constable before he concludes for the University. I will do what I can to meet Mr. James.