



Joint Development Control Committee

Date: Wednesday, 21 December 2022

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel 01223 457000

Agenda

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Declarations of Interest
- 3 Minutes (PAGES 3 - 18)

Miscellaneous Items

- 4 Planning Committee Site Visit Protocol (PAGES 19 - 26)
- 5 Joint Development Control Committee Meeting Dates for 2023/2024 (PAGES 27 - 28)

Application

- 6 21/05433/REM - Parcel BDW4, Darwin Green 1, Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge (PAGES 29 - 120)

Joint Development Control Committee Members:

Cambridge City Council: Cllrs S. Smith (Chair), Carling, Flaubert, Porrer, Scutt and Thornburrow, Alternates: D. Baigent, Gawthrop Wood, Levien and Page-Croft

South Cambridgeshire District Council: Cllrs Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart and R.Williams, Alternates: Cone, Garvie, J.Williams and H.Williams

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

This Meeting will be live streamed to the Council's YouTube page. You can watch proceedings on the livestream or attend the meeting in person.

Those wishing to address the meeting will be able to do so virtually via Microsoft Teams, or by attending to speak in person. You must contact Democratic Services democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

21 September 2022
10.00 am - 3.15 pm

Present: Councillors S. Smith (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Carling, Flaubert, Porrer, Scutt, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins, Stobart and R. Williams

Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites): Philippa Kelly
Principal Planner: Rebecca Ward
Principal Sustainability Officer: Emma Davies
Principal Urban Designer: Sarah Chubb
Senior Planner (Strategic Sites): James Truett
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe
Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

Other Officers Present:

Development Management Engineer: Victoria Keppey (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Developer Representatives:

Strutt & Parker: David Fletcher, Director, National Development & Planning
Durkan Limited: Kim Rickards, Senior Planning Manager
RPR LLP: Richard Edge, Architect
Bidwells: Jake Lambert, Principal Planner (Planning Agent)
GL Hearn: Ben Stalham, Planning Director. Head of Major Projects.
Cambridge University Hospital: Carin Charlton, Executive Estates and Facilities Director
NNBBJ: Julia Davies, Architect

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/34/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from City Councillor Thornburrow, Councillor D Baigent attended as an alternate.

22/35/JDCC Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
All	Baigent	Personal: Member of Cambridge

		Cycling Campaign
All	R Williams	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
22/39/JDCC	Carling	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest: Observer to the Board of Trustees, Christ's College, Cambridge University. Did not take part in either the discussion or the decision making.

22/36/JDCC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

22/37/JDCC S/1231/18/COND9 and 18/0481/COND9 - Land North of Cherry Hinton (LNCH), Coldhams Lane, Cambridge - Design Code

The Committee received a report referring to the applications which sought discharge of condition 9 for the site wide design code of outline planning permission 18/0481/OUT and S/1231/18/OL for up to 1200 residential dwellings (including retirement living facility), a local centre, primary and secondary schools, community facilities, open spaces, allotments, landscape and associated infrastructure.

Mr David Fletcher (Agent) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee raised the following comments in response to the Officer's presentation and report:

- i. Asked if Officers could be more detailed in how the residential units would be numbered; way finding could be added.
- ii. Requested that an electricity supply be installed to the open square, so power could be offered to community events / markets being run from this space; also access to water supply would be beneficial.
- iii. Would like to have car club referenced in the design code
- iv. Queried whether the 800 houses which would trigger the building of a recycling point was for units built or units sold / occupied.
- v. Enquired why all the site roads/footpaths were not being adopted; this could lead to the freeholder charging leaseholders for the resulting estate

- management costs over which the leaseholders would have little oversight or control.
- vi. Concerned about the long-term management / maintenance of the site
 - vii. Requested further detail on the management company and how this would operate; the impact this could have on the site over the long term needed to be seriously considered.
 - viii. Questioned if Cambridge City Council would be responsible for all the green areas on site, even those within the boundary of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - ix. Highlighted the importance of being aware of local government boundaries when working on the detailed design; this would affect residents' council tax according to which local authority administrative boundary they were in.
 - x. There should be some indication to potential buyers which local authority would be responsible for the area in which they lived in.
 - xi. Thanked the Officers, Designers and Developers for their collaboration in working to improve the quality of application.
 - xii. Questioned if additional access points were required due to the quantity of roads leading to the primary street as all traffic would currently leave at the eastern and western ends.
 - xiii. Asked for further information on movement and access of the site concerning vehicles and cyclists.
 - xiv. Welcomed the permeability to Cherry Hinton village.
 - xv. Requested further information on the location of the post boxes on site.
 - xvi. Asked for clear definition on the use of the terms 'must' and 'should' throughout the document.
 - xvii. Enquired who owned the copyright of the design code document.
 - xviii. Suggested a clear definition of term 'fabric first' was required and asked how this would be tested during the design process.
 - xix. Recommended that the separation for movement and access for cycling and pedestrian should be made clearer.
 - xx. Requested further information on the management of cycle and pathways throughout the build-out process and how they would be kept clear of vehicle parking.
 - xxi. Highlighted the importance of the reference to air source heat pumps and to the cooling of the buildings, particularly those units of dual aspect; these should be installed from the start of the build.
 - xxii. Consideration should be given to ground source heat sources at the early design stage.

- xxiii. Important to install highest possible level of solar electricity generation capacity and notes that some photovoltaic panels do not reflect sunlight and maybe safe to install in close proximity to the airport.
- xxiv. Asked if there would be a permanent on-site warden provision who would liaise with tenants.
- xxv. Requested further clarification on the mechanical ventilation for the residential units.
- xxvi. Enquired if there could be outdoor gym equipment installed on site to help promote the active lifestyle referenced.
- xxvii. Noted the highway authority did not allow underground communal bin storage on adopted roads which would prevent innovative waste solutions being found.
- xxviii. Queried where the bus stops would be installed.
- xxix. Expressed concern at the impact of the additional vehicle and cycle movement under the railway bridge (top end of Coldham Lane) from the site which was already a pinch point.
- xxx. No provision had been made for cyclists to leave the site and bike into Cambridge.
- xxxi. Stated it was important to have a phasing plan for the facilities referenced on site such as the health centre, community centre, schools, and retail.

The Principal Planner, the Delivery Manager, Strategic Sites, the Sustainability Officer and Chair responded to the Committee's comments with the following:

- i. A large amount of time had been spent with the Officers from the local Highway Authority and the City Council's streets and open spaces team to reduce the amount of land which would fall under a management company for maintenance purposes. This was an exemplar design code proposal compared to the design codes in place for other fringe site developments.
- ii. Adoption was the first consideration. Over the last decade the parameters had changed as to what would be adopted in terms of key street elements.
- iii. Acknowledged that the costs for a management company needed to be kept low.
- iv. Officers had ensured the installation of drainage swales on the primary streets met the wider function required by streets and open spaces team to be adopted. Such requirements were width, biodiversity, urban greening, and social ability to ensure adoption.
- v. Cambridge City Council would undertake the management of all green open spaces including those in the South Cambridgeshire District

- Council's boundary. The developer would pay a sum of money, known as a commuted sum (yet be agreed) towards post adoption work.
- vi. All letter boxes would meet the accessibility requirements and be installed in a secure location. Letter box heights would be no less than 0.7m in height which could be secured by reserved matters applications.
 - vii. Street names and numbering were not usually discussed at this stage but way finding could be designed in.
 - viii. A signage strategy would be discussed at the pre-application (of reserved matters) stage and acknowledged the request for consultation with local councillors.
 - ix. A s106 Agreement planning obligation has been secured to enhance the movement and travel arrangements in and around the site which included:
 - a new shared cycle way along Coldham Lane that linked the north-western tip of the site;
 - an upgrade to the Barnwell Road pedestrian and cycle crossing;
 - delivery of small-scale walking and cycling measures;
 - access improvements at various junctions around Coldham Lane.
 - widening of cycle paths around the area.
 - x. The impact of the wider transport assessment had included the top of Coldham Lane under the railway bridge. This would have been considered when measuring the trip generation and discussed as part of the determination of the outline planning application.
 - xi. The County Council's transport assessment team had previously confirmed that the transport mitigation package put forward as part of the outline planning application for this site was acceptable; wider/strategic discussions on transport in the area were ongoing.
 - xii. The County Council's transport assessment team had concluded there were appropriate off-road routes into the City including the Tinns cycleway.
 - xiii. Confirmed the primary street had a segregated cycle and pedestrian route (p44 of the Design Code).
 - xiv. The location of the modal filters were indicative at this stage of the Design Code; the exact location of these filters would be determined through the master planning at the reserved matters application stage.
 - xv. Referred to the construction phasing plan subject to a planning condition under the outline approval.
 - xvi. There would be short temporary diversions in place along the public right of way through the centre of the site at points of construction.
 - xvii. The recycling centre was required to be delivered at occupation of the 800th dwelling but there could be potential for earlier provision.

- xviii. The s38 Agreement process concerning the adoption of highways would start when the reserved matters applications had been approved.
- xix. The Highway Authority would seek to adopt highways serving five properties or more; some tertiary roads on site only had two dwellings and thus not eligible for adoption.
- xx. Discussion would be held with the developer concerning enforcement and how to keep the cycle ways clear of vehicular parking until adoption. This would be discussed at the reserved matters applications.
- xxi. As part of the detail of the reserved matters applications discussion would include the following:
 - Car club parking for all flats and apartments;
 - house numbering on site;
 - permanent on-site warden for the social housing.
- xxii. Utilities on the open square had been envisaged and would be added to the Design Code for this to be clearer.
- xxiii. Subject to discussions with the developer car club spaces had been secured on site.
- xxiv. Noted the request to have cycleways remain open during build-out
- xxv. The Design Code document was owned jointly by all parties involved.
- xxvi. Local Government administrative boundary issues were not a matter for the Design Code.
- xxvii. Fabric first meant carefully considering the design and construction of buildings early in the design stages. This was to ensure minimising energy demand and consumption through a range of different methods.
- xxviii. The energy strategy would provide more detail on how the fabric first principles could and would be met.
- xxix. A trim trail would run along the outside of the site, the play strategy consideration would be given to installation of equipment.
- xxx. Acknowledged the comment that the design was boring but noted that design was subjective and influenced by personal taste or opinion. The Design Code was intended to set a precedent for what was trying to be achieved throughout the site and to create a vision for its delivery.
- xxxi. The reference to mechanical ventilation would be discussed with consultants to ensure that the information was clear and concise and could be understood.

The Legal Advisor stated that changing boundaries would be a very lengthy process to complete with various consultations undertaken and should not constrain the development of the site. Furthermore, the Legal Advisor advised that 'must' creates a mandatory requirement whilst the use of 'should' provides an element of flexibility.

The Strategic Sites Delivery Manager, summarised the following additional amendments to the Design Code document will include:

- i. specific reference to letter box heights being no less than 0.7m above dwelling floor level;
- ii. a review of the trigger point for delivering the community recycling point;
- iii. reference to ensuring provision is made for electricity and water supply infrastructure in/to the central community areas; and
- iv. review and update to the paragraph on page 63 of the Code regarding mechanical ventilation.

These amendments were **carried unanimously**.

The Committee:

The Committee **unanimously resolved** to (additional text underlined):

- i. Approve the discharge of condition application reference 18/0481/COND9 subject to:
 1. amendment of the description of the proposal as follows: 'Submission of details required by condition 9 (Site Wide Design Code) of outline permission 18/0481/OUT as varied by planning permission 22/1967/S73' and Design Code document update to include:
 - specific reference to letter box heights being no less than 0.7m in height;
 - a review of the trigger point for delivering the community recycling facility;
 - reference to ensuring provision is made for electricity and water in the central community areas; and
 - review and update to the paragraph of the Code on page 63 regarding mechanical ventilation.

The Committee **unanimously resolved** to (additional text underlined):

- ii. Approve the discharge of condition application reference S/1231/18/COND9 subject to:
 1. amendment of the description of the proposal as follows: 'Submission of details required by condition 9 (Site Wide Design

- Code) of outline permission S/1231/18/OL as varied by planning permission 22/01966/S73' and Design Code document update to include
2. Specific reference to letter box heights being no less than 0.7m in height.
 3. A review of the trigger point for delivering the community recycling point.
 4. Reference to ensuring provision is made for electricity and water in the central community areas.
 5. Review and update to the paragraph of the Code on page 63 regarding mechanical ventilation

22/38/JDCC Robinson Way, Cambridge

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied with comments from Officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers and/or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently they are not recorded in these minutes.

Councillors Scutt, Stobart and R Williams gave apologies for absence for this item.

- i. Enquired how the transport connectivity would be dealt with, including buses.
- ii. Requested further information on the use of the tunnel connecting to the hospital: would like clarification that it was free of water.
- iii. Asked if more details could be provided for the ground floor courtyard; would there be sufficient light and ventilation.
- iv. Asked for additional information about energy management and building services; how would this be an effective space and ensure energy flow?
- v. Questioned the use of grey water on site.
- vi. Queried what would be the expected volume of patients and staff on site and how the sustainable travel needs would be met.
- vii. Expressed interest in the long views of the building shown in the presentation and wanted to know more; what would be the impact on the views concerning the plant on the roof.
- viii. Queried if the developers had anticipated using passive cooling from the ground source on site.
- ix. Asked if there was a roof garden which could be used by staff and patients.

22/39/JDCC Lots M4/M5, North West Cambridge (Eddington), Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road Cambridge

Members raised the comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied with comments from Officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers and/or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently they are not recorded in these minutes.

Councillors Scutt, Stobart and R Williams gave apologies for absence for this item.

- i. Asked to explain the reasoning for the open brick frame on the four-storey apartments.
- ii. Enquired how the shared spaces between the private space in the residential courts would be managed.
- iii. Queried how parking would be managed on the road that ran parallel to Huntingdon Road.
- iv. Asked if the developer had considered planting smaller trees in the first instance rather than mature large trees.
- v. Advised further explanation of how to reduce possible overheating of the single aspect apartments was needed.
- vi. Requested clarification if a refuse vehicle would be able to reverse down the primary routes.
- vii. Asked for further information on the design to break up the mono tones colour of the previous developments on site.
- viii. Noted the tertiary streets had many parking spaces which was different to the rest of the development; did not want it to become a car park and questioned how this could be stopped.
- ix. Suggested more greenery was required on the tertiary streets.
- x. Noted the main street was very long and straight and recommended further design should be considered to reduce the speeding of vehicles; queried how this would be managed
- xi. Asked for further information on cargo bike parking and parking for other types of bikes.
- xii. Expressed concern in the design from the private entrances of the residential units to the semi-private courtyards and how they would be managed.
- xiii. Questioned if the developer had thought about whether car parking was required at all for city living and if parking was required whether it should

- be located on the edge of the site to provide for living streets with more landscaping and bigger gardens.
- xiv. Questioned if the temperatures inside the triple aspect apartments would be liveable as global warming continued. Was this an example of planning and design above policy.
 - xv. Asked what the interface was with those houses on Huntingdon Road.
 - xvi. Requested further information on the youth zone.
 - xvii. Asked for the junction between the access road from Eddington Avenue and the existing dual use footpath and cycleway (which runs from Storey's Field Centre, and along the school boundary to the playing field) to privilege pedestrians and cyclists
 - xviii. Noted the district heating scheme is gas fired and a timetable for phasing out the use of gas at Eddington is required
 - xix. Questioned whether the Part O analysis of single aspect dwellings is rigorous enough to anticipate rising temperatures during the life of the building

The meeting ended at 3.15 pm

CHAIR

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

19 October 2022
10.00 am - 12.20 pm

Present: Councillors S. Smith (Chair), Bradnam (Vice-Chair), Carling, Gawthrope Wood, Page-Croft, Cahn, Fane, Hawkins and Stobart

Present virtually via Microsoft Teams: Councillors Flaubert, Porrer and Thornburrow

Officers Present:

Head of Commercial Services: James Elms
Delivery Manager (Strategic Sites): Philippa Kelly
Major Projects & Programme Manager: Sarah Tovell
Legal Adviser: Keith Barber
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Chris Connor

Developer Representatives:

David Fletcher
Alexis Butterfield
Ulrich van Eck
Will Nicholls

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/40/JDCC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Porrer (Councillor Page-Croft attended as an Alternate), Scutt (Councillor Gawthrope Wood attended as an Alternate) and R. Williams.

Councillor Porrer, a substantive member of the Committee, was unable to attend the meeting in person and instead attended virtually via Microsoft Teams. Councillor Page-Croft attended in person as her Alternate.

It was noted that those who attended the meeting virtually could not vote but could contribute to debate. Councillor Porrer attended virtually via Microsoft Teams as an observer.

22/41/JDCC **Declarations of Interest**

Item	Councillor	Interest
All	Stobart	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
22/44/JDCC	Bradnam and Cahn	Personal: District and County Councillor for Ward that abuts development. Discretion unfettered.

22/42/JDCC **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 22 June 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment on page 4, under item relating to 21/03244/FUL – Cambridge Airport Newmarket Road Cambridge, after second sentence add:

‘A JDCC site visit was held on Monday 13 June 2022. The purpose of the visit was to see the existing H16 radar; to see the proposed H17 radar site; and to observe the H16 radar in operation and to listen close up and at a distance’.

22/43/JDCC **Reserved Matters 3, Land North of Cherry Hinton, Cambridge**

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, and comments from officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

1. Would young people have input into the design of outside play space?
2. Would the proportion of adopted roads increase?
3. Was there sufficient space for cars to park, and garage doors to open, without taking up pavement space?
4. Could grass survive in the play spaces if spaces were used as per the design?
5. Could all housing be made dual aspect?
6. Did single aspect homes have noise attenuation measures?

7. Were post boxes located outside flats in an accessible location?
8. Welcomed the Play Strategy and Trim Trail. Could cyclists access the site?
9. Were allotments provided, and if so, where? Would there be an associated community building for allotments?
10. How could bricks from this development be re-used at the end of the site's life to minimise its carbon footprint?
11. What water efficiency measures were in place eg water meters or grey water recycling?
12. Queried if the following were available:
 - a. Electric vehicle charging points?
 - b. Photovoltaic panels on roofs?
 - c. A focal point for children and adult social activities?
 - d. Space for cargo bike storage?
 - e. A car share scheme?
13. Was it possible to service several properties from one air source heat pump instead of requiring one for each property?
14. Could mechanical ventilation be installed with other features to 'personalise' homes in future?
15. Queried size of parks in the development?
16. Would trees be planted in the small squares, particularly near houses?
17. Could waste/refuse trucks and the bus network use the adopted roads?
18. How to meet the challenge of cooling flats, particularly when the weather was especially hot?
19. What facilities were in place to dry clothes as people did not want to put them on radiators?
20. What facilities were in place for electric bikes and scooters:
 - a. Access?
 - b. Storage?
 - c. Hiring? (So people did not have to go off site.)
21. How would management companies be established to oversee maintenance service charges? Arrangements needed to be accountable and transparent.
22. Could flat roofs be green roofs?
23. Could roofs be retrofitted in future to take photovoltaic panels once the Cambridge Airport leaves its current site?
24. Requested a copy of the guidance provided to the airport that stated photovoltaic panels could not be used on roofs at present due to the impact of glare and reflection.

25. Please spread affordable housing across different types/tenures instead of locating in one type eg single aspect buildings.
26. Play areas needed to be in place from phase 1.

22/44/JDCC Cambridge Operational Hub - 59, 68, and 72 Cowley Road, Cambridge, CB4 0DN

Members raised comments/questions as listed below. Answers were supplied, and comments from officers but as this was a pre-application presentation, none of the answers or comments are binding on either the intended applicant or the local planning authority so consequently are not recorded in these minutes.

1. Asked if existing operations from the current depot site would be relocated to the new one on Cowley Road.
2. How would the development fit into the North East Area Action Plan?
3. What plans were in place for the wash down area and the protection of the nearby public drain?
4. How would staff be encouraged to change their travel arrangements from cars to bikes and public transport?
5. Would this application be:
 - a. An exemplar site for staff to work at?
 - b. Attractive in design?
 - c. Net zero footprint?
6. Would the site have appropriate parking and be accessible for people with mobility issues?
7. Were car club or car share facilities in place?
8. Would the development increase traffic levels in Cowley Road?
9. Would there be charging facilities for electric bikes on-site?
10. Asked what water recycling facilities would be in place and how water would be heated eg solar thermal?
11. How could roofs be used eg siting solar panels?
12. Could ground source heat pumps be used instead of air source heat pumps?
13. Queried if site treatment had been discussed? The design used a lot of concrete, how could this be mitigated?
14. What structural support was in place for the projecting part of the building?
15. Were mowers stored in the main building for security reasons?
16. Cambridge Assessment did a good consultation exercise circa 2020, please learn from their good practice.

The meeting ended at 12.20 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank



GREATER CAMBRIDGE SHARED PLANNING

PLANNING COMMITTEE PROTOCOL FOR OFFICER-LED SITE VISITS

Planning Committee Date: 21 December 2022

Report to: Joint Development Control Committee

Report by: Philippa Kelly, Strategic Sites Delivery Manager, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service.

Tel: 07704 018 468

Email: philippa.kelly@greatercambridgeplanning.org

Ward/parishes affected: All

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 Procedural guidance on the conducting of committee site visits can be found in Part 6 of the Cambridge City Council Constitution and Part 4 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Ethical Handbook (May 2020). The District's Ethical Handbook does not form part of the District's Constitution, but supplements some of the documents that are, such as the Code of Conduct.
- 1.2 On occasions, the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) may wish to visit a site, where development is proposed, before making a decision on a given planning application. This report confirms the procedure for requesting site visits and the conduct of site visits, that will be followed on those occasions when such site visits take place
- 1.3 The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service (GCSPS) is supported by three planning committees, and as such the need for consistency in

arranging and undertaking planning committee site visits is recognised. A planning committee protocol for officer-led site visits (Appendix A) has been prepared which sets out the approach which will be followed by all three planning committees - JDCC, Cambridge City Council Planning Committee and South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee. It is the intention that this protocol will also, eventually supplement the City and District Councils' existing procedural guidance on the conduct of site visits.

2. Recommendation

2.1 Officers recommend that the Joint Development Control Committee:

- (i) Notes this report and the accompanying planning committee protocol for officer-led site visits.
- (ii) Confirms implementation of the protocol for officer-led site visits for the Joint Development Control Committee.

3. Background

3.1 Planning committee site visits are helpful in enabling Members to see the site of a planning application, so that they gain a better understanding of its location, physical characteristics and relationships to neighbouring uses, before the application is determined.

3.2 During a planning committee site visit, the merits of the application are not discussed, nor is a decision reached at this time. The proper forum to discuss the application is at the Planning Committee meeting, when all information is in the public arena, and Councillors' debate and decide on the full proposal.

3.3 The purpose of the protocol for officer-led site visits is to guide the conduct of Planning Committee site visits.

Requests for JDCC Site Visits

3.4 The decision on whether to organise a formal JDCC site visit will rest with the Strategic Sites Delivery Manager, taking into consideration the views of the JDCC Chair.

3.5 A site visit can result from any one of the following:

- (i) A request by a Member of the JDCC in writing (giving reasons why the site visit is considered necessary) during the time that an application is being processed.
 - (ii) The Director of Planning and Economic Development, or Strategic Sites Delivery Manager considers that one is necessary in the interests of proper decision making.
 - (iii) The JDCC calls for a site visit following a deferral of a decision purposely for a site visit.
- 3.6 The site visit will take place at a date and time fixed by the Strategic Sites Delivery Manager, following discussion with the Chair of JDCC and the Committee Services Manager.
- 3.7 For complex or sensitive applications which are being referred to JDCC, a site visit agenda as appropriate will be prepared by the planning case officer and circulated to Members in advance of the site visit. The site visit agenda will confirm the meeting point, set out the purpose and format of the visit, and highlight any important notes such as the need for appropriate attire.
- 3.8 Members will be encouraged to attend organised site visits: in the event that this is not possible, and Members wish to independently visit, the site visit should be undertaken from public land only; contact with applicants and objectors should be avoided. By failing to do so a perception of bias could arise, which in turn might lead to the JDCC's decision being susceptible to challenge.

Conduct of JDCC Site Visits

- 3.9 JDCC site visits are solely for the purpose of viewing the site, understanding its location and immediate environs to be able to put the development proposal into context, and discussing the facts of the application. It is not a meeting to discuss the planning merits of the scheme or to make decisions.
- 3.10 JDCC site visits will be led by the Strategic Sites Delivery Manager and/or the planning case officer with support from the Chair of JDCC. On occasion, technical officers of the Council or officers from other authorities may be invited to attend a site visit by the planning case officer to clarify factual or technical matters.
- 3.11 The site visit will only be attended by Members of JDCC, unless there are circumstances where it is necessary for the landowner or their representatives to be in attendance. As a private meeting, public rights of attendance and speaking do not apply.

- 3.12 Members will travel to the meeting point for the site visit independently, unless the Director of Planning agrees that alternative arrangements shall be provided by the shared planning service.
- 3.13 Members may ask their questions including any requests for specific information from the Applicant (or any representatives of the Applicant) if they are present. Members should ensure that they can hear the Officers' presentation and the questions and answers.
- 3.14 Before closing the site visit, the Lead DM or planning case officer will seek confirmation that Members are satisfied they have seen everything they need to make a decision, after which will draw the site visit to a close.
- 3.15 Members should avoid engaging in private conversations with each other on the subject of the application or with the Applicant (or any representatives of the Applicant) if they are present at the time of the site visit. Questions regarding points of clarification in relation to the proposed development may be asked at the discretion of the Delivery Manager/planning case officer.
- 3.16 For the purposes of factual record, attendance at a site visit will be recorded by officers including the locations visited. No formal notes of a site visit will be recorded.

4. Implications

Financial Implications

- 4.1 The JDCC is currently managed by Cambridge City Council, and the cost of the JDCC meetings are covered within existing budgets. The introduction of a planning committee site visit protocol is not anticipated to increase the frequency of JDCC meetings or its caseload so as to introduce significant additional costs. Officers will nevertheless keep these ongoing costs under review.

Staffing Implications

- 4.2 There are no staffing implications arising from this report.

Equality and Poverty Implications

- 4.3 An Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) has not been undertaken in respect of this report, because the site visit protocol relate to the terms of reference of a committee and no material changes are proposed to the operation of the Committee meetings which will follow existing practices.

Environmental Implications

4.4 None.

Procurement Implications

4.5 None.

Community Safety Implications

4.6 None.

5. Consultation and Communication Considerations

5.1 No formal consultation has been undertaken in the preparation of this report. The committee site visit protocol is a matter for the Local Authorities and no formal consultation is required.

6.0 Background Papers

6.1 Background papers used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridge City Council Constitution [Constitution - Cambridge City Council](#)
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Ethical Handbook (May 2020) [Ethical Handbook.pdf \(moderngov.co.uk\)](#) and Constitution. [Agenda for Constitution on Thursday, 9 June 2022 \(moderngov.co.uk\)](#)

7.0 Appendices:

7.1 Appendix 1 – Planning Committee Protocol for Officer-Led Site Visits

APPENDIX 1:



FORMAL PLANNING COMMITTEE PROTOCOL FOR OFFICER-LED SITE VISITS

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (JDCC); CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE (City PC); SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE (SCDC PC)

Purpose of a Planning Committee Site Visit

Planning committee site visits are solely for the purpose of viewing the site, understanding its location and context immediate environs to be able to put the development proposal into context, and discussing the facts of the application.

Site visits will be led by the relevant Lead Delivery Manager (Lead DM) and/or the planning case officer with support from the Chair of Planning Committee. On occasion, technical officers of the Council or officers from other authorities may be invited by the planning case officer to attend a site visit to clarify factual or technical matters.

A site visit is not a meeting to discuss the merits of a development proposal, and no decisions will be made at the site visit by the Planning Committee. The Lead DM/planning case officer will make this clear at the beginning of the visit within their introduction.

As a private inspection to gain an understanding of the facts relating to an application, site visits are not part of the formal consideration of the application, and public rights of attendance and speaking do not apply.

Requests for Site Visits:

The decision on whether to organise a formal committee site visit rests with the relevant Lead DM. For the JDCC this is the Strategic Sites Delivery Manager and for the City PC and SCDC PC this is the Delivery Manager or Area Delivery Managers.

The Lead DM will take into consideration the views of the relevant Planning Committee Chair with regard to:

1. The complexity or sensitivity of the development proposal.
2. The characteristics of the site and its surroundings.

A site visit can result from any one of the following:

1. A request by a Member of the JDCC, City PC or SCDC PC in writing (giving reasons why the site visit is considered necessary) during the time that an application is being processed.
2. The Director of Planning and Economic Development, or Lead DM considers that one is necessary in the interests of proper decision making.
3. The JDCC, City PC or SCDC PC calls for a site visit following a deferral of a decision purposely for a site visit.

The site visit will take place at a date and time fixed by the Lead DM and/or the planning case officer following discussion with both the Chair of the relevant Planning Committee (or if they are not available, the Vice Chair), and the Committee Services Manager.

Members will travel to the meeting point for the site visit independently, unless the Director of Planning agrees that alternative arrangements shall be provided by Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (GCSPS).

For complex or sensitive applications which are being referred to a Planning Committee, a site visit agenda as appropriate will be prepared by the planning case officer and circulated to Members of that committee in advance of the site visit. The site visit agenda will confirm the meeting point, set out the purpose and format of the visit, and highlight any important notes such as the need for appropriate attire.

Members are encouraged to attend organised site visits. In the event that this is not possible, and Members wish to independently visit, the site visit should be undertaken from public land only and contact with applicants and objectors should be avoided. By failing to do so a perception of bias could arise which in turn might lead to the Planning Committee's decision being susceptible to challenge.

Conduct of Site Visits:

- Members will view the site from the nearest public space and any other public spaces as considered appropriate by the planning case officer. Should access to the application site (or any other private land) be considered necessary to view the site, the planning case officer will seek the consent of the relevant landowner in advance.

- The site visit will usually only be attended by Members of the Planning Committee unless there are circumstances where it is necessary for the landowner or their representatives to be in attendance.
- Officers will open the site visit; give a brief presentation on the site, the setting of the proposed development and the specific reasons why the site inspection was requested.
- Members may ask their questions of officers including any requests for specific information that may be required to assist their consideration of the item at the Committee meeting. Exceptionally, questions may be asked directly to the Applicant's representative should they be present. Members need to ensure that they can hear the officers' presentation and the questions and answers.
- Before closing the site visit the Lead DM or planning case officer will seek confirmation that Members are satisfied that they have seen everything they need, after which will draw the site visit to a close.
- Members should avoid engaging in private conversations on the subject of the application with each other during the site visit as this can give the wrong impression to others present or anyone observing the site visit outside of it.
- Members should avoid engaging in conversations with the public should any be present at the time of the site visit.
- Members should avoid engaging in conversations with the applicant (or any representatives of the applicant) if they are present at the time of the site visit. Questions regarding points of clarification in relation to the proposed development may be asked at the discretion of the Lead DM/planning case officer.
- For the purposes of factual record, no formal notes of the site visit will be made. The Lead DM or planning case officer will make a record of the date and time of the site visit, attendance and the locations visited.

Committee Dates – 2023/24

The proposed dates are:

2023/24	Committee Meeting	Development Forum	Control
June	21	As required	
July	19	As required	
August	16	As required	
September	20	As required	
October	18	As required	
November	15	As required	
December	20	As required	
January	24	As required	
February	21	As required	
March	20	As required	
April	17	As required	

Members are requested to contact the Committee Manager in advance of the meeting if they have any comments regarding the above dates.

Please note the JDCC usually falls on the third Wednesday of the month, to fit in with City and South Cambs Planning Committees dates which are usually scheduled on the first and second Wednesday of the month respectively. There are times when this scheduling cannot be followed for example in January, the City Planning Committee is usually pushed to the second Wednesday of the month because of the bank holidays over the Christmas and New Year period, which then impacts on the South Cambs and JDCC meeting dates.

This page is intentionally left blank



21/05433/REM – Parcel BDW4, Darwin Green 1, Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge

Committee Date: 21 December 2022

Report to: Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC)

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Ward / Parish: Castle

Proposal: Reserved Matters application for the fourth housing phase (known as BDW4) including 342 dwellings, with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. The Reserved Matters include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and related partial discharge of conditions 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 25, 26, 28, 35, 40, 49, 58, 62, 63, 66 and 69 pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT.

Applicant: Barratt David Wilson Homes (BDW) Cambridgeshire

Presenting Officer: Charlotte Burton, Principal Planning Officer

Reason Reported to Committee: This is a reserved matters application for the provision of more than 100 residential units within the JDCC administrative area.

Member Site Visit Date: None

Key Issues:

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design, and external spaces
3. Housing delivery
4. Community infrastructure
5. Residential amenity of future occupiers
6. Access and transport
7. Sustainability
8. Environmental considerations

Recommendation: **APPROVE** this reserved matters application 21/05433/REM subject to conditions and informatives as detailed in this report with delegated

authority to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and include others considered appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission.

Part discharge outline planning conditions on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT in relation to this reserved matters only:

- 8 – Design Code Compliance
- 17 – Tree and Hedges Protection
- 18 – Tree Protection
- 25 – Affordable Housing
- 26 – Accessible Housing
- 28 – Renewable Energy
- 35 – Detailed Surface Water Strategy
- 40 – Ecological Conservation Management Plan Statement
- 49 – Secure Parking of Bicycles
- 58 – Noise Assessment for Future Residents
- 62 – Domestic and Trade Waste

Report contents

1. Executive Summary
2. Site Description and Context
3. The Proposal
4. Relevant Site History
5. Relevant Policy
6. Consultations
7. Publicity
8. Third Party Representations
9. Member Representations
10. Planning Background
11. Assessment
12. Principle of Development
13. Context of site, design, and external spaces
14. Housing Delivery
15. Residential amenity for future occupants
16. Community Infrastructure
17. Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties
18. Access and Transport
19. Environmental Issues
20. Ecology and Biodiversity
21. Other Issues
22. Third Party Representations
23. Planning Balance
24. Recommendation
25. Planning Conditions and Informatives

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The proposal is for parcel 'BDW4' which is the next phase of residential development to come forward on Darwin Green 1 (Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road) pursuant to the outline consent 07/0003/OUT. Approvals on previous parcels to date total 1,020 dwellings out of a maximum 1,593 homes approved under the outline consent, with the current application and the live application for the last remaining BDW3 parcel (21/05434/REM) bringing the total to 1,572 homes.
- 1.2 The application is for the approval of reserved matters for layout, landscaping, appearance and scale. The scheme would deliver 342 homes including 137 affordable homes, open space, play areas, and other associated infrastructure. Parts of the approved road infrastructure are included in the red line boundary of the application site to incorporate changes to design speed features to align with the proposed scheme. The application also includes details for approval required by conditions on the outline consent, seeking to part discharge those conditions in relation to this parcel only.
- 1.3 The application was subject to full public consultation ending in January 2022. Following this and review by the Disability Panel, a second review by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and a series of workshops with urban design and landscape officers and the Highway Authority, the applicant submitted substantial amendments (including an amendment to the red line boundary of the application site) in September 2022. The amended proposals were presented to the JDCC at a briefing on 19 October 2022. A second full public consultation was held on the amendments which expired in October 2022.
 - 1.1 Further amendments were received in relation to waste and recycling to address comments from the Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Team, and those amendments were shared with the consultee. Formal consultation has not been carried out on these amendments as the changes were minor.
 - 1.2 Final amendments to realign one street in response to comments from the Highway Authority are expected to be submitted prior to the JDCC committee meeting on 21 December. These will be shared with the consultee and their comments reported at the committee meeting. Formal consultation will not be carried out on these amendments, however the proposed amendments have been informally discussed prior to submission with urban design and landscape officers and no concerns have been raised.
- 1.4 The reserved matters proposals are generally compliant with the outline consent including the outline parameter plans. The proposals have evolved the site layout from the Design Code and conform to the established principles within the Code. This has been a result of an extensive collaborative process with officers, review by the

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and the Disability Consultative Panel, feedback from briefings with the Joint Development Control Committee and amendments submitted during the course of the application.

- 1.5 The resulting scheme would provide a high-quality living environment for the future occupants. The site layout and provision of infrastructure promotes sustainable lifestyles through the creation of the car-free Green Link and low-traffic mews streets. It maximises the opportunities to promote sustainable travel arising from the parcel's frontage onto the Orbital Cycle Route. Amendments to the site layout have created a highly permeable network for pedestrians and cyclists, and have rationalised motor vehicle access. The applicant has worked hard to provide high quality cycle parking which is at least as convenient as car parking, and has designed on-plot parking and parking courts to be capable of being adapted for other uses in the future as car use declines. This work has been complemented by greening across the parcel and landscape proposals which take opportunities to incorporate biodiversity, edibles, space for play and community, and sustainable drainage features, in order to maximise the environmental and social value of the landscaping. This is supported.
- 1.6 In addition to providing a housing mix that responds to the current housing demand, the scheme delivers benefits over and above the requirements of the outline consent. These benefits should be given weight in the planning balance. This includes more public open space, measurable biodiversity net gain, future-proofing infrastructure for electric heating systems; and a commitment to build a proportion of homes to the forthcoming Part L Building Regulations 2021 and Future Homes Standard; homes which meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards and have private amenity space; homes which are dual aspect; a higher proportion of accessible homes; and active electric vehicle (EV) charge points. This is supported.
- 1.7 For these reasons, the proposals are supported by officers, and the recommendation is to approve the application subject to conditions. The recommendation includes the respective approval or refusal of details submitted to part discharge outline planning conditions in relation to this phase of development. Any details that are not recommended to be fully approved in respect of this parcel will need to be resubmitted in line with the triggers for each specific condition or another timescale agreed with the local planning authority.
- 1.8 Issues relating to compliance with the approved Phasing Plan and delivery of infrastructure in line with the obligations within the Section 106 Agreement mentioned in this report are in the process of being resolved separately and are not material to the consideration of the application proposals.

2.0 Site Description and Context

- 2.1 The application is pursuant to the Darwin Green 1 outline consent 07/0003/OUT supported by the site allocation in the CLP 2018 under policy 20 'Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Area of Major Change'. Darwin Green 1 is a 52.87 hectare site. Parcel 'BDW4' is located on the north western side of the site.
- 2.2 The Darwin Green 1 Primary Street North / Bus Route lies on the south eastern side of the site and has been constructed to base course level. Part of the primary route has been included in the amended red line boundary to incorporate changes to the design speed features. The amended red line boundary also includes part of the primary road on the north eastern side of the parcel for the same reason.
- 2.3 The parcel has a long frontage onto the Central Park to the south east. On the opposite north western side, the parcel fronts the Orbital Cycle Route, swale and open space. On its north eastern side, the parcel fronts the Green Corridor between the parcel and BDW5/6. The south western side interfaces with the rear of the Retail Block within the Local Centre, another Green Corridor with part of the Orbital Cycle Route extending south eastwards, and beyond that the site identified in the Design Code as the intended 'Supermarket Site'.
- 2.4 The Darwin Green 2/3 site allocation lies to the north on the opposite side of the Orbital Cycle Route, swale and open space. The retained Green Belt lies beyond and is identified in the Darwin Green 2/3 site allocation for a new country park. The secondary school site is located on the northern corner of the parcel.
- 2.5 The nearest existing uses are the NIAB buildings on the north western corner of the site, and the existing occupiers of the BDW1 parcel and Local Centre, including the residential units above the Retail Blocks. These are apartments with windows facing towards the western side of the parcel. The Retail Block is currently under construction.
- 2.6 The site is former agricultural land. There are no existing features within the site boundary, however there is a retained hedge to the north east within the Green Corridor. The site is not within a conservation area. There are no listed buildings within the vicinity. The site is within Flood Zone 1.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 The application is made pursuant to condition 1 of the outline planning permission which mandates submission of reserved matters for each development parcel. Reserved matters approval is sought for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 342 dwellings, with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space.

- 3.2 The proposal would provide 137 affordable and 205 market homes including a mix of houses and apartments, with a range of sizes, types and tenures, as summarised in the table below.

Size of unit	Affordable - Social rent	Affordable - Shared ownership	Market
1 bed flat	33	3	18
2 bed flat	26	5	122
2 bed house	15	12	3
3 bed flat	0	0	17
3 bed house	20	14	8
4 bed house	9	0	37
Total	103	34	205

- 3.3 The affordable homes would be a mix of 103 social rent and 34 shared ownership. The affordable dwellings will be owned and/or managed by the affordable housing provider London and Quadrant (L&Q) who are the developer's partner in delivering affordable housing across the Darwin Green 1 development.
- 3.4 The houses would be a mix of attached and detached properties over two to three storeys and including flats-over-garages (FOGs) and maisonettes-over-garages (MOGs). The apartments would be within blocks up to four storeys. The scheme also includes 'walk-up blocks' which provide flats on the ground floor, and apartments above within blocks up to three storeys, each unit with a separate entrance.
- 3.5 Motor vehicle access into the parcel would be via two points of access from the Primary Street within the Green Corridor on the north eastern boundary. There is also one point of access from the Primary Street North / Bus Route on the south eastern boundary. These accesses into the parcel are categorised as 'Secondary Streets' and serve a network of Tertiary Streets and Mews Streets.
- 3.6 Cycle and pedestrian links are provided via car-free routes from the Central Park, the Orbital Cycle Route, the Local Centre, and the Green Corridor. The Green Link through the site provides a car-free route between the Central Park and the Orbital Cycle Route. These connections feed into a network of low-traffic routes through the site.
- 3.7 Open space is provided via the Green Link, the park on the north western corner, secondary squares forming Green Gateways into the parcel, and in the green routes throughout the parcel. In total this provides 0.144 hectares of open space. Two locally equipped areas of play (LAPs) are proposed within the Green Link and the south western secondary square Green Gateway. This is in addition to the LAP provided within the park on the north western corner.

- 3.8 Car parking is proposed via on-plot spaces for the houses, including some garages, car-ports and tandem spaces. The apartment blocks have small parking areas within the Mews Streets to the rear. There are some car-free units within the apartment block in the north eastern corner. In total 382 residential car parking spaces are proposed plus 48 visitor spaces located on-street on the Primary and Secondary Streets across the parcel and within individual parking bays.
- 3.9 Cycle parking is via small stores for each house and unit within the walk-up blocks, or within garages. The apartment blocks are served by small communal stores within the ground floor of the building. In total 800 residential cycle parking spaces are proposed plus 25 spaces for visitors located within areas of open space and close to the entrances to apartment blocks.
- 3.10 Refuse and recycling facilities are similarly provided for each house or via communal stores for the apartment blocks.

Discharge of conditions

- 3.11 The application includes details for approval required by conditions on the outline consent, seeking to part discharge the following conditions in relation to this parcel:
- Condition 8 Design Code Compliance
 - Condition 10 Youth Facility and Children's Play Provision
 - Condition 14 Soft and Hard Landscaping
 - Condition 17 Tree and Hedge Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment
 - Condition 18 Arboricultural Method Statement
 - Condition 25 Affordable Housing
 - Condition 26 Accessible Dwellings
 - Condition 28 Renewable Energy
 - Condition 35 Detailed Surface Water Strategy
 - Condition 40 Ecological Conservation Management Plan Statement
 - Condition 49 Secure Parking of Bicycles
 - Condition 58 Noise Assessment for future residents
 - Condition 62 Domestic and Trade Waste
 - Condition 63 Construction Waste Management
 - Condition 66 Lighting
 - Condition 69 Public Art
- 3.12 Assessment of the details submitted for approval in relation to these conditions is provided in the relevant section of this report.

Application documents

- 3.13 In addition to the application forms, location plan and covering letter, the application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

Planning Statement
Design and Access Statement
Existing site survey plans
Proposed site plans
Proposed strategy plans
Architectural plans and elevations
Hard and soft landscaping plans
Indicative highway and landscape adoption plan
Landscape Design Approach statement
Detailed Open Space Landscape Management & Maintenance Plan
Drainage strategy plans, calculations and technical note
SuDs Management and Maintenance Strategy
Transport Statement
Highways plans
Arboricultural Layout plans and Method Statement
Sustainability Statement and EV Charging Plan
Ecological Conservation Management Plan
Ecological Update Consideration and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Noise Assessments
Outdoor Lighting Report and Lighting Strategy
Odour Assessment
Site Waste Management Plan
Interim Public Art Statement
Statement of Community Involvement

Pre-application

- 3.14 The proposals were subject to extensive pre-application discussions with urban design and landscape officers and the Highway Authority in 2021. This included a presentation at pre-application stage to the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel in November 2021.

Application timeline

- 3.15 The application was received on 16 December 2021 and before the expiration of the outline consent on 18 December 2021, as controlled via condition 4 on the outline consent. The application was received valid.
- 3.16 The first statutory consultation period expired in January 2022. A series of workshops were held with urban design and landscape officers and the Highway Authority to resolve issues raised. The proposals were reviewed by the Disability Panel in January 2022 and presented a second time to the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel in April 2022. Following this, the applicant submitted substantial amendments received on 28 September 2022. This included amendments to the red line of the application site boundary, so a second statutory consultation was carried out which expired in October 2022. The amended proposals were presented to the JDCC at a briefing in October 2022.

- 3.17 Further amendments were received in relation to waste and recycling to address comments from the Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Team which were shared with the consultee. Formal consultation has not been carried out on these amendments as the changes were minor.
- 3.18 Final amendments to realign one street in response to comments from the Highway Authority are expected prior to the JDCC committee meeting on 21 December 2022. Formal consultation will not be carried out on these amendments, however comments from the Highway Authority will be sought and reported to committee. The amendments have been informally discussed with urban design and landscape officers.

Amended plans and additional information

- 3.19 During the course of the application, amendments were submitted by the applicant seeking to address the following:
1. Amendments to the red line to include areas of approved infrastructure to allow for improvements to certain areas;
 2. Removing car access to the Green Link to provide a high-quality pedestrianised area of open space;
 3. Amendments to parking courts to reduce the hard surfacing and improve on overheating;
 4. Inclusion of additional high-quality open space within the parcel;
 5. Inclusion of a feature drainage pond, contributing to the enhancement and protection of biodiversity;
 6. Amendments to cycle parking spaces to make them more convenient than access to car parking;
 7. Internal amendments to flat blocks to provide lifts to upper floor units and provide space for air source heat pumps;
 8. Improvements to the sustainability feature such as green roofs on the cycle stores;
 9. More meaningful planting including fruiting trees; and
 10. Alterations to car parking locations to make more of the open space on offer and provide enhancements to the streetscapes.

4.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Decision
07/0003/OUT	Mixed use development comprising up to 1593 dwellings, primary school, community facilities, retail units (use classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5) and associated infrastructure including vehicular, pedestrian and cycleway accesses, open space and drainage works.	Approved on 20 February 2015
S/0001/07/F	Formation of Vehicular Pedestrian and Cycleway Access Road from Histon Road to serve the Urban Extension of the City between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road	Approved on 18 December 2013

	Cambridge together with Drainage and Landscaping Works.	
14/0086/REM	Reserved matters of 07/003/OUT for access roads, pedestrian and cycle paths, public open space, services across the site and one allotment site (Infrastructure reserved matters consent)	Approved on 19 June 2014
14/1410/REM	Construction of public square with hard surfaced pedestrian and cycle areas, access road, disabled and service bay parking, soft landscaping, drainage and utilities pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT	Approved on 23 December 2014
15/1670/REM	Reserved matters for 114 residential units and local centre, including library, community rooms, health centre and retail units pursuant to outline consent 07/0003/OUT.	Approved on 23 May 2016
C/5000/15/CC	Erection of 2-Form Entry Primary School and Children's Centre.	Approved on 17 February 2016
16/0208/REM	Reserved matters application for first housing phase (known as BDW1) including 173 dwellings with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space.	Approved on 27 May 2016
21/03619/REM	Reserved matters application for fifth and sixth housing phases and Allotment 3 (collectively known as BDW5 and 6) including 410 dwellings and allotments with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. The reserved matters include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and the related partial discharge of conditions 8, 10, 14, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35 and 58 pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT (BDW5/6)	Approved on 22 December 2021
21/04431/REM	Reserved Matters application for second housing phase (known as BDW2) including 323 dwellings with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. The Reserved Matters include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and related partial discharge of conditions 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 26, 28, 35, 40, 49, 52, 58, 63, 66 and 69 pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT.	Approved on 26 July 2022

21/05434/REM	Reserved Matters application for third housing phase (known as BDW3) including 210 dwellings with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. The Reserved Matters include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and related partial discharge of conditions 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26, 28, 35, 40, 49, 58, 62, 66, and 69 pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT	Under consideration
22/02528/OUT	Darwin Green 2/3. Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for means of access) for up to 1,000 residential dwellings, secondary school, primary school, community facilities, retail uses, open space and landscaped areas, associated engineering, demolition and infrastructure works; and Full planning permission for relocation of drainage pond permitted under reference S/0001/07/F	Under consideration
07/0003/COND5	Submission of details required by condition 5 (Phasing Plan) of planning permission 07/0003/OUT	Under consideration

5.0 Relevant Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide 2019
Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design
Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)
Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development
Policy 13: Areas of major change and opportunity areas
Policy 20: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Area of Major Change
Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use
Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 33: Contaminated land
Policy 34: Light pollution
Policy 35: Protection of human health and quality of life from noise and vibration
Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
Policy 37: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding Zones
Policy 42: Connecting new developments to digital infrastructure
Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix
Policy 50: Residential space standards
Policy 51: Accessible homes
Policy 55: Responding to context
Policy 56: Creating successful places
Policy 57: Designing new buildings
Policy 68: Open space and recreation provision through new development
Policy 69: Protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
Policy 71: Trees
Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
Policy 82: Parking management
Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Affordable Housing SPD (2008)
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD (2018)
Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide SPD (2012)
Public Art SPD (2010)
Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020)
Greater Cambridge Biodiversity SPD (2022)

5.4 Other Guidance

Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2019 – 2023
Draft Affordable Housing SPD (June 2014)
Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011)
Air Quality Action Plan (2018)
Waste Storage & Collection Guidance for Developers (November 2021)

6.0 Consultations

6.1 Access Officer, Cambridge City Council – Comments

6.2 Wheelchair housing should be 5% of each housing type and at least 18 homes. Wheelchair housing should always have a wet room not a bath. Maisonettes should be avoided because they are hardest to meet M4(2).

Shared space streets are not accessible to all. Recommend review by Disability Panel.

- 6.3 **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue** – No objection
- 6.4 Adequate provision should be made for fire hydrants, secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement or a planning condition. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with Building Regulations.
- 6.5 **Safeguarding Department, Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ministry of Defence)** – No objection
- 6.6 No safeguarding concerns with the heights of the development. Some apartments/houses have flat-roofs which may attract and support populations of large and or flocking birds. Recommend condition for a Bird Hazard Management Plan.
- 6.7 **Designing Out Crime Officer, Cambridgeshire Constabulary**
- 6.8 Comments on amendments – Comments
- 6.9 Previous concerns about insufficient lighting have been addressed. Remaining concerns about the audio/visual access and security of external letterboxes, concerns about audio-only visitor entry system for the apartment blocks. Mail delivery should be via a secure external letter box in accordance with relevant standards.
- 6.10 Initial comments - Comments
- 6.11 The site is in an area of low to medium risk to the vulnerability to crime.
- 6.12 Appears to be an acceptable layout in relation to crime prevention and the fear of crime providing good levels of natural surveillance. Offer the following observations:
- Note the external lighting plan, however, there is no lighting covering the open spaces or orbital cycle route.
 - Recommend that ground planting and hedging should be kept to a minimum of 1 to 1.2 metres high and tree crowns raised to 2 metres.
 - Details of access control and visitor entry systems proposed for the apartment blocks (recommend audio/visual visitor entry, no trade buttons or other electronic release mechanisms).
 - Integral cycle and bin stores (flats), doors should be enhanced security door-sets fitted with self-closers.
- 6.13 **Disability Panel**
- 6.14 Notes of meeting 25 January 2022:

- 6.15 Clarification sought on market wheelchair access homes and about electric vehicle charge point locations. Supported priority given to walking and cycling, and clarification sought about how it would be possible to move around in a wheelchair or mobility scooter. Queried whether the FOGs would be cold. Lack of lifts in apartment blocks is short-sighted.
- 6.16 **Ecology Officer, Cambridge City Council** – No objection
- 6.17 Content with condition assessment of existing baseline habitat. Content that a biodiversity net gain of between 20 and 30 per cent is deliverable. The box specification and locations within the ECMPS are appropriate. Support the discharge of condition 40.
- 6.18 **Environment Agency** – No objection
- 6.19 No objection provided all outstanding pre-commencement conditions are discharged.
- 6.20 **Environmental Quality and Growth Team, Cambridge City Council**
- 6.21 Comment on amendments – No objection subject to conditions and informatives
- 6.22 Revised reports / assessments have been submitted to address the previous concerns about noise / odour impacts.
- 6.23 Noise from supermarket - It is difficult to accurately model the impact from the supermarket as this has yet to be granted planning permission. It is also reasonable that the applicants for BDW4 are not overly restricted due to the pending supermarket. When the supermarket application is received, good acoustic design will be strongly recommended to protect the locality. Whilst our preference from an environmental health perspective would be a change in internal room configuration to place non-habitable rooms on the noise affected façade, acceptable consideration and mitigation has been proposed by the applicants considering the uncertainties of the supermarket. A condition is recommended to ensure the MVHR system to be installed (NW & SW facades of block A) achieves an acceptable ventilation rate within habitable rooms.
- 6.24 Noise from NIAB - Considering the current infrequent activity at the NIAB site, the acoustic context, the predicted low to adverse impact and planning considerations, the proposals are acceptable subject to the implementation of the ventilation condition.
- 6.25 Noise from Local Centre - The existing conditions within the approved Local Centre are acceptable to protect local amenity and quality of life for future residents of BDW4.
- 6.26 ASHPs have the potential to harm local amenity and quality of life of existing and proposed receptors due to noise impacts if poorly located

- without sufficient noise mitigation (if required). Recommend a plant noise insulation condition and the standard plant noise informative.
- 6.27 The odour assessment is acceptable and it is agreed that based on the prevailing wind and detailed activities within the NIAB facilities and fields that the odour impact is not likely to be significant.
- 6.28 The use of gas efficient boilers and ASHPs is acceptable from an air quality perspective. The commitment to install electric vehicle charging points is welcomed and a condition is recommended to secure further details.
- 6.29 Condition 58 relating to noise insulation is recommended for approval.
- 6.30 Condition 66 relating to artificial lighting is not recommended for approval because further information is required.
- 6.31 Recommend standard conditions for plant noise insulation, and additional conditions for alternative ventilation schemes and electric vehicle charging. Informatives for plant noise insulation.
- 6.32 **Health and Safety Executive** – No comment
- 6.33 **Housing Strategy Team**
- 6.34 Comment on amendments – Support
- 6.35 The scheme provides 40% affordable housing and providing 75% social rented units & 25% shared ownership units. This is policy compliant.
- 6.36 The housing mix differs from the indicative mix in the Section 106 Agreement which was agreed in 2013. The original mix suggested higher numbers of larger units (3 and 4 bed homes). However, the housing need for Cambridge City over the last few years is overwhelmingly for smaller homes (1 and 2 bed homes). The developer and the Housing Strategy Team have works together to amend the mix to address some of that need.
- 6.37 Outline permission was granted in December 2013 prior to the adoption of the current Local Plan and policy 51. Therefore, the applicant is not obliged to be policy compliant in this matter. However, the applicant has agreed that all of the affordable units will meet the Building Regulations requirement M4(2) and 7 of the Social rent units will meet the M4(3) standard for wheelchair users.
- 6.38 Outline permission was granted prior to the adoption of the current Local Plan and Policy 50. However, the application shows that all of the affordable units, meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards. The affordable housing scheme is policy compliant.

- 6.39 The scheme was granted outline permission before the Greater Cambridgeshire Housing Strategy (April 2019) which introduced a requirement to maximise the number of bed spaces required per property. The scheme ultimately does not maximise the bed spaces for the affordable units.
- 6.40 The clusters of affordable housing are all below the maximum limit of 25 units. Clusters range from 2 units to 19 units. The Housing Team consider the scheme is policy compliant.
- 6.41 The scheme adheres to the Draft Housing SPD, with regard to its requirements that the affordable housing is not distinguishable from market housing by its external appearance and is well integrated into the scheme.
- 6.42 A Local Lettings Plan and nomination agreement, for this scheme, is to be agreed between the council and the Registered Provider.
- 6.43 **Landscape Officer, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning**
- 6.44 Comment on amendments - Support
- 6.45 The proposals have addressed the wide majority of Landscape concerns identified previously. The result of considerable engagement and review which is commended. Support the proposals. The scheme has taken a very positive approach to creative place-making which will result in a high-quality, attractive, green development within Darwin Green.
- 6.46 Condition 10 – Youth and Play Provision - Unsuitable for Discharge. Distribution of LAPs is acceptable, particularly with the provision of additional Play along the Way incidental play which is identified in the DAS/Land Strategy. However, the discharge of this condition is not achievable as the design, layout and specification of the play areas has not been provided.
- 6.47 Condition 14 – Hard and Soft Landscape - Unsuitable for Discharge. Whilst the technical details are acceptable, it is considered that further specifications information is required to achieve acceptability for approval.
- 6.48 Condition 49 – Cycle Storage - Unsuitable for Discharge. The proposed locations for cycle parking and storage is acceptable. We await submission of further detail of design and material, particularly for those domestic stores at the front of houses.
- 6.49 Condition 62 – Bin Storage – Unsuitable for Discharge. There is not enough clarity about the placement and design of the bin storage units. Within the DAS a single example is shown but within the typologies a number of different garage configurations exist, some of which do not conform with policy (3 bins need to be shown). The distribution diagram is broadly acceptable.

- 6.50 Condition 66 – Lighting – Unsuitable for discharge. A coordinated street lighting plan has not been provided for consideration. Street light placement must be mindful and work in coordination with the tree planting shown within the Soft Landscape proposals.
- 6.51 Initial comments - Objection
- 6.52 Overall Assessment:
It is considered that the site is overdeveloped. The arrangement and number of units has impacted on the external spaces reducing their useability and function. Overdevelopment has led to the use of large areas of planting to fill difficult areas, dependence on parking courts and a lack of pedestrian and cycle permeability.
- 6.53 Layout (southern corner):
- The area directly opposite existing approved proposals for the local centre is of concern; the relationship between streets, pedestrians and housing is poorly defined and dependent on an excess of hard landscape.
 - Approved landscape plan not illustrated.
 - Vegetation on the north side of the street has been removed to achieve driveways and FOGs.
 - Some gardens are small and north facing.
- 6.54 Layout (western corner):
- Apartment block on the corner may interfere with growth of proposed trees.
 - Too many vehicular routes, inadequate green spaces for trees or planting.
 - Unreasonably large and underutilised planting areas.
 - Parking courts too heavily relied on within the overall proposals.
- 6.55 Layout (eastern boundary):
- Some house arrangements along a primary street not quite Code compliant.
 - Small trees in garden frontages will look odd in relation to street typology and opposite large trees.
 - Northern corner requires more consideration.
- 6.56 Southern Apartment Parking Courts:
- Courtyard space currently overwhelmed by parking and awkward FOG structures.
- 6.57 Central Green Corridor:
- Disappointing that there has to be any vehicular traffic through this space.
- 6.58 Maintenance and Adoption

- Unclear what areas are offered for adoption.
- 6.59 Planting
- Further detail required on grass area for Plot 017, boundaries between Plots 32-35 and 36-36 and parking court to units 001-016.
 - Depth of planting at the entrance to court of units 001-016 very large and will be difficult to manage.
 - Depth of planting within shrubs beds of the green corridor is excessive.
 - Planted areas to the rear of blocks 137-143, 144-151, 175-182 and 183-189 and other similar locations should provide a better communal garden space.
 - Too much Alchemilla mollis being used.
- 6.60 Hard Landscape
- Hard landscape material choices are relatively simple and limit the potential richness of high-quality streetscapes.
- 6.61 Boundaries
- No boundary drawing, it is not clear what is proposed for most boundaries.
- 6.62 **Lead Local Flood Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council**
- 6.63 Final comments – No objection.
- 6.64 Calculations are acceptable. Support subject to informative for pollution control. Support condition for construction drainage details.
- 6.65 Comments on amendments – Objection
- 6.66 Unable to support to the reserved matters application until all hydraulic outputs have been provided. Upon review of the submitted information, catchment 11-3A requires all outputs and the 100 year + climate change results should be submitted for catchment 13-1.
- 6.67 Initial comments - Objection
- 6.68 More information is required including drainage layout plan, calculations, permeable areas, proposed runoff rates, required attenuation volume and management/maintenance arrangements.
- 6.69 Drains which fall to multiple riparian owners is not support and surface water conveyance pipes should run within the highways.
- 6.70 Recommend informative on pollution control.
- 6.71 **Local Highways Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council**
- 6.72 Additional comment on amendments – Outstanding concerns

- 6.73 Deviation in the road alignment outside plots 119 and 146 is unsafe for cyclists and not acceptable to be adopted. Some ambiguity on the drawings about the location of the back of the footway and areas of verge and planting. Clarification of width of footway in some locations . No clear designated route for pedestrians from the end of the footway into shared surface areas.
- 6.74 Comment on amendments – No objection
- 6.75 The concerns previously raised have been addressed. The proposed adoption plan would be acceptable and must include areas that form part of inter vehicle visibility splays from internal access points. The swept path analysis for both refuse vehicle and fire tender demonstrate that such vehicles will not oversail footways. Request a standalone plan showing the dimensions of the proposed roads and paths without any information relation to the proposed adoptions so that this can form part of the approved documents.
- 6.76 Initial comments – Objection
- Lighting within the proposed adopted highway should not form part of the planning approval.
 - Not all streets are suitable for adoption.
 - Overrun areas on corners is unacceptable.
 - Blockwork as the surface course for whole streets is unacceptable.
 - Driveways must not overhang the public highway.
 - Width of space to move bicycle past a parked car is unacceptable.
 - Planting in secondary streets unlikely to establish.
 - Visibility splays must be provided Swept path analysis for refuse vehicle must be provided.
 - Concerns about the vehicular access to plots 162, 163, 164, 191 and 192.
 - Engineering drawings required.
- 6.77 **Natural England** – No objection
- 6.78 **Public Art Officer, Cambridge City Council** – No comments received.
- 6.79 **Streets and Open Spaces Team, Cambridge City Council** – No comments received.
- 6.80 **Sustainable Drainage Engineer, Cambridge City Council** – No comments received.
- 6.81 **Sustainability Officer, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning** – Support
- 6.82 The Energy and Sustainability Report sets out that all units will be built to either the forthcoming Part L 2021 requirements or the Future Homes standard, which is due to come into force in 2025. Part L 2021 requires a

- 31% reduction in carbon emissions compared to Part L 2013, and as such all of the units will exceed the requirements of the outline conditions.
- 6.83 59 units will now be built to Part L 2013 and meet the requirements of condition 29 with certification against Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. 216 units will be built to Part L 2021, while the remaining 69 units will be built to the Future Homes Standard.
- 6.84 Those being built to the 2021 requirements will benefit from waste water heat recovery, while those being built to Future Homes Standard will benefit from air source heat pumps. All units will still benefit from the use of photovoltaic panels, with the detailed layout of the panels being determined at the detailed design stage.
- 6.85 Welcome the consideration that has been given in the amendments to ensuring that the apartment buildings have space for future internal air source heat pump units, with storage shown on the floorplans for all of the apartment blocks.
- 6.86 Recommend conditions relating to the implementation of carbon reduction strategy and futureproofing for low temperature heating.
- 6.87 All residential units are to be fitted with photovoltaic panels and built to either Part L 2021 or the forthcoming Future Homes Standard (see further detail on the energy strategy below).
- 6.88 The majority of units benefit from dual, or in some cases triple aspect, to allow for natural ventilation and help mitigate the risk of overheating. Ground floor apartment are to be fitted with security screens and inward opening windows to allow for full ventilation, while solar control glazing is to be specified for unshaded glazing on top floor flats. Overheating assessment will be undertaken using the new Part O requirements of Building Regulations, which will come into force this summer.
- 6.89 Achievement of potable water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day. For units with a bath and shower, the submitted water efficiency calculator shows water use of 100.5 litres/person/day, while for those units with just a shower, 96.4 litres/person/day is shown.
- 6.90 Specification of bricks from the Marshalls low carbon range, which reduces embodied carbon by 28% compared to standard bricks.
- 6.91 The additional landscaping and greening that was included in the amendments will have positive impacts in terms of assisting with ambient cooling and shading of buildings.
- 6.92 The Site Waste Management Plan submitted to discharge condition 63 on the outline consent fails to include a location plan showing the location of the waste storage compound and therefore is not recommended to be discharged.

- 6.93 **Tree Officer, Cambridge City Council** – No comments received.
- 6.94 **Urban Design Officer, Greater Cambridge Shared Planning**
- 6.95 Comments on amendments:
- 6.96 Support subject to conditions for materials and sample panels.
- 6.97 The architects have responded positively to our ideas and suggestions to push the scheme beyond the requirement of the outline application and the site wide design code, taking a thoughtful and creative approach to evolving suggested alternative concepts and potential solutions raised throughout the redesign process. The revised scheme has evolved through extensive collaboration with officers and in response to feedback from the Quality Panel, with notable design evolutions between every workshop. The proposal has taken a design led approach to evolve the key principles of the design code, which creates the potential for enhanced and better placemaking solutions. In our view, the revised proposal will create a high quality and visually attractive addition to the wider Darwin Green new community and therefore subject to conditions, is supported in urban design terms.
- 6.98 Initial comments:
- 6.99 We have fundamental concerns about the structure and layout of the southern end of the phase which is creating streets with poor levels of ground floor natural surveillance, unresolved interfaces, and poor-quality streetscape. The proposed car parking courts for the apartment blocks creates large areas of hard surfacing, which have a poor relationship with the internal organisation of the surrounding apartment blocks, and in some cases are framed by rear blank walls and inactive ground floor edges. The concentration of the parking courts along the eastern part of the phase in combination with limited meaningful green infrastructure will create microclimate issues relating to urban heat. The lack of trees along the secondary street and some E-W tertiary streets will exacerbate this further and does not comply with the Design Code. Pedestrian links along the north-western edge of the parcel are fragmented and desire lines are inhibited in places. The design of the streets themselves creates areas where rogue parking is likely to occur.
- 6.100 The proposal is struggling to create a distinctive and coherent identity, too repetitious in places and lacking richness in detail. The lack of variety to the forms and expression of apartment blocks along the Central Park frontage, the seemingly lack of hierarchy and diversity between key buildings, and the wide use of the repeating 2-storey gabled linked detached houses, are contributors to this.
- 6.101 The absence and questionable quality of private amenity space and cycle parking for some typologies is unacceptable.

6.102 These fundamental issues demonstrate there is likely too many units being proposed in this phase and when considered together with the functional design issues, the proposal represents overdevelopment. In its current form, the proposal does not comply with key areas of the design code nor with policies 50, 56, 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, and is not supported in urban design terms.

6.103 **Waste Team, Greater Cambridge Shared Waste**

6.104 Initial comments:

6.105 Require clearer plans showing which properties are using collection points and how many bins for apartments are being collected from each point.
Confirm size of refuse vehicle used for tracking diagrams
Too many long drag distances for crews.
The development does not flow well and results in longer collection times.
Hammer heads are problematic as cars can park there which creates a problem for turning. Are these roads adopted, what will the surface be, will there be parking enforcement?
Drags past parked cars should be avoided.

7.0 Publicity

7.1 The following publicity has been undertaken:

Neighbour notification	Yes
Site notice	Yes
Advertisement	Yes

7.2 In addition to the initial consultation when the application was validated, a full re-consultation for 21 days was undertaken for the amended location plan in September 2022 via neighbour notification, site notice and advertisement, and with statutory consultees. Consultation on the full amended scheme (detailed plans) was subsequently undertaken for 14 days in September 2022 with relevant consultees.

8.0 Third Party Representations

8.1 No representations were received from third parties.

9.0 Member Representations

9.1 No representations are reported.

10.0 Planning Background

Outline Consent

10.1 Outline planning permission was granted in December 2013 for Darwin Green 1 to deliver a mixed-use development comprising up to 1,593

dwellings, primary school, community facilities, retail units (use classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5) and associated infrastructure including vehicular, pedestrian and cycleway accesses, open space and drainage works. The outline planning application required Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

- 10.2 The outline consent approved the detail of access from Huntingdon Road (with a second access from Histon Road approved under a separate full planning permission S/0001/07/F). The details that were reserved for determination at a later stage were the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. These are defined in article 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The assessment of a reserved matters application is limited to these aspects.
- 10.3 The outline consent approved a series of parameter plans. The approved parameter plans relate to land use, access, building heights, landscape and urban design parameters, and supporting text. Illustrative material accompanying the outline consent including illustrative masterplans or visualisations are not listed on the decision notice and are not approved plans.
- 10.4 The outline consent was also subject to planning conditions. These include strategic conditions, including approval of a site-wide Design Code. This was approved in 2014 and all reserved matters parcels are required to demonstrate compliance with it. The Code defines a vision for Darwin Green, site-wide coding and character areas.
- 10.5 Other strategic conditions include a site-wide drainage strategy, a site-wide strategy for youth and play and a public art strategy. The conditions on the outline consent also set requirements for car parking standards, sustainability targets, and affordable housing delivery. Reserved matters must demonstrate compliance with these details.
- 10.6 The outline consent was subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement which sets out the requirements for the delivery of affordable housing and social infrastructure, including formal and informal open space, allotments, community facilities and the primary school, and transport improvements.
- 10.7 The outline consent was approved under the previous Cambridge Local Plan 2006. As such, policies within the subsequently adopted CLP 2018 can only be applied where these fall within the definition of the reserved matters, where details have been secured through conditions, or where the requirements of the new policy are consistent with the Design Code or other approved outline documents.

Reserved Matters

- 10.8 Several reserved matters consents have been granted and outline conditions discharged, as detailed in the Planning History section of this

report. This includes approval of site-wide infrastructure including roads, pedestrian and cycle paths, open space, services across the site and one allotment site (14/0086/REM). The main arterial route through the site has been completed to base course level and the strategic drainage works have been completed.

- 10.9 Reserved matters consent has been granted for the Local Centre (15/1670/REM) and public square (14/1410/REM), and three residential parcels known as BDW1 (16/0208/REM), BDW5 and 6 (21/03619/REM) and BDW2 (21/04431/REM). Construction is complete on BDW1 and partially complete on the Local Centre except for the retail block, library and public square. Parcels BDW5/6 and BDW2 are currently under construction.

Planning Obligations and Phasing

- 10.10 In correspondence with the Council, the applicant has advised that the occupation of these parcels has reached the 200th dwelling, triggering certain planning obligations. The sequence of construction has not followed the approved Phasing Plan and a revised Phasing Plan has been submitted to discharge condition 5 on the outline consent (07/0003/COND5). The relevant obligations and phasing are discussed further in the Principle of Development section of this report.

11.0 Assessment

- 11.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from an inspection of the site and the surroundings, the key issues are:

- Principle of development
- Context of site, design, and external spaces
- Housing delivery
- Residential amenity for future occupants
- Social and community infrastructure
- Access and transport
- Energy and sustainability
- Impact on residential amenity of existing properties
- Environmental considerations
- Third party representations

12.0 Principle of Development

- 12.1 The principle of residential development was established by the outline permission 07/0003/OUT. This is a reserved matters application submitted pursuant to condition 1 on the outline consent, which requires approval of details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. This application was submitted and validated within eight years from the date of the outline permission thus complying with condition 4.

- 12.2 This reserved matters proposal is acceptable in principle provided that it complies with the outline parameter plans, the Design Code and the Section 106 Agreement, and that the development is carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures as set out in the Environmental Statement. Compliance is assessed as follows and in the relevant sections of this report.

Compliance with Outline Parameter Plans

- 12.3 Condition 72 of the outline consent requires development to be in accordance with the approved parameter plans and supporting text.
- 12.4 The scheme is compliant with the Land Use PP which shows BDW4 within an area identified on the key as 'predominantly residential zones, including associated infrastructure and facilities, such as access roads, play areas and allotments'. The proposed residential use is supported.
- 12.5 The scheme is compliant with the Number of Storeys PP which shows the parcel is within an area where up to four storeys and maximum 15.5m building height is supported. The proposal does not exceed four storeys or the maximum height and is supported.
- 12.6 The bus route shown on the Access PP on the south eastern side of the parcel is partially included within the extended red line site boundary in order to make changes to the design speed features previously approved under the infrastructure reserved matters consent. The proposed amendments are consistent with the PP. The Orbital Cycle Route and pedestrian connections to the north western and western sides of the parcel were also approved under the infrastructure reserved matters consent and are outside the red line boundary. The scheme's edges and frontages are consistent with these. This is supported.
- 12.7 The approved Urban Design Framework PP shows key building frontages along the south eastern edge fronting the bus route and central park, and positive building frontages along the eastern, north western and western edges. The proposal is consistent with this, which is described in more detail in later sections of this report. This is supported.
- 12.8 The scheme does not conflict with the Landscape PP. The red line site boundary does not extend to the retained hedgerow to the north east and the proposal also does not impact on the landscape corridors and open spaces. This is supported.
- 12.9 For these reasons, the proposal is assessed to be generally compliant with the outline approved parameter plans and supporting text.

Outline Environmental Statement

- 12.10 Condition 6 on the outline consent requires the development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures as set out in the

Environmental Statement (ES) submitted with the outline permission. The conclusion is that the proposal would not have significant environmental impacts as these would be mitigated through measures secured via conditions and planning obligations. The topics covered by the ES are the following:

- Landscape and Visual Assessment
- Ecology
- Cultural Heritage and Archaeology
- Agriculture and Soils
- Ground Conditions and Contamination
- Drainage and Flood Risk
- Traffic and Transportation
- Noise and Vibration
- Air Quality
- Recreation
- Socioeconomics
- Services
- Waste
- Energy and Carbon Strategy

12.11 The proposals would not vary from the outline consent and therefore they would not have significant environmental effects beyond those already assessed with the outline application. An Environmental Impact Assessment therefore is not required alongside the reserved matters application.

Compliance with Section 106 Planning Obligations

12.12 The Section 106 Agreement for the outline consent (as amended by Deed of Variations) establishes the triggers for the delivery of infrastructure. At the time of preparing this report, the delivery of some infrastructure is in breach of those triggers. Members of the Joint Development Control Committee and local Councillors were briefed on this at a separate private officer briefing which was held in October 2022. The Council is working proactively with the applicant, the County Council and other stakeholders to resolve these breaches and to ensure upcoming triggers are on-track to be delivered. However, these breaches are not material to the consideration of the current application proposals.

Phasing

12.13 A site-wide phasing plan dated June 2014 was approved through the discharge of condition 5 on the outline consent. There are some areas of inconsistency between construction on site and the phasing plan. This includes the construction sequencing, delivery of infrastructure, open space, drainage, highways works, and pedestrian and cycle networks. The Council requested that the applicant submit an updated phasing plan to re-discharge condition 5 and an application was received in May 2022.

Officers have commenced a review of the updated plan and will brief members of the Joint Development Control Committee and local Councillors in due course before the plan comes to the committee for determination. However, this is not material to the current application.

Principle of Development – Conclusion

- 12.14 The scheme forms an important next phase of delivery on Darwin Green 1, which makes a significant contribution to meeting the Greater Cambridge housing delivery targets. The scheme is generally compliant with the outline consent in terms of the outline parameter plans and Environmental Statement. Issues relating to compliance with the Section 106 Agreement and approved phasing plan are not material to the current application. The principle of development is acceptable in accordance with CLP 2018 policies 1, 3 and 20.

13.0 Context of site, design, and external spaces

Compliance with Design Code

- 13.1 The Design Code for Darwin Green 1 was approved through discharge of condition 7 on the outline consent in 2014. Design codes are intended to bridge the gap between outline consents and reserved matters applications for complex and large scale developments that will be delivered over many years. The Code aims to achieve a balance between a clear level of prescription to ensure high standards of design, and an appropriate degree of flexibility to accommodate changing needs, market conditions or government / local guidance over the duration of the project, and allow schemes to come forward that improve upon the Code.
- 13.2 The approved Design Code sets a vision for the creation of a distinctive new urban extension to the city, achieving the highest quality of design and embodying the principles of sustainability. It includes site-wide coding for elements that cover the whole site and do not differ across the character areas, including movement network, landscape, waste and drainage strategies. The Code also includes character area coding, which set out the essential characteristics for each area. The BDW4 parcel falls within two character areas: the Northern Quarter ('medium' density) and the Urban Quarter ('high' density).
- 13.3 Condition 8 on the outline consent requires reserved matters applications to include a Design Code Statement to demonstrate how the proposal accords with the Code, and accordingly the applicant has submitted a Design and Compliance Statement. It is important to note that some elements of the Design Code are 'mandatory' meaning there is 'minimum flexibility' and any departure must not conflict with the overall aim of the Design Code. All other guidance is important and must be taken into account of when developing reserved matters. Compliance with the Design Code is discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

Layout, Form, Scale and Density

- 13.4 The overall layout has evolved and improved upon the Design Code through extensive collaboration with officers and in response to feedback from the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel and from briefings to the Joint Development Control Committee. Key spatial changes include the rationalisation of car movements throughout the site and more car-free spaces; an increase in the amount of open space (compared to the Design Code illustrative masterplan) and a greener spatial structure that is more integrated and connected; and removal of large, sterile parking courts behind the park frontage apartment blocks and replacement with green Mews Streets with climbing plants and pockets of communal open space. This is supported.
- 13.5 Other positive variations from the Design Code include the introduction of the car-free Green Link through the middle of the parcel and the creation of a car-free frontage adjacent to the Orbital Cycle Route, as well as the rationalisation of motor vehicle access points into the parcel and circulation space for cars generally. Permeability and interconnectivity for pedestrians and cyclists is maintained and enhanced, but the revised movement strategy for motor vehicles that has reduced the extent of car access throughout the parcel also helps to create a more people friendly public realm that can better foster social interaction and doorstep play. This is supported.
- 13.6 In terms of density, the Design Code shows the central and western parts of the site within the medium density areas (up to 45 dwellings per hectare), and the park frontage and north eastern frontage onto the green corridor within the high density 'urban quarter' area (up to 125 dwellings per hectare). The Design Code states densities may be subject to review as reserved matters applications are prepared. The Design and Access Statement states that the proposed density within the high density area is 125 dwellings per hectare in line with the Design Code. The density within the medium density area is 54 dwellings per hectare which exceeds the Code, but reflects the higher number of apartments proposed in part to meet the current affordable housing need. This is acceptable given the flexibility offered within the Design Code.
- 13.7 The proposed typologies include apartments, flats-over-garages, maisonettes-over-garages, walk-up blocks, and a range of house types (terraced, semi-detached and detached forms). The arrangement of typologies creates a legible structure that provides defined edges and good levels of active frontages onto streets, intersections and spaces. The apartment blocks are located on the park frontage, at gateway points on the Green Link, and to mark key outer corners of the parcel. Taller 3 storey houses are focussed mainly on the Secondary Street and the western frontage, with an increased use of lower terraced and semi-detached forms now on the east-west Tertiary Streets, creating a clear distinction in character and hierarchy between the Secondary Street and the lower order Tertiary Streets. This is supported.

13.8 As well as the range of typologies, varied roofscapes reinforce the different character of streets and spaces they define. The mews typology used only along north lane and the mono pitch roof form used specifically behind the park street apartments is one example of this. The scale and massing of the apartment blocks along the park frontage has been refined with 3 storey blocks located between 4 storey corner marker buildings, improving the overall hierarchy of forms and creating better massing compositions along this key frontage. Entrances are used to manipulate the massing further, with rooflines stepping down and façades stepping back at these points, creating more vertically proportioned volumes. The footprint of the 4 storey marker buildings have also been refined to moderate the bulk of the larger forms. This is supported.

Detail and Materials

13.9 The range of typologies provides variety to the street scene. Facades of buildings are well-ordered and proportioned which will provide a degree of rhythm and vertical emphasis to the street. The combination of different roof forms including flat, pitched, gabled fronted, mono pitched, and angled brick parapets will combine to create a varied and articulated roofscape. Mono pitched roof forms are specifically used on the mews to the rear of the park frontage apartments creating a more unique character within the scheme. This is supported.

13.10 A material palette has been provided within the Design and Access Statement. The development would be a mix of red, buff and white brick tones. These would be used separately or in combination, mixed either vertically on different elements of a linked row of houses, or horizontally to delineate the ground and upper floors. Contrasting bricks and rusticated detailing at ground floors work well to express the base and provide a common language throughout the range of typologies. This is supported.

13.11 The scheme achieves a high degree of richness and variety through detailing. A range of window shading devices have been integrated, including louvre shading and white brick surrounds. Entrances throughout the scheme are varied but complementary, which works well to enhance their legibility within elevations. Metal pergola structures on mews facades with climbing plants, provides a playful way of vertically greening these intimate streetscapes. Integrated seating at entrances supports social interaction. Balconies appear as integral elements of facades. This is supported.

13.12 Overall, the proposed architectural approach meets good urban design objectives, the established principles in the Design Code and will be complimentary to the Local Centre and recently consented schemes. The approach to elevational design, detailing and materials is supported by the GCSP urban design team. A condition is recommended to secure samples for all external surfaces and brickwork sample panels (**condition**

14 – Design details and materials and condition 14 – Brickwork sample panel).

- 13.13 A condition is also recommended to remove permitted development rights for the installation of microwave antennae in the interest of visual amenity and to protect the high-quality design of the development, consistent with the consent granted for the BDW2 parcel (**condition 25 - Class H permitted development rights (microwave antennae)**). An informative is recommended to advise the developer that letterboxes should be no less than 0.7 metres above ground level (**informative 6**).
- 13.14 The proposed site plan shows two substation buildings within the Mews Streets behind the park frontage. Indicative plans have been submitted showing a single storey flat roof brick structure. However final plans have not been submitted. A condition is recommended to secure the detailed design (**condition 16 – Substation buildings**). This approach is acceptable.

Landscaping

- 13.15 The introduction of a car-free Green Link through the site is strongly supported. The mews to the rear of the park frontage blocks promotes connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, and creates flexible spaces that could be adapted in the future as demand for car parking reduces. Other areas that have seen significant improvement are the area to the rear of north western apartment block where the number of car parking spaces (with some car-free apartments) has been reduced to enable more greening and open space for residents. This is supported.
- 13.16 The hard and soft landscaping scheme works hard to integrate drainage, ecological and other social elements. Sustainable drainage features including rain gardens, small attenuation ponds and other floodable landscapes are integrated with planting which promote species diversity. The planting scheme focuses on a diverse range of native species and pollinators. Areas of open space include species rich grassland. Log piles and bug hotels within areas of open space encourage interaction. Fruiting trees and shrubs provide edibles for wildlife and residents. This has evolved during the course of the application and is supported.
- 13.17 The street hierarchy is reinforced through the landscape strategy which establishes strong street character, moving from the formal Primary Street to the intimate Mews Streets. Greening has been achieved through tree planting, rain gardens, low shrub planting and planted thresholds. The integration of climbers into the Mews Streets has been particularly welcomed. Greening in this way not only softens the streetscape, but also delivers other environmental benefits such as shading and cooling, and reduces acoustic reverberation. Thresholds have been considered and opportunities have been taken to integrate seating to the front of properties in the informal Mews Streets. This is supported.

13.18 Overall, the landscape team supports the proposals, however notes some details that are missing from the submission or require further amendment. This includes details of the hard landscape material choices and boundary details. As a result, condition 14 on the outline consent is not recommended to be discharged at this stage and further details will need to be formally submitted and approved prior to commencement of development. Further details are also requested by the landscape officer about the play, cycle storage, bin storage and lighting conditions, which are discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

Inclusive Access

13.19 The application was reviewed by the Disability Panel in January 2022 as part of the initial consultation and on the recommendation of the Access Officer. The applicant responded to the panel's comments in their submission of amendments in September 2022. This response is provided in **Appendix 3** of this report showing how the applicant has addressed the feedback from the panel.

13.20 Overall, the applicant has responded satisfactorily, including changes such as the installation of lifts into the apartment blocks. Accessible housing is assessed in the Housing Delivery section of this report and addresses the feedback from the Access Officer regarding the provision of accessible market homes which is proposed over and above the requirements of the outline consent. This is supported.

13.21 The Access Officer commented that shared space Mews Streets in general are not accessible for all. While acknowledging these comments, the Disability Panel raised no specific concerns about the Mews Streets and supported the priority given to walking and cycling across the parcel generally. This is discussed in more detail in the Access and Transport section of this report and is acceptable.

13.22 Accessible car parking spaces are provided across the parcel and are well-located close to the entrances of apartment blocks. Visitor car parking spaces are also well-distributed across the parcel, available for visiting health care professionals. This is acceptable.

Designing Out Crime

13.23 Cambridgeshire Constabulary has reviewed the scheme and notes the site is in an area of low to medium risk to the vulnerability to crime. Overall, the proposed layout has considered crime prevention by providing reasonable levels of natural surveillance with many of the homes facing each other and overlooking open space. Pedestrian and vehicle routes are aligned together, well-overlooked and pedestrian safety has been considered. Most of the vehicle parking is on-plot between and to the side of properties and in garages. The majority of homes have back-to-back protected rear gardens which reduces the vulnerability to crime, and these have been provided with some defensible space to their front.

- 13.24 Comments were made with regards to the lighting of open spaces and the Orbital Cycle Route. Lighting on the Orbital Cycle Route is outside the red line of the current application and is controlled through the infrastructure reserved matters consent. Lighting plans have been submitted pursuant to the discharge of condition 66 on the outline consent. Updated lighting plans were provided during the course of the application. Cambridgeshire Constabulary reviewed the updated lighting plans and commented that their previous concerns had been addressed. Nonetheless, the updated lighting plans are not supported by the Environmental Quality and Growth Team and a resubmission is required to discharge condition 66. Cambridgeshire Constabulary will be consulted on the resubmission to ensure these remain acceptable from a safety and security perspective.
- 13.25 Recommendations have been made about landscape management and maintenance to allow surveillance and to sure there is no conflict with lighting. The recommendation is to maintain ground planting and hedging to 1 – 1.2 metres higher, and to raise tree crowns to 2 metres. In response, the applicant has confirmed that the planting is predominantly low and that the landscape management and maintenance plan specifies that all single stem trees would have approximately 2 metre clear stems. This addresses this comment.
- 13.26 Further detailed comments have been made about the access and visitor entry systems for the apartment blocks, and the preference for secure external post boxes. In response, the applicant has confirmed that entry to the apartment blocks is via an audio system with no trade button. Cambridgeshire Constabulary would prefer a visual system. These are matters of detailed design outside the scope of the current application.
- 13.27 Detailed comments were also made about access to communal bin and bike stores. The applicant has confirmed that this would be via a fob access for residents and compliant with Secure by Design. This addresses this comment.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

- 13.28 The scheme was reviewed by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel at pre-application stage in November 2021 and again during the course of the application in April 2022. A copy of the report from the second review is provided in **Appendix 1** of this report. The applicant submitted a response to the main points of feedback and recommendations with their amendments in September 2022, which is provided in **Appendix 2**.
- 13.29 The scheme evolved significantly and positively in response to the panel's feedback. The creation of the Mews Streets to the rear of the frontage apartment block to create linked and greened spaces with greater potential to add community value than parking courts evolved as a result of the panel's feedback and developed further in discussion with officers. Another significant outcome was making the landscape scheme work

harder to integrate sustainable urban drainage features, a biodiversity strategy, edibles, climate resilience and opportunities for community building. This is supported.

- 13.30 Overall, the panel were pleased the with scheme's development through the process and considered that points of detail were required to achieve the scheme's full potential. These include consideration of vehicle movements within the Mews Streets, pedestrian priority at junctions, parking provision and privacy for ground floor apartments. These have been addressed by the applicant in the submission as summarised in **Appendix 2**. The panel also supported the direction of the GCSP Sustainability Officer in terms of the energy strategy and lent weight to the need to future-proof the scheme, particularly in terms of providing space within the scheme to air source heat pumps. Finally, the panel commented that the diversity of space and typologies would be an example of a mixed community, and admired several of the apartment typologies in the way they are designed to look onto the park.

Context of site, design, and external spaces – conclusion

- 13.31 In conclusion, the scheme has developed positively through a collaborative process with the urban design and landscape teams and through review by the Cambridgeshire Quality panel. The scheme would provide high quality public realm. The proposal accords with the outline consent and the established principles within the Design Code, and with CLP 2018 policies 55, 56, 57 and 59, and the guidance on good design within the NPPF applicable to this reserved matters.

14.0 Housing Delivery

Affordable homes

- 14.1 The Section 106 Agreement accompanying the outline consent requires any reserved matters application to be submitted with an Affordable Housing Scheme to address the priority housing needs identified by the Council, with regard to the Indicative Housing Mix set out within Schedule 17 of the Agreement, the Council's adopted Affordable Housing SPD or any replacement document, the City Council's most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment, or any replacement mix approved by the Council.
- 14.2 Condition 25 on the outline consent also requires any reserved matters application to be submitted with a plan showing the distribution of market and affordable dwellings, a schedule of the dwellings size (by number of bedrooms). The clustering of affordable homes should be consistent with the Council's affordable housing SPD unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority. The applicant has submitted a housing tenure plan and housing schedule with the application. This is assessed in the following sections.

Affordable housing provision

- 14.3 The Indicative Housing Mix within the Section 106 Agreement requires 40% of dwellings to be affordable tenure. The current proposal provides 137 affordable dwellings which is 40% of the total housing provided. Taken together with the earlier approved phases, the development would continue to achieve 40% affordable housing across Darwin Green 1. This is supported. The scheme has been designed to be tenure blind in the housing design. This is supported.

Parcel	Percentage of homes affordable %
BDW1 (approved)	39.90
Local Centre (approved)	40.35
BDW5 and BDW6 (approved)	39.90
BDW2 (approved)	39.94
BDW4 (proposed)	40.06
Overall	40.03

Tenure split

- 14.4 The Indicative Housing Mix within the Section 106 Agreement requires a tenure split within the affordable housing provision of 75% for social rent and 25% for intermediate. The current proposal provides 103 homes for social rent and 34 homes for shared ownership. This equates to 75% for social rent and 25% for shared ownership. Taken together with the earlier approved phases, the development would continue to meet the Indicative Housing Mix. This is supported.

Parcel	Percentage for social rent %	Percentage for shared ownership %
BDW1 (approved)	81.15	18.85
Local Centre (approved)	73.92	26.08
BDW5 and BDW6 (approved)	75.00	25.00
BDW2 (approved)	72.09	27.91
BDW4 (proposed)	75.18	24.82
Overall	75.47	24.53

Housing mix and typology

- 14.5 The Indicative Housing Mix within the Section 106 Agreement sets out the preferred size mix for the affordable element across Darwin Green, having regard to the different social rent and intermediate tenures. This was intended to ensure a balanced, mixed community with a range of sizes to meet housing needs. The Section 106 Agreement was completed in 2013. Schedule 8 of the Agreement requires the affordable housing provision to meet the Indicative Housing Mix, unless otherwise agreed with

the City Council. This allows an opportunity for the Council to agree an alternative appropriate mix with the applicant.

14.6 The table below shows the proposed dwelling mix for the affordable tenures on BDW4 alongside the mix for the other parcels already approved. The dwelling mix for each parcel follows the densities and character areas set out in the Design Code, which is reflected in the affordable housing as well as the market homes. BDW4 is within medium and high density character areas. It is therefore an appropriate parcel on which to provide relatively more flats than apartments. This is supported.

Approved or proposed	Parcel	Tenure	1 bed flat	2 bed flat	2 bed house / maisonette	3 bed house / maisonette	4 bed house
Approved	Local Centre	Social rent	12	22	0	0	0
Approved	Local Centre	Shared ownership	0	12	0	0	0
Approved	BDW1	Social rent	11	35	5	5	0
Approved	BDW1	Shared ownership	0	0	10	3	0
Approved	BDW5/6	Social rent	32	53	28	6	4
Approved	BDW5/6	Shared ownership	7	28	0	6	0
Approved	BDW2	Social rent	12	18	33	9	21
Approved	BDW2	Shared ownership	0	12	8	16	0
Proposed	BDW4	Social rent	33	26	15	20	9
Proposed	BDW4	Shared ownership	3	5	12	14	0

14.7 The proposed affordable housing dwelling mix across Darwin Green has been extensively discussed with the Housing Strategy team with a view to achieving a balanced community which also reflects the current housing need within Greater Cambridge. The table below shows a comparison between the Indicative Housing Mix in the Section 106 Agreement and the cumulative mix including both the approved parcels and the BDW4 proposals. Overall, the figures show more smaller homes (1 and 2 beds) compared to the Indicative Housing Mix. This is supported by the Housing team as it reflects changes in the housing need in Cambridge City since the Section 106 Agreement was completed.

Source	Tenure	1 bed flat	2 bed flat	2 bed house / maisonette	3 bed house / maisonette	4 bed house
S106 Indicative Housing Mix	Social rent	10%	10%	15%	30%	10%
S106 Indicative Housing Mix	Shared ownership	0%	5%	10%	10%	0%
Approved plus proposed BDW4	Social rent	18%	28%	15%	7%	6%
Approved plus proposed BDW4	Shared ownership	2%	10%	5%	8%	0%
Overprovision (+) or under provision (-) compared to S106 Indicative Housing Mix	Social rent	+ 8%	+18%	0%	-22%	-4%
Overprovision (+) or under provision (-) compared to S106 Indicative Housing Mix	Shared ownership	+2%	+5%	-5%	-2%	0%

14.8 The current Greater Cambridgeshire Housing Strategy 2019-2023 was published after the outline permission for Darwin Green. This means that the requirement to maximise the number of bedspaces for affordable homes cannot be applied. It is acknowledged that the scheme could theoretically provide a further 29 bedspaces, however the Housing Strategy team acknowledges the policy position on this and has raised no objection on these grounds. This is supported.

Clustering

14.9 The adopted Affordable Housing SPD (2008) states that the layout of developments should integrate affordable and supported housing with the market housing in ways that minimise social exclusion. Clustering affordable homes is supported normally in groups of up to 25 dwellings. In flatted schemes no more than 12 affordable dwellings should normally have access from a common stairwell or lift. The submitted tenure plan shows clusters range from 2 units to 19 units. The Housing Strategy team consider the clustering to be policy compliant. This is supported.

Affordable housing provider

14.10 The Section 106 Agreement requires that the City Council has approved the appointment of an approved affordable housing provider. The

developer has confirmed that L&Q will remain as the affordable housing provider as per earlier phases of the development. This is acceptable.

Accessible homes

- 14.11 The outline consent was granted before the publication of the Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document M, establishing requirements for the access and use of buildings, and before the adoption of CLP 2018 policy 51 requiring all housing developments to meet M4(2) accessible and adaptable homes standard, and 5% of housing on developments providing 20 or more dwellings to meet M4(3) wheelchair user home standard, or be easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users.
- 14.12 Policy 51 cannot lawfully be applied to the assessment of the current reserved matters application because accessibility and the internal arrangement of the dwellings does not fall within the definition of any of the reserved matters. The only relevant requirement is condition 26 on the outline consent which requires a minimum of 15 per cent of all market housing and 15% of all affordable housing to be designed with external design, layout, and access suitable for occupation by people with disabilities and capable of adaptation to meet long term housing needs.
- 14.13 Nonetheless, 95 per cent of affordable homes meet M4(2) standard and the remaining 5 per cent meet M4(3)(2)(b) standard which would allow for immediate occupation by a wheelchair user. In addition, 80 per cent of market homes meet M4(2) standard. Apartment blocks are served by lifts following feedback from the Disability Panel. The market homes which do not achieve M4(2) include the upper floors of the walk-up blocks and the FOGs because there is no lift access. However, these typologies have been used to respond to place-making objectives and contribute to the housing options on the site. The proposal exceeds the requirements of the outline consent and is supported.

Housing Delivery – conclusion

- 14.14 In summary, the provision of affordable housing complies with the outline consent in terms of the percentage provision and tenure mix. The affordable housing mix and typologies has been agreed following extensive discussions with the Housing Strategy team to reflect the current housing need in Greater Cambridge, updating the Indicative Mix set out in the Section 106 Agreement. This approach is supported. The affordable housing is well distributed across the parcel and clustering complies with the current policy. The applicant has exceeded the requirements of the outline consent to deliver more accessible homes. This is strongly supported. On this basis, the proposals are acceptable with regard to housing delivery. Condition 25 on the outline consent is recommended for approval.

15.0 Residential amenity for future occupants

Internal floor space

- 15.1 The outline consent was granted under the previous Cambridge Local Plan 2006 before internal space standards were adopted, and there is no condition to secure this requirement, nor is there is an internal floor space requirement within the approved Design Code. Internal floor space also does not fall within the definition of any of the reserved matters. Therefore, on the basis of legal advice from Counsel and case law, there is no lawful basis on which the local planning authority can require the proposed scheme to strictly comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS, 2015) as required by CLP 2018 policy 50.
- 15.2 Notwithstanding this, the local planning authority must assess the quality of the proposed accommodation and the residential amenity of future occupants as a material consideration. For this purpose, the NDSS do provide a useful guide and reference point as to the minimum floor spaces that are generally considered to provide an acceptable living environment. All homes within the current proposal would meet or exceed the NDSS and therefore would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants. This is a benefit over and above the requirements of the outline consent.

External amenity space

- 15.3 On the same legal basis, the external space standards within the CLP 2018 policy 50 cannot be lawfully applied, and therefore the relevant assessment is about the quality of the external amenity space and whether this provides a high-quality living environment. The approved Design Code states that amenity space should be of a size, shape, aspect and level that allows it to be positively used whilst affording an appropriate level of privacy to users and should be of a size appropriate to the size of the dwelling in order to accommodate outdoor furniture so that the space is productive.
- 15.4 All the proposed houses and apartments would have private external amenity space. Houses would have private rear gardens which would be an acceptable size for the number of bedrooms within the property and would meet the needs of the future occupants. Some, such as those fronting the Orbital Cycle Route, would have additional roof terraces. Apartments, flats- / maisonettes-over-garages and the upper-floor units within the walk-up blocks would have balconies at least 1.5 metres deep or roof terraces. This would provide useable space and is comparable to other balconies that are accepted across new developments. This would provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupants and is supported.
- 15.5 The ground-floor units within the walk-up blocks would have a small garden. The applicant has provided a daylight and sunlight assessment of those small gardens. Some would fail to meet the BRE guidance for 50 per cent of the garden receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight per day,

however the ground floor layout of those units has been re-arranged so that French doors open out onto those areas that receive the most sunlight. Therefore, there is an acceptable amount of high quality amenity space comparable to the balconies serving the units above. This is supported.

- 15.6 A condition is recommended to secure the provision of private amenity space for each dwelling prior to its occupation (**condition 23 – Curtilages**). This is necessary.

Inter-relationships between units

- 15.7 There are no back-to-back distances within the adopted CLP 2018 and therefore this is another matter of planning judgement in terms over overlooking, sense of enclosure, and daylight and sunlight. Before submitting amendments, the applicant carried out an audit of the separation distances between proposed units. This has been submitted within the Design and Access Statement. Back-to-back distances between 'traditional' dwellings with windows on the rear elevations facing each other are typically 18 metres. Some locations with three storey houses have longer separation distances of over 25 metres to mitigate the overlooking from second floor windows. This is acceptable.
- 15.8 Where distances are below 18 metres, this has been mitigated by removing windows to habitable rooms on the first floor of one of the facing properties. For example, where there are two storey dwellings backing onto flats-/ maisonettes-over-garages, there are only obscure-glazed bathroom windows on the first floor of the flats-over-garages. While there could be some views from first floor windows into ground floor windows less than 8 metres separation distances, these would typically be an oblique view from a bedroom window and would not result in a significant loss of privacy. Typical back-to-side relationships are 9.5 metres. This is acceptable.
- 15.9 To secure the mitigation incorporated into the design, conditions are recommended to remove permitted development rights. First, a condition to secure the implementation of obscure glazing with restricted opening prior to first occupation (**condition 22 - Opaque and fixed windows for all bathroom and ensuites**). Secondly, conditions to remove permitted development rights for the insertion of first and second floor windows and roof alterations on certain plots (**condition 19 – Removal of permitted development rights (windows)** and **condition 20 – Removal of Class B and C permitted development rights (alterations to roof)**). Thirdly, a condition to remove permitted development rights across the site for the erection of two storey extensions (**condition 21 – Removal of permitted development rights (two storey extensions)**). These are necessary in order to protect the amenity of future occupants. Subject to this, the proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity in this regard. This is supported.

Impact on amenity from existing neighbouring properties

- 15.10 The nearest approved dwellings adjacent to the parcel are the residential units to the rear of the Retail Block within the Local Centre. This is two storey development with windows on the rear elevations facing towards the parcel. The proposed development opposite is two storey mews properties and a three storey walk-up block with windows. The separation distance is approximately 10 metres. This relationship is acceptable.

Noise and Odour

- 15.11 The Environmental Quality and Growth team has considered the impact of the proximity of the existing NIAB buildings to residential development on the western corner of the site. The NIAB buildings currently operate in association with the retained farmland. The potential impacts include operational noise from the workshop and vehicle movements, and the impact of odour from fertiliser storage and muck / fertiliser spreading. The nearest proposed dwellings are the apartments on the corner block, which include balconies facing towards the NIAB site.
- 15.12 The applicant has submitted a noise assessment based on information gathered on site concerning current activities on the NIAB site. However, there are no restrictions controlling the use of the site. Therefore, activities could occur 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, which could increase the current impact to significant adverse. While the Environmental Quality and Growth team would prefer habitable rooms to be moved away from the NIAB site, they are satisfied that a condition for a ventilation scheme for the nearest units would achieve acceptable mitigation (**condition 10 – Alternative Ventilation Scheme**). This is supported.
- 15.13 An odour assessment has also been submitted. The Environmental Quality and Growth team are satisfied that there would be no unacceptable odour impact on future residents due to the prevailing wind direction and detailed activities within the NIAB facilities and fields. This is supported.
- 15.14 The Environmental Quality and Growth team has also considered the impact of the Local Centre and potential future supermarket site. Deliveries and collections to the commercial units within the Local Centre are controlled through condition 61 on the outline consent. Condition 59 on the outline consent requires that plant and commercial noise impacts from the commercial units are assessed and mitigation if required. The Local Centre reserved matters also restricts opening hours of retail units 1-6 and prohibits these being serviced by HGVs. The Environmental Quality and Growth team has advised that these existing conditions are acceptable to protect local amenity of the future residents of BDW4.
- 15.15 Concerning the supermarket site, it is difficult to accurately model the impact as the supermarket has yet to be granted planning permission and may not come forward. Good acoustic design for the supermarket will be

strongly recommended to protect the locality including internal curtained delivery system, restricted delivery hours, suitable plant insulation and acoustic shielding. Again, while the Environmental Quality and Growth team would prefer habitable rooms to be moved away from the supermarket site, the technical officers are satisfied that a ventilation scheme can achieve acceptable mitigation.

- 15.16 The Environmental Quality and Growth team has also considered the impact of noise from air source heats pumps (ASHPs). ASHPs have the potential to harm local amenity if poorly located without sufficient noise mitigation. It is important to consider the noise impact of the ASHP upon the occupants where the ASHP is installed to ensure elevated noise levels do not dissuade use. An important element to consider regarding ASHPs will be directivity of the noise source including tonal elements and reflections from nearby reflective surfaces which will increase the noise impact. A plant noise insulation condition (**condition 9 – Plant Noise Insulation**) and the standard plant noise informative (**informative 3**) are recommended.

Residential amenity for future occupants – conclusion

- 15.17 Overall, the proposals would provide an acceptable residential amenity for the future occupants. The proposal is acceptable both in terms of the outline permission and CLP 2018 policies 55 and 56.

16.0 Community Infrastructure

Public Open Space

- 16.1 A site-wide Strategy for Public Open Space provision was approved via schedule 6 of the Section 106 Agreement for the outline consent. The minimum requirement for this parcel was 0.06 hectares of open space consisting of two secondary squares.
- 16.2 The proposals achieve approximately 0.144 hectares of open space (excluding areas already approved under the infrastructure and Local Centre reserved matters consents and play spaces). This has been achieved through the introduction of the Green Link and Green Gateways, as well as the integration of greening into pedestrian / cycle routes and incidental spaces, particularly within the Mews Streets to the rear of the park frontage. Therefore, the scheme is compliant with the outline consent and is supported.

Children's Play Spaces

- 16.3 A site-wide Strategy for Youth Facilities and Children's Play Provision for Darwin Green was approved via condition 9 on the outline consent. Condition 10 on the outline consent requires reserved matters applications to include a Play Statement demonstrating compliance with the approved strategy. The approved site-wide strategy requires the BDW4 parcel to

provide two local areas of play (LAPs) of 100 square metres each and generally locates these within secondary squares on the park frontage side of the parcel. The applicant has submitted a Public Open Space and Play Strategy within the landscape Design Statement which was updated during the course of the application.

- 16.4 In accordance with the site-wide strategy, the proposal provides two LAPs within the parcel. One is located within the Local Centre Gateway South secondary public square in the south western corner of the site, and the second is provided within the Green Link. The location of these has been adjusted compared to the approved site-wide scheme, however this is a result of a design-led process. The play provision provides safe, accessible and inclusive space which is well-integrated into the landscaping scheme in accordance with the aims of the approved site-wide scheme. This is supported.
- 16.5 The wider area includes an enhanced LAP within the green corridor to the west of the parcel, which was approved as part of the infrastructure reserved matters consent. The enhanced LAP has been included within the red line of the application site to allow changes to be made to the layout of the play space in response to the detailed design of the nearby buildings. There are also two further LAPs within the Green Corridor to the north west and north east, also approved under the infrastructure reserved matters consent. As a result, there is good access to play space across the parcel in general accordance with the approved strategy.
- 16.6 The general layout and features of the play spaces have been provided on the landscaping plans and the Play Strategy. Play features are integrated into the landscape and provide informal opportunities to encourage exploration and to connect with nature. Elements include boulders, balancing logs and stepping stones, which respond to the landscape setting. This is in accordance with the aims of the site-wide scheme. However, detailed layouts and specifications have not been received. In addition, comments have not been received from the Streets and Open Spaces Team who will adopt the play spaces. This requires further review.
- 16.7 The individual pieces of play equipment have been positioned to achieve the 5 metre buffer distance to residential dwellings required by the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011) in most instances in order to protect the residential amenity of future occupiers. However, this will need to be reviewed again once the final details layout and specifications have been submitted. Adjustments will be made to achieve the required 5 metres in as many instances as possible. The proposed soft landscaping around the play spaces and forming thresholds to residential properties enhances the buffer. This is acceptable.
- 16.8 Therefore, while the general principles of the play spaces are supported, condition 10 is not recommended to be discharged and a further submission is required. This is acceptable.

Provision for Waste and Recycling

- 16.9 Condition 62 on the outline consent requires full details of the on-site storage facilities for waste including waste for recycling. This should comply with the Design Code which states that the proposal should be guided by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) Waste Management Design Guide SPD. The Shared Waste Team has also prepared a Waste Storage and Collection Guidance for Developers dated November 2021 which is a material consideration, however carries less weight than the RECAP SPD as it has not been formally adopted.
- 16.10 The applicant has submitted a Refuse Strategy plan showing the arrangement for bin storage and collection. This was updated during the course of the application following meetings with the Shared Waste Team. Each house would have a bin store providing space for three bins, which is supported. Apartment blocks would have communal bin stores within the ground floor of the building or in a nearby block. The walk-up blocks have communal external storage areas. This is supported.
- 16.11 Storage capacity for the apartment blocks and walk-up blocks has been calculated based on the most up to date guidance within the informal guidance. In all cases, the proposal exceeds the requirements, providing some additional capacity to accommodate for higher occupancy of some of the units compared to the occupancy anticipated in the guidance. The number, size and mix of bins for the apartment blocks and walk-up blocks is acceptable. The communal stores are appropriately sized to accommodate the required bins, without being excessively large. This is supported.
- 16.12 The maximum drag distance for collection crews for small bins is 25 metres and 10 metres for larger bins within communal stores, as set out in the SPD and guidance. The submitted Refuse Strategy plan shows most homes would be collected from the kerbside, apart from some properties within the mews streets and some small bins serving the walk-up blocks. This is because these properties are not accessed from the adoptable highway or are accessed via a green link. In those instances, the drag distance is below the 25 metres and is acceptable. This has been achieved through amendments submitted during the course of the application including the creation of collection points serving the properties on the Green Link. This is supported.
- 16.13 The drag distance for larger bins within communal stores meets the required 10 metres, except for one block on the northern end of the Green Link which is 15.9 metres, and another block on the eastern side of the Green Link which is 10.5 metres. This is a consequence of the place-making objecting to create a car-free space. These exceptional circumstances have been agreed in meetings with the Shared Waste Team. This was compensated by amendments that the applicant made to

other parts of the scheme during the course of the application to achieve compliant drag distances. Those amendments included additional external doors on stores and relocating one of the stores within the ground floor of the apartment blocks from the Green Link frontage to the park frontage, both of which created more direct access for crews from the highway. Overall, this approach is supported.

- 16.14 The maximum distance for residents to take waste to bins is 30 metres and to move bins from the storage point to the collection point is 25 metres, as set out in the SPD. While the applicant has aimed to achieve this (including via the creation of collection points during the course of the application), it is noted that the most up to date guidance from the Shared Waste Team does not specify maximum distances. Instead, the guidance recommends storage areas should be safe and accessible, but recognises that the method of transit of waste to a storage point will depend on the type of development. This has allowed the applicant to balance this with place-making objectives.
- 16.15 Most homes are served by a store in the rear garden with distances which comply with the SPD or are up to 35 metres from the store to the kerb for some terraces. However, there is one instance on the Green Link (plot 136) where the distance between storage and collection is up to 65 metres. This has been minimised by the creation of a collection point within the Mews Street serving this and other units. Nonetheless, this far exceeds the maximum distances within the SPD. This is noted as a non-compliance with the SPD and a disbenefit of the scheme, however is balanced against the wider place-making benefits achieved by the Green Link, and is acceptable on balance in this instance.
- 16.16 The applicant's Refuse Strategy plan shows distances from the door to the apartment blocks to the stores, rather than from individual apartments to the store as specified in the SPD. Therefore, there are instances where the distance from the individual apartments to the store will exceed the maximum. However, the stores have been conveniently located close to main routes to the apartment blocks and doors have been added in some instances to create more direct access. The location of stores has been dictated to some extent by the need to achieve the 10 metre drag distance for crews. This has been a particular constraint on the apartment blocks fronting the Green Link and Orbital Cycle Route. In discussion with the Shared Waste Team, it was agreed that longer distances for residents was preferable to longer distances for collection crews. This allows the scheme to achieve the place-making objectives of car-free spaces and is acceptable.
- 16.17 Refuse vehicle tracking diagrams have been provided and updated during the course of the application to reflect amendments to the site layout and collection points. No objections have been raised by the Shared Waste Team. The majority of the route is on the adoptable highway, however there are some instances where the refuse vehicle would need to traverse or reverse into non-adopted Mews Streets. A condition is recommended

to ensure these are built to adoptable standards to minimise damage caused by the refuse vehicle (**condition 2 – Non-adopted roads**). There are also non-adopted turning heads which are required to be kept clear from parked vehicles and a condition is recommended to secure parking enforcement in these areas (**condition 6 – Parking enforcement on hammer heads**).

16.18 In terms of the detail of the bin stores, the applicant has provided some plans and elevations for the houses and apartment stores, however some details are missing, including details of the standalone stores for houses and apartments. Therefore condition 62 is recommended to be part-discharged at this stage, and a further submission with this additional information will be required.

16.19 On this basis, the proposals are acceptable with regard to the refuse strategy.

Public Art

16.20 The outline consent approved a site wide Public Art Strategy dated July 2013, which sets out the themes and process for delivering public art across the Darwin Green as a whole. It also breaks down separate commissions with budgets allocated for each commission. These commissions relate to the Local Centre, Central Park, allotments, gateways and mapping, as well as an artist in residence and temporary art space. There are no specific commissions within the BDW4 parcel, however there is an expectation that elements of the site-wide gateways and mapping project will be delivered within the parcel.

16.21 Condition 69 on the outline consent requires the submission of a Public Art Delivery Plan with any reserved matters application. The applicant has submitted an Interim Public Art Statement, with a more detailed Public Art Delivery Plan to be submitted to discharge condition 69. The interim statement puts forward a proposal to locate an installation within the Green Link as part of the site-wide gateways and mapping project. This would be a continuation of the ‘wheat’ sculptures commission approved on other parcels. The location within the Green Link is supported as it would be highly visible at an intersection of routes.

16.22 The Council’s Public Art Officer has not commented on the application, however the details put forward in the interim statement provide an acceptable direction of travel for the public art proposals for this parcel. It sets out an indicative timetable to commission and develop the work, with installation targeted by December 2024. This aligns with the construction programme for BDW4 and is acceptable. It also allows time for a more detailed Public Art Delivery Plan to be submitted and assessed by the Public Art Officer. On this basis, the proposal is acceptable with regard to public art.

Community Infrastructure – conclusion

16.23 In summary, the proposals would provide more open space than required by the outline consent, and would achieve good access to play spaces across the parcel in general accordance with the approved site-wide strategy, albeit the detail of the play spaces is still to be agreed. The applicant has worked hard to achieve a refuse strategy which is now supported on balance by the Shared Waste Team. The applicant has made a commitment to deliver public art within the parcel in accordance with the approved site-wide strategy. Details can be secured via further submissions at a later date. Overall, the provision of community infrastructure is generally compliant with the outline permission and the social and community objectives of the CLP 2018 policies and the NPPF.

17.0 Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties

17.1 The nearest approved dwellings adjacent to the parcel are the residential units to the rear of the Retail Block within the Local Centre. This is two storey development with windows on the rear elevations facing towards the parcel. The proposed development opposite is two storey mews properties and a three storey walk-up block with windows. The separation distance is approximately 10 metres. This relationship is acceptable in accordance with CLP 2018 policies 55 and 56 in this regard.

18.0 Access and Transport

Transport Impact

18.1 The transport impact was assessed at the outline stage and is subject to conditions and mitigation measures secured through that consent. These include improvements to the local highway network, the provision of cycling, walking and public transport infrastructure, and residential travel plans. The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement to support the reserved matters application. The quantum of development proposed is in accordance with the outline consent and the proposal accords with or evolves the principles within the Design Code which support a modal shift towards non-car modes of transport. This is supported.

Car Parking

18.2 The outline consent controls the number of car parking spaces via condition 48 which states that car parking for residential properties shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the Local Plan. The condition also restricts the total number of residential parking spaces for the Darwin Green development (2,389 spaces) and this cap has not been reached (a total of 1,424 residential spaces have been approved through earlier reserved matters for BDW1, the Local Centre, BDW5/6 and BDW2).

18.3 Car parking standards within the adopted CLP 2018 are set out in Policy 82 and Appendix L. The standards for new developments outside the

controlled parking zone are no more than a mean of 1.5 spaces per dwelling up to 2 bedrooms; and no less than a mean of 0.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling for 3 bedrooms or more. The proposal provides 383 residential car parking spaces. The applicant has provided an assessment in the Planning Statement demonstrating compliance with the adopted standards. This is supported.

- 18.4 Parking is provided in tandem, garages car ports, or within small courts in the Mews Streets for the apartment blocks. This provides flexibility for homeowners to use this space for storing cycles or other sustainable transport modes, and for parking courts to be adapted for community use in the future as demand for car parking drops. A condition is recommended to remove permitted development rights for the conversion of car ports and garages to habitable space in the interests of protecting space that could be used for cycles and other alternative transport modes consistent with the consent granted for the BDW2 parcel (**condition 24 - Removal of permitted development rights for the conversion of garages and car ports**).
- 18.5 Regarding visitor parking, outline condition 48 states that the development could also provide for visitor spaces as appropriate, and that these spaces shall be on street and not allocated to any residential property. The proposal includes 48 visitor parking spaces, which equates to approximately 1 space per 7 dwellings. Visitor parking spaces have been provided on-street on the Primary and Secondary Streets across the parcel and within individual parking bays. These are evenly spread throughout the development. This is supported.
- 18.6 Condition 70 of the outline consent requires the applicant to provide details of interim parking management arrangements prior to any formal adoption of the roads and ahead of the introduction of a formal traffic regulation order whereby parking controls will be enforced by the local authority. The applicant is required to submit details prior to occupation of any dwelling on this phase.

Cycle Parking

- 18.7 Condition 49 on the outline consent requires that any reserved matters application for residential units or open spaces shall provide details of facilities for the covered, secure parking of bicycles in accordance with the approach approved within the Design Code, which requires 1 space per bedroom for dwellings up to 3 bedrooms, and 4 spaces per dwelling for 4 or 5 bedroom dwellings (which exceeds the adopted CLP 2018 standards for 3 spaces for 4-bedroom dwellings). The proposal provides 800 residential cycle parking spaces and 25 spaces for visitors. The applicant's assessment in the Planning Statement demonstrates compliance with the Design Code standards. This is supported.
- 18.8 The applicant has made substantial changes during the course of the application to improve the cycle parking provision for all homes, so that in

all instances, cycle parking is at least as convenient as car parking, if not more convenient. Houses are provided with at least some cycle parking spaces at the front of the dwelling, with some also providing spaces in the rear garden to meet the standards. This is acceptable and provides the future occupants with storage options. Apartments have communal stores, although the walk-up blocks have individual stores for each home. FOGs have cycle parking within the garages with adequate space in accordance with the Council's adopted guidance. Apartment blocks show space for off gauge cycles and maintenance areas. This is strongly welcomed by officers.

- 18.9 Condition 49 requires details of the cycle parking to be submitted for approval. Stores that are integrated into the front of houses and within the apartment blocks are shown on the proposed plans and on some elevations, however not on all house types. Elevations should be submitted to ensure a high quality design which is visually well integrated. Standalone stores in the rear gardens require plans and elevations to be submitted. In addition, plans and elevations of the stores for the walk-up blocks are also required. Therefore condition 49 is recommended to be part-discharged at this stage, and a further submission with this additional information will be required. This is acceptable.
- 18.10 The Design Code sets out that some level of visitor cycle parking is expected to be provided, particularly for large housing, without specifying quantity requirements. The cycle parking should be in convenient and safe places, where it would not obstruct the passage of pedestrians or vehicles. Moreover, it expects the cycle parking spaces to be well lit and benefit from natural surveillance and be secure, whilst being provided in key public spaces. 25 visitor spaces have been provided as shown on the proposed landscape plans. These are a mix of Sheffield stands and wall brackets, and are positioned to serve areas of open space and entrances to apartment blocks. This is acceptable.
- 18.11 In conclusion, the proposal provides high quality cycle parking for residents and visitors in accordance with the Design Code and adopted policy and guidance. Some further details are required to ensure the stores are visually well integrated before condition 49 can be discharged in respect of parcel BDW4.

Cycling and Pedestrian Infrastructure

- 18.12 The Orbital Cycle Route runs along the north western boundary of the site and also south east between the parcel and the supermarket site / Local Centre to the west of the parcel. This was approved as part of the infrastructure reserved matters. It forms a key strategic route through the development and connecting wider parts of the city. The proposal provides an appropriate frontage to the Orbital Cycle Route with a threshold in front of the dwellings fronting it. The car-free frontage also promotes use of the route by creating direct access from the dwellings and

their cycle stores onto the route, and avoids conflict between cyclists and cars. This is supported.

- 18.13 The scheme also provides good cycle and pedestrian links onto the route via the Green Gateways, which align with the approved crossing points over the drainage swale and feed into permeable network or car-free or low traffic routes. A key element of this is the Green Link which evolved into a car-free space for pedestrians and cyclists. This provides an informal connection from the Central Park to the Orbital Cycle Route in addition to the formal routes within the Green Corridors on either end of the parcel approved under the infrastructure reserved matters. This is supported.
- 18.14 There are also Green Gateways on the park frontage which provide a high density of informal routes into the parcel from the Central Park, and one on the north eastern side of the parcel which aligns with the swale bridge and provides a connection from the Green Corridor and BDW5/6 parcel beyond. These feed into the Mews Streets to the rear of the park frontage apartment blocks, which create a permeable low-traffic route east and west through the parcel, providing an alternative route to the Primary Road. There are also connections from the Local Centre via the existing routes between the Retail Blocks, which feed into the Secondary Streets. This is supported.
- 18.15 Officers are satisfied that the principles of the Design Code ensure that appropriate provision for cyclists and pedestrians has been made, and that similar aspirations for the site are shared with LTN/10 namely that cycle networks and routes should be coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive. This is supported.

Highway Safety

- 18.16 The Primary Street North / Bus Route through Darwin Green 1 runs along the south western boundary of the site along the park frontage. This has a bus gate which prevents access for private cars. This was approved under the infrastructure reserved matters consent and is outside of the red line of the application site boundary, apart from some areas which were included during the course of the application to allow changes to the design speed features to be compatible with the proposals. This includes adjustments to the position of raised tables. A similar situation occurred on parts of the Primary Street on the north eastern side of the parcel. This is acceptable.
- 18.17 Within the parcel, the Primary Street feeds into a network of Secondary Streets, Tertiary Streets and Mews Streets. This follows the general principles within the Design Code although there have been some significant layout changes as the scheme has evolved. The number of motor vehicle accesses into the parcel has been rationalised compared to the Design Code, with only one Secondary Street accessed from the park frontage and two Secondary Street accesses on the north eastern side.

The creation of the Green Link has prevented motor vehicle access between the western and eastern side of the site which prevents 'rat-running'. This is supported.

- 18.18 The applicant has submitted vehicle tracking diagrams and visibility splays. The Highway Authority has been involved in reviewing the proposals at all stages. Comments made on highway safety grounds have been addressed as part of the amendments. At the time of writing, one issue remains outstanding, which is the alignment of one of the Secondary Streets. The Highway Authority has raised concern a small 'kink' in the road being unsafe for cyclists and has requested that the road is straightened before it can be acceptable for adoption. The solution requires moving three houses and two walk-up blocks to create space to realign the road. This has been discussed informally with the Highway Authority and officers. Amended plans are due to be submitted prior to committee, which will be reported to committee as an update.
- 18.19 A highway adoption plan has been submitted for information. This will be subject to a separate adoption process with the Highway Authority. The indicative proposal is for the Highway Authority to adopt the Secondary and Tertiary Streets. The Highway Authority will not adopt the Mews Streets which would be maintained by a management company. The extent of non-adopted roads has been minimised as much as possible. This is acceptable in principle on balance due to the place-making objectives these Mews Streets achieve.
- 18.20 Concerns were raised by the Highway Authority about there being no designated route for pedestrians from the end of the footway into the shared surface Mews Streets. The Access Officer also noted that shared spaces are not accessible to all, although the Disability Panel raised no specific concern about the Mews Streets. The Cambridgeshire Quality Panel raised no problem in principle but recommended the entrance to the Mews Streets should provide a clear visual pedestrian priority by creating continuous footways including over raised tables, and recommended contrasting materials to differentiate the carriageway and areas where motor vehicles are not expected to encroach.
- 18.21 Shared surfaces have been used extensively in similar developments in the Greater Cambridge area, including on other parcels of Darwin Green. In the current scheme, they are proposed on no-through routes for motor vehicles with low traffic flows and are designed for low traffic speeds and to give priority to pedestrians. Contrasting pavers and raised tables mark the entrances to shared surface areas and provide clear pedestrian priority at junctions. The carriageway is demarcated by contrasting pavers and planting beds. This - together with the intimate character of the Mews Streets and the neighbourhood community these areas foster - promotes low traffic speeds and pedestrian priority. While acknowledging the comments made, the Mews Streets are acceptable.

- 18.22 The Refuse Strategy plan shows the refuse vehicle would mainly traverse on adopted roads, however would need to reverse onto areas of the non-adopted highway. Therefore, a condition is recommended for the Mews Streets to be constructed to an adoptable standard to minimise damage (**condition 2 – Non-adopted roads**).
- 18.23 Conditions are recommended relating to pedestrian visibility splays (**condition 3 – Pedestrian visibility splays**), construction of driveways and off street parking spaces (**condition 5 – Driveway levels**), and inter-visibility splays for access points (**condition 4 - Inter-visibility splays**).

Access and transport – conclusion

- 18.24 The scheme has evolved the Design Code to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements through the parcel, via the site layout, creation of the Green Link, connections to the Orbital Cycle Route, and high-quality cycle parking which has been carefully considered for each dwelling. Motor vehicle access has been rationalised in the process. Highway safety is acceptable subject to resolution of the outstanding alignment issue. The proposal is consistent with the outline consent and the established principles within the Design Code and align with CLP 2018 policies 80 and 81. On this basis, the proposals are acceptable with regard to access and transport.

19.0 Environmental Issues

Water Management, Drainage and Flood Risk

- 19.1 A site-wide Surface Water Drainage Strategy for Darwin Green has been approved under condition 34 of the outline consent. The Design Code sets three key drainage objectives to capture and treat surface water to minimise pollution, harvest rainwater and surface water runoff for reuse and reduce peak flows from the site. The site-wide strategy for Darwin Green incorporates ponds and swales appropriately located within open green areas and alongside roadways to collect controlled run-offs from the various development site parcels. The strategic infrastructure has been approved via the infrastructure reserved matters consent and partially implemented.
- 19.2 For the detailed proposals, condition 35 of the outline consent requires the submission of a surface water drainage scheme for each reserved matters demonstrating accordance with the approved site-wide Surface Water Drainage Strategy. The applicant has submitted a Drainage Technical Note, Strategy Layouts and Catchment Area Layouts, supported by drainage calculations which were updated during the course of the application. The proposed surface water drainage strategy is based on the approved site-wide Surface Water Drainage Strategy.
- 19.3 The drainage calculations demonstrate that the network does not flood in a 1 in 100-year storm events, including a 30% allowance for climate

change. The updated drainage calculations are supported by the Lead Local Flood Authority, and this advice is supported.

- 19.4 Surface water run-off will be attenuated on site through a range of sustainable urban drainage features and will discharge at controlled rates to the strategic swales and existing network. Sustainable urban drainage features include permeable paving, rain gardens, dry swales and a small attenuation pond. The open surface water drainage features have been purposely incorporated throughout the site to improve biodiversity and water quality. The proposal includes water butts for harvesting rainwater for garden use. This is supported and condition 35 is recommended to be discharged. A condition is recommended to secure drainage construction details (**condition 17 – Detailed drainage construction details**).
- 19.5 CLP 2018 policy 31 requires flat roofs to be green or brown roofs. The outline consent was granted before this policy was adopted. Therefore, it cannot be lawfully applied to the current reserved matters application. The scheme does not propose green or brown roofs on the flat roofs of the apartment blocks, which is regrettable. However, green roofs are proposed to the flat roofs of the cycle stores to the front of dwellings, which is supported. Given the policy situation, this is acceptable.
- 19.6 The applicant has submitted ownership and maintenance details. This includes potential adoption of sustainable drainage features and pipework by Cambridge City Council. This is subject to a separate adoption process to be agreed with the local authority. For the avoidance of doubt, this is not agreed as part of the planning application process.
- 19.7 The Lead Local Flood Authority has recommended an informative on pollution control particularly during construction. This is secured via condition 38 on the outline consent, which requires a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment to be approved. Control of drainage during construction also forms part of the CEMP and CMP secured via conditions 51 and 52 on the outline consent. However, the recommendation for the informative is supported (**informative 5**).

Sustainable Construction and Design

- 19.8 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement which outlines the energy assessment and the approach towards climate change, low carbon development, renewable energy systems, and the sustainable use of environmental resources. All apartments will be dual aspect to enable cross ventilation. Buildings are relatively shallow to reduce the need for artificial lighting and mechanical ventilation, therefore reducing energy demands. This is supported.
- 19.9 Condition 27 of the outline consent requires each reserved matters application to demonstrate a 10% reduction in carbon emissions can be achieved using on-site renewable energy. Condition 28 of the outline

consent effectively supersedes condition 27 upon adoption of any new policy related to carbon reduction, which has now come into effect following the adoption of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. Policy 28 requires all new residential development to achieve an on-site reduction in carbon emissions equating to a 19% reduction compared to 2013 Building Regulations Part L.

- 19.10 Condition 29 of the outline consent requires all homes to be constructed to a minimum of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes which was scrapped by the government in 2014. Forthcoming changes to the Building Regulations Part L are incompatible with certification under Code for Sustainable Homes. This is because the technical requirements related to the Code for Sustainable Homes are linked to older versions of the Building Regulations. Therefore, any homes built under the forthcoming 2021 Building Regulations Part L cannot be certified and cannot comply with condition 29.
- 19.11 The new 2021 Building Regulations Part L introduce further reductions in carbon emissions beyond those required by Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. The new 2021 Building Regulations Part L standards require a 31% improvement on the 2013 Part L standards, representing an improvement in performance from Code Level 4 which only required a 19% improvement. Therefore, any homes built under the new 2021 Building Regulations Part L standards will exceed the requirements of condition 29 in terms of reducing carbon emissions.
- 19.12 Information on renewable energy provision and overall carbon reduction has been included within the Sustainability Statement. The report sets out a hierarchical approach to reducing emissions, with the use of fabric improvements followed by the implementation of at least 1 kWp of photovoltaic panels for each residential unit. A schedule has been submitted with the application, setting out the amount of photovoltaic panels to be applied to each unit, with a total provision of 508.53 kWp across the site. The site roof plan general arrangement drawing shows the indicative layout of these panels. This approach is supported and enables all units to meet (and indeed exceed) the 19% reduction requirement. This is supported.
- 19.13 The applicant has submitted a construction programme setting out the number of homes that will be built to the 2013 Building Regulations Part L standards and those which will be delivered against future iterations, notably the forthcoming 2021 Building Regulations of Future Homes Standard. 59 of the 344 plots will be built under 2013 Regulations. These are properties to be built or commence building before the 2021 Regulations come into full effect on 15 June 2023. 216 of the 344 plots will be built under the 2021 Regulations. The remaining 69 plots will be built to comply with the Future Home Standards, which are expected to be delivered in 2025. This is supported by the Sustainability Officer as an improvement on the requirements of the outline consent.

- 19.14 In terms of condition 29, interim and post-construction certificates will need to be submitted for the 201 homes constructed under 2013 Building Regulations Part L demonstrating they meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. For the units constructed to the 2021 Regulations and Future Homes Standard, a condition is recommended to secure assessment of those units against the relevant standards (**condition 12 – Carbon Reduction Strategy**). This approach is consistent with the approach taken for the BDW5/6 and BDW2 parcels. This is acceptable.
- 19.15 For all properties, it is currently proposed to provide heating and hot water via energy efficient gas boilers of gas boilers. As part of discussions on other parcels, the approach has been to phase out the use of gas boilers in light of the transition to net zero carbon and the implementation of the Future Homes Standard in 2025. As above, the construction programme indicates that some homes will be built under the Future Homes Standards and these will benefit from electric forms of heating from the outset. A condition is recommended to ensure that houses built before the Future Homes Standard are future-proofed for electric heating to allow future homeowners to more easily retrofit electric forms of heating (**condition 13 – Futureproofing for low temperature heating**). This is acceptable.
- 19.16 Water efficiency has been reviewed as part of the design process and a Part G compliant specification will be adopted, resulting in the higher standard (lower water use) of 110 litres per person per day. This consists of a maximum of 100.5 litres internal water use and 5 litres external water use. This is supported and meets the targets within the Design Code. Photovoltaic panels and electric vehicle charge points are also proposed. This is supported.
- 19.17 Condition 63 of the outline application requires the submission of a Detailed Waste Management Plan (DWMP), setting out the approach to reducing construction waste. The applicant has submitted a Waste Management Technical Note. This is not supported by the Sustainability Officer as it does not include a plan showing the location of the waste storage compound. Therefore condition 63 is not recommended for approval and a further submission prior to commencement of development is required.

Air Quality

- 19.18 The outline consent was approved under the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which contained no requirements for electric vehicle (EV) charge points. As a result, there is no condition on the outline consent and no requirement within the approved Design Code for the applicant to provide EV charge points within the development. The provision of EV charge points does not fall within the legal definition of any of the reserved matters to which the assessment is limited for the current application. This legacy situation means that it is not lawful to apply adopted CLP 2018 policy 36.

- 19.19 Notwithstanding this, the applicant has committed to provide one active EV charge point for each dwelling with an on-plot car parking space, and to provide 50 per cent of spaces within each communal parking area for the apartments and on street parking spaces on private roads with an active EV charge point. Passive provision including installing appropriate ducting and associated infrastructure would be provided to the remaining spaces. The charge points would be a minimum 7 kilowatts. This would be secured through **condition 11 – Electric Vehicle Infrastructure**. This exceeds the requirements of the outline consent and is strongly welcomed.
- 19.20 In a similar legacy situation, there is no requirement for the applicant to provide low Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) boilers, as this is not required in the outline conditions or within the Design Code, and it does not fall under the legal definition of reserved matters. Nevertheless, the applicant proposes the use of gas efficient condensing boilers or ASHPs. This is in accordance with current policy in CLP 2018 and is supported by the Environmental Quality and Growth team. It exceeds the requirements of the outline consent and is strongly welcomed.
- 19.21 In addition to this, the applicant has committed to installing measures in all dwellings to facilitate the upgrade of heating systems to efficient electric heating (such as heat pumps) to future-proof the homes. This includes installing appropriate radiators, identifying suitable space for air source heat pumps, and installing appropriate pipework and hot water tanks. This would be secured through **condition 13 – Futureproofing for low temperature heating**. This exceeds the requirements of the outline consent and is strongly welcomed.
- 19.22 Further measures incorporated into the scheme to promote the use of sustainable transport as described in the Access and Transport section of this report, and the measures to meet carbon reduction and renewable energy targets as covered in the sustainability section of this report, are considered to contribute towards the reduction in emissions and improved air quality for this development.

Construction method

- 19.23 Condition 52 of outline permission requires a construction method statement (CMS) be submitted to demonstrate how the construction of the reserved matters approval accords with the details of construction criteria of the construction environmental management plan (CEMP) approved under outline condition 51. The CMS has not been submitted with the current application and must be submitted for approval prior to commencement of development.

Contaminated Land

- 19.24 Contaminated land is controlled by condition 50 on the outline consent and various site investigation reports have demonstrated that the Darwin

Green 1 site is largely free from contamination and that no remedial measures are required. As such this condition has been partially discharged and no further investigation works are required. The condition requires a watching brief to be maintained and an assessment and remediation works should be carried out if unexpected contamination is found. Therefore, parts of condition 50 remain applicable.

- 19.25 A soil management strategy forms part of the CMS required to be submitted for approval under condition 52 of the outline consent prior to commencement of development.

Lighting

- 19.26 Condition 66 on the outline consent requires reserved matters applications to include details of the height, type, position, and angle of glare of any final site lighting / floodlights including light contours. The applicant has submitted details of street lighting and private installations, however the Environmental Quality and Growth team has advised that further information is required in order to make a proper assessment. Therefore, condition 66 is not recommended for approval and a revised submission will need to be made.

20.0 Ecology and Biodiversity

- 20.1 A site-wide Ecological Conservation Management Plan (ECMP) setting out how the development will improve net biodiversity and in accordance with the outline Environmental Statement was approved via the discharge of condition 39 of the outline consent. An Ecological Conservation Management Plan Statement (ECMPS) demonstrating how the detailed proposals accord with the site-wide plan is required to be submitted with any reserved matters to discharge condition 40 of the outline consent.
- 20.2 The applicant submitted an ECMPS which was supplemented by an Ecological Update Consideration report during the course of the application. The ECMPS is based on a walkover survey undertaken in December 2021. Since then, construction works have progressed, and the former arable land has been cleared to construction areas, active site compounds and associated land, which are subject to frequent disturbance from construction activities. The site was re-surveyed for habitats in May 2022 which informed the update report.
- 20.3 The key protected animal species issues within the BDW4 parcel relate to badgers and bats. Surveys found no evidence of badger setts within the site itself, however a number of setts were noted within the offsite habitats east of the site, in the vicinity of associated Green Corridors. Accordingly, it is proposed that construction safeguards and working practices be put in place to ensure any badgers remain fully protected should they enter the site during any construction works. This includes a pre-construction and update checks for badgers and associated construction safeguards and measures. This is acceptable.

- 20.4 Relating to bats, while there are no buildings or structures offering potential opportunities for roosting bats and the site lacks vegetated corridors, cover or navigational features that would offer potential foraging or commuting bats, the offsite habitats (in particular Green Corridors to the north and east of the parcel) provide potential flyways. Therefore, it is recommended that the detailed lighting scheme should minimise potential light spill in these directions, and construction lighting should be similarly avoided in these locations. This will need to be considered in resubmission of the lighting scheme to discharge condition 66. This is acceptable.
- 20.5 Other mitigation measures and safeguards recommended in the applicant's submission include the appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works to oversee construction and an initial briefing for site staff and overseeing relevant works. The Landscape Design Approach statement includes hedgehog holes in all garden fences, which is supported. The Ecology Officer supports the ecological mitigation measures and accordingly condition 40 is recommended for approval.
- 20.6 In terms of biodiversity enhancements, the proposals include the installation of 40 swift boxes and 8 bat boxes on the parcel. This would contribute to the site-wide number of boxes required under the approved outline ECMP and would exceed the number of swift boxes required. This is supported. The landscape strategy incorporates a focus on native and pollinator species and enhances the biodiversity value of sustainable drainage feature through planting. Log piles, bee posts and bug hotels are also proposed throughout the open spaces.
- 20.7 The applicant submitted a biodiversity net gain assessment. This used the permitted outline scheme (including the approved open space strategy and the landscape strategy) as the baseline against which the proposed scheme was considered. The proposed biodiversity value was measured directly from the detailed scheme. It identified a relative increase in the proposed biodiversity of approximately 30 percent compared to the outline consent. This is supported by the Ecology Officer and is welcomed as a benefit over and above the requirements of the outline consent.

21.0 Other Issues

Trees and Hedges

- 21.1 Conditions 17 and 18 require the submission of a land survey, tree and hedge survey, and arboricultural implications assessment; and an arboricultural method statement, tree constraints plan and tree protection plan respectively. The applicants have submitted an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), and Tree Protection and Retention Plans covering the BDW4 and BDW3 parcels. These show there are no existing trees within the red line boundary of the application site.

- 21.2 There is a retained hedge to the north east which is outside of the site boundary and within the area covered by the infrastructure reserved matters consent. Nonetheless, the plans show protecting fencing around this hedge. The Tree Officer has not commented on the application, however the information submitted is acceptable and conditions 17 and 18 are recommended for approval. Conditions are recommended to secure the implementation of the approved tree protection methodology (**Condition 7 – Tree protection methodology implementation**) and replacement tree planting (**condition 8 – Tree replacement**).

Fire safety

- 21.3 Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has reviewed the scheme and has raised no objection. Access and facilities for the fire service is a matter controlled by Building Regulations. There are no proposed buildings that would be 18m or more, or seven or more storeys and therefore there are no requirements under Planning Gateway One. This is acceptable. Condition 71 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for the provision and the location of fire hydrants to be discharged prior to commencement of development on this parcel. This addresses the comment concerning fire hydrants from the fire service.

Broadband

- 21.4 Condition 15 on the outline consent requires a site-wide strategy for the provision or facilitation of broadband. This condition has been fully discharged and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved 'Broadband Provision for Darwin Green' document by Utility Consultant Services dated 20 March 2014. This is in accordance with CLP 2018 policy 42.

Archaeology and Heritage

- 21.5 A programme of archaeological investigation works was secured via condition 67 on the outline consent. A written scheme of investigation was agreed with the County Archaeology team and the investigation works have been carried out. An archive report has been submitted to the Council as required by the condition. Approval is awaited from the County Archaeology team before this condition can be fully discharged. This is separate to the current application. This is acceptable.

Airport Safeguarding

- 21.6 The site falls within two airport safeguarding zone consultative areas around Cambridge Airport for any structure greater than 45 metres and 90 metres above the ground level, and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation has no safeguarding concerns with the heights of the development. The site is also within the birdstrike safeguarding zone, and the flat roofs of some apartments and houses have the potential to attract 'large gull' species which will use the roof spaces for breeding and/or

roosting. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation has requested a condition for a Bird Hazard Management Plan providing details of how the flat roof spaces will be managed and mitigated to deter breeding and roosting 'large gull' species from being attracted to these areas (**condition 17 – Bird Hazard Management Plan**). Subject to this, the proposal does not conflict with CLP 2018 policy 37.

22.0 Third Party Representations

22.1 None were received.

23.0 Planning Balance

- 23.1 The material considerations are limited to the reserved matters of layout, landscaping, appearance and scale. These are assessed in the context of the outline consent and the relevant development plan policies where applicable. The assessment in this report has concluded that the proposals are generally compliant with the outline consent and the established principles within the Design Code. While the site layout has evolved from the Design Code, this has been a result of an extensive pre-application process with officers, review by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel, feedback from briefings with the Joint Development Control Committee and amendments submitted during the course of the application. This has been a collaborative process with the applicant and is supported.
- 23.2 The resulting scheme would provide a high-quality living environment for the future occupants. The site layout and provision of infrastructure promotes sustainable lifestyles through the creation of the car-free Green Link and low-traffic Mews Streets. It maximises the opportunities to promote sustainable travel arising from the parcel's frontage onto the Orbital Cycle Route. Amendments to the site layout have created a highly permeable network for pedestrians and cyclists and have rationalised motor vehicle access. The applicant has worked hard to provide high quality cycle parking which is at least as convenient as car parking and has designed on-plot parking and parking courts capable of being adapted in the future as car use declines. This work has been complemented by greening across the parcel and landscape proposals which take opportunities to incorporate biodiversity, edibles, space for play and community, and sustainable drainage features, in order to maximise the environmental and social value of the landscaping. This is supported.
- 23.3 In addition to providing a housing mix that responds to the current housing demand, the scheme delivers benefits over and above the requirements of the outline consent. These benefits should be given weight in the planning balance. This includes providing more public open space, measurable biodiversity net gain, securing future-proofing infrastructure for electric heating systems via condition; a commitment to build a proportion of homes to the forthcoming Part L Building Regulations 2021 and Future Homes Standard achieving a greater carbon reduction than the current

standards; homes which meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards and have private amenity space; homes which are dual aspect; a higher proportion of accessible homes; and provision active electric vehicle (EV) charge points. This is strongly welcomed.

23.4 In the planning balance, these benefits outweigh the issues discussed in this report about instances of non-compliance with the RECAP SPD on waste collection and the concerns raised about shared surface Mews Streets. For this reason, subject to resolution of the outstanding highway alignment issue prior to the JDCC meeting, the proposals are supported by officers, and the recommendation is to approve the application subject to conditions, as per section 24 below. The recommendation includes the respective approval or non-approval of details submitted to discharge outline planning conditions in respect of this parcel. Any details that are not recommended to be fully approved in respect of this parcel will need to be resubmitted in line with the triggers for each specific condition, or as otherwise agreed with the local planning authority. This approach is acceptable to approve outstanding details.

24.0 Recommendation

24.1 **Approve planning permission of reserved matters application reference 21/05433/REM**, subject to:

- (i) The conditions and informatives set out below in this report; and
- (ii) With authority delegated to officers to carry through minor amendments to those conditions and informatives (and include others considered appropriate and necessary) prior to the issuing of the planning permission.

24.2 **Approve / refuse partial discharge of the following outline planning conditions** (planning application reference 07/0003/OUT) in relation to the BDW4 parcel reserved matters **according to the recommendations for each condition set out in the table below:**

Conditions submitted	Recommendation
Condition 8 Design Code Compliance	Approve
Condition 10 Youth Facility and Children’s Play Provision	Not approve
Condition 14 Soft and Hard Landscaping	Not approve
Condition 17 Tree and Hedges Protection	Approve
Condition 18 Tree Protection	Approve
Condition 25 Affordable Housing	Approve

Condition 26 Accessible Dwellings	Approve
Condition 28 Renewable Energy	Approve
Condition 35 Detailed Surface Water Strategy	Approve
Condition 40 Ecological Conservation Management Plan Statement	Approve
Condition 49 Secure Parking of Bicycles	Part approve
Condition 58 Noise Assessment for Future Residents	Approve
Condition 62 Domestic and Trade Waste	Part approve
Condition 63 Construction Waste Management	Not approve
Condition 66 Lighting	Not approve
Condition 69 Public Art	Not approve

25.0 Planning Conditions and Informatives

1. Plans Compliance

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Highways

2. Non-adopted roads

Non-adopted roads shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the Housing Estate Road Construction Specification 2018 produced by Cambridgeshire County Council (or its successor document at the time of construction), or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of construction of the road to which those details relate.

Reason: To ensure non adopted roads are constructed and maintained to a standard suitable for refuse and maintenance vehicles in the interests of maintaining visual amenity and safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 59, 80, 81).

3. Pedestrian visibility splays

Two pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided each side of all motor vehicular accesses where they enter onto the adopted public highway. The splays shall be measured from and along the boundary of the adopted public highway and shall be within the curtilage of property served by the access. The splays shall be free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway at all times and shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 59, 80, 81).

4. Inter-visibility splays

Motor vehicle accesses serving more than one dwelling onto the adopted public highway shall be provided with inter-vehicle visibility splays of 2.4m x 25m on each side of the access measured along the edge of the carriageway or shared surface. The splays shall be free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adopted public highway at all times and shall be maintained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 59, 80, 81).

5. Driveway levels

All driveways, parking spaces, pedestrian and cycle accesses and other hard paved exterior elements shall be constructed so that their falls and levels are such that no private water drains across or onto the adopted public highway, and shall be constructed using a bound material to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: For the safe and effective operation of the highway (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 59, 80, 81).

6. Parking enforcement on hammer heads

A scheme for parking enforcement on the areas shown on the approved plan [insert plan reference] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to implementation of the scheme. The parking enforcement scheme shall be in place prior to commencement of use of those areas for the purposes of waste collection (including for the traverse and turning of refuse collection vehicles) and shall remain in place thereafter.

Reason: To prevent parking within hammer heads which would obstruct turning of refuse collection vehicles (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56, 59, 80, 81).

Landscape

7. Tree Protection Methodology implementation

The tree protection methodology approved via the discharge of condition 17 and 18 on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT (insofar as it relates to this reserved matters consent) shall be implemented (including supervision as required) throughout the construction of the development hereby permitted until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with approved tree protection plans, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority via the discharge of condition 20 on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT.

Reason: To ensure that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, in the interests of arboricultural amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 59, 71).

8. Tree Replacement

If any tree shown to be retained on the tree protection methodology approved via the discharge of condition 17 and 18 on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT (insofar as it relates to this reserved matters consent) is removed, uprooted,

destroyed or dies within five years of project completion, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that remaining arboricultural amenity will be preserved (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 59, 71).

Environmental

9. Plant Noise Insulation

No operational plant, machinery or equipment shall be installed until a noise assessment and any noise insulation and/or mitigation as required has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any required noise insulation and/or mitigation, as approved, shall be fully installed or implemented prior to first use of the plant, machinery or equipment, and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

10. Alternative Ventilation Scheme

No above ground development relating to plots 001 – 016 as shown on the approved site plan shall commence until details of an alternative ventilation scheme for the habitable rooms on the north-west and south-west façades overlooking the NIAB facility and Local Centre (including the site referred to in the approved Design Code as the 'supermarket option) in order to protect future occupiers from external noise has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at minimum of 2 air changes per hour and shall include full details of the operating noise level of the alternative ventilation system. The scheme, as approved, shall be fully installed and operational prior to first occupation of the dwellings and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36).

11. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

Prior to commencement of installation of electrical services, a scheme for the provision of dedicated electric vehicle charge points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include relevant plan(s) and specifications for electric vehicle charge points, appropriate ducting and associated infrastructure. The scheme shall provide:

- i. The provision of at least one active electric vehicle charge point for each dwelling with on-plot parking, which shall be designed and installed on-plot with a minimum power rating output of 7 kilowatts.

- ii. The provision of active electric vehicle charge points to least 50 per cent of car parking spaces within each area of communal/courtyard and on street parking spaces to private roads provision, which shall be designed and installed with a minimum power rating output of 7 kilowatts.
- iii. Additional passive electric vehicle charge provision of cabling to parking spaces for all remaining communal/courtyard car parking spaces and on street parking spaces to private roads to facilitate and enable the future installation and activation of additional active electric vehicle charge points as required.
- iv. The scheme shall enable capacity in the connection to the local electricity distribution network and electricity distribution board, as well as the provision of cabling to parking spaces.
- v. The electric vehicle charge points shall be designed and installed in accordance with BS EN 61851 or any superseding standard or Building Regulations.

The electric vehicle charge point scheme, as approved, shall be installed and functioning prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which they relate and maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable modes and forms of transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the NPPF and policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and with Cambridge City Council's adopted Air Quality Action Plan 2018.

12. Carbon Reduction Strategy

The carbon reduction strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Sustainability Statement V2 (Environmental Economics 22/09/2022) and submission of details to discharge condition 29 on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT (insofar as it relates to this reserved matters) shall be as follows, or in accordance with alternative details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- i. No more than 59 dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed to the Part L Building Regulations 2013 standard and assessed against Code for Sustainable Buildings Level 4. Certificates shall be submitted in accordance with condition 29 on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT; and
- ii. No more than 216 dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed to the forthcoming Part L Building Regulations 2021 standard. Post-construction assessments demonstrating compliance with the relevant standard shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the dwelling to which the assessment relates; and

- iii. No less than 69 dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed to the Future Homes Standard. Post-construction assessments demonstrating compliance with the relevant standard shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the dwelling to which the assessment relates.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and futureproofing the development for net zero carbon and ensuring that new buildings are constructed in a sustainable manner (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 28 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

13. Futureproofing for low temperature heating

The development hereby permitted shall be constructed to facilitate the upgrade of heating systems to efficient electric heating (such as heat pumps), including the following measures which shall be provided to all dwellings prior to each occupation:

- i. All radiators shall be sized and fitted to be capable of running at a maximum of 45 degrees Celsius flow temperature when switched to a heat pump system.
- ii. An appropriate space shall be identified for an external air source heat pump unit that is acceptable within permitted development requirements for noise, proximity to boundaries and physical size.
- iii. The primary pipework shall be provided between the external unit and the primary heating installations (heating pump and hot water tank) to enable the use of the heat pump system with minimum disruption upon gas boiler removal.
- iv. The hot water tank shall be heat pump ready and sized to enable incorporation of any additional requirements to the heat exchanger area and storage volume.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and futureproofing the development for net zero carbon and ensuring that new buildings are constructed in a sustainable manner and are easily adaptable (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 28 and policy 57 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

Urban design

14. Design details and materials

No development of any building shall take place above ground level (except for demolition) until details of all the materials for the external surfaces of buildings to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include all external features including, as appropriate, cycle stores, roof tiles, windows,

feature window surrounds, brise soleil, doors and entrance canopies, exposed I-beam features, external metal work, rainwater goods, balustrades, balcony panels, soffits, edge junction and coping details. The details should consist of a materials schedule, large-scale drawings and/or samples as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55 and 57).

15. Brickwork sample panel

No brickwork above ground level shall be laid until a sample panel at least 1.5 metres wide and 1.5 metres high has been constructed on site detailing the choice of brick, bond, coursing, special brick patterning (including chamfered brick window solder headings, 45 degree turned brick, solder coursing, protruding rusticated string coursing, hit and miss Flemish bond), mortar mix, design and pointing technique, and the details submitted to the local planning authority in an accompanying schedule, and until the sample panel and schedule have been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details thereafter. The approved sample panel shall be retained on site for the duration of the works for comparative purposes.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

16. Substation buildings

Prior to commencement of development of the substation buildings as shown on the approved site plan, detailed plans and elevations including a roof plan and a materials schedule shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

Other Environmental

17. Detailed drainage construction details

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, detailed construction drawings and cross sections for all sustainable drainage features in accordance with the approved Drainage Strategy Report and accompanying drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. The details shall include catch pit chambers, pipe connections,

attenuation crate structures, permeable paving, rain gardens/biorientation features, and other features as appropriate. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Reason: To ensure there is no risk of infiltration as a result of known high groundwater levels and that the risk of pollution to the wider catchment is reduced (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32).

18. Bird Hazard Management Plan

Prior to commencement of development above ground level of any building with a flat roof (other than a bin or bike store), a Bird Hazard Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of airport safeguarding (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 37).

Residential amenity and permitted development rights

19. Removal of permitted development rights (windows)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows, doors or openings of any kind (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be constructed in the elevations of the dwelling houses(s) shown on the approved site plan as a 'FOG', 'MOG' or 'Mews HOF' above ground floor level and on the side elevation of plots 100, 102, 127, 129, 146, 160, 173, 180 and 192 above ground level without the granting of specific planning permission, unless i) all glazing is obscured meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity, and ii) the openings are fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the openings cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall unless the parts that can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed.

Reason: In the interests of protecting residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

20. Removal of Class B and C permitted development rights (alterations to roof)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes B and C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no addition or alteration (including for the avoidance of doubt the insertion of roof lights or other openings in the roof slope) to the roof of the dwelling house(s) shall be constructed on plots of the dwelling houses(s) shown on the approved site plan as a 'FOG', 'MOG' or 'Mews HOF' without the granting

of specific planning permission unless i) all glazing is obscured meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity, and ii) the openings are fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the openings cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall unless the parts that can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed.

Reason: In the interests of protecting residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

21. Removal of Class A permitted development rights (two storey extensions)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwelling house(s) consisting of a two-storey rear extension shall be constructed without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of protecting residential amenity (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

22. Opaque and fixed windows for all bathroom and ensuites

Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until all windows above ground floor level serving bathrooms and ensuites have been fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 or equivalent in obscurity) and have been fixed shut or have restrictors to ensure that the windows cannot be opened more than 45 degrees beyond the plane of the adjacent wall. The windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

23. Curtilages

No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the curtilage of that dwelling has been fully laid out and finished in accordance with the approved plans. The curtilage shall remain as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers and to avoid the property being built and occupied without its garden land (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 50, 55 and 56).

24. Removal of permitted development rights for the conversion of garages and car ports

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) the garages and car ports shown on the approved plans shall not be converted to habitable space without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of protecting space that could be used for parking bicycles and alternative sustainable transport modes (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 57 and 82).

25. Removal of Class H permitted development rights (microwave antennae)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class H of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no microwave antenna shall be installed, altered or replaced without the granting of specific planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the development (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57).

Informatives

1. Discharge of conditions

This decision includes the part-discharge of the following conditions on the outline consent 07/0003/OUT in relation to this reserved matters only:

- 8 – Design Code Compliance
- 17 – Tree and Hedges Protection
- 18 – Tree Protection
- 25 – Affordable Housing
- 26 – Accessible Housing
- 28 – Renewable Energy
- 35 – Detailed Surface Water Strategy
- 40 – Ecological Conservation Management Plan Statement
- 49 – Secure Parking of Bicycles
- 58 – Noise Assessment for Future Residents
- 62 – Domestic and Trade Waste

Additional information is required to be submitted for approval for condition 49 – Secure Parking of Bicycles and 62 – Domestic and Trade Waste in relation to this reserved matters.

2. Remaining outline conditions

The developer's attention is drawn to the conditions attached to outline application 07/0003/OUT that require the submission and approval of details, in particular those that require the approval of details before the development can

commence. This includes conditions listed in informative 1 for which details have not been approved through this consent. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure all conditions have been discharged.

3. Plant noise insulation

To satisfy the plant noise insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014+A1:2019) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background sound level (LA90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

As noise sensitive premises are located within the site boundary, then the glazing of the premises and/or amenity areas will also be a location for the rating level of all plant not to exceed the existing background sound level (LA90).

Tonal/impulsive sounds and other sound characteristics should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction (rating penalty) in accordance with BS4142:2014+A1:2019. This is to prevent unreasonable disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014+A1:2019 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the application boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

Whilst our requirements are for the rating level not to exceed the background sound level at the application site boundary, if the plant is roof mounted and nearby noise sensitive receivers are in closer proximity than the site boundary and / or the site boundary is afforded shielding from the application building parapet, the nearest noise sensitive receiver would be the required assessment location.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014+A1:2019 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; sound sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of noise sources; details of proposed noise sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, frequency spectrums, directionality of plant, noise levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of noise mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full acoustic calculation procedures; noise levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

4. Section 38 Applications

The applicant is advised that this decision notice does not give permission for the detailed road layout (such as drains, lighting and supporting structures), not does it imply that the Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority will adopt the new roads that are proposed as part of this development. A separate application will need to be made to the County Council under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended).

5. Pollution Control

Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

6. Letterboxes

Letterboxes in doors should be no less than 0.7 metres above the ground level.

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- Application File 07/0003/OUT
- Application File S/0001/F



Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

Darwin Green 1 – BDW4 Reserved Matters

Friday 22nd April 2022

Virtual Meeting

Panel: Lynne Sullivan, John Dales, Luke Engleback, Kirk Archibald,
Elanor Warwick, David Birkbeck

Local Authority: Charlotte Burton (GCSP), Sarah Chubb (GCSP)

The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth sets out the core principles for the level of quality to be expected in new development across Cambridgeshire. The [Cambridgeshire Quality Panel](#) provides independent, expert advice to developers and local planning authorities against the four core principles of the Charter: connectivity, character, climate, and community.

Development Overview

Reserved matters application 21/05433/REM for the fourth housing phase (known as BDW4) including 351 dwellings, with associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. The Reserved Matters include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and related partial discharge of conditions pursuant to outline approval 07/0003/OUT.

Presenting Team

The scheme is promoted by Barratt Homes supported by HTA Architects. The presenting team is:

Chris Fry (BDW), Simon Toplis (HTA), Emma Haward (HTA), Dulcie Foster Finn (HTA), Matt Jarvis (Rural Solutions), Will Fayers (Paul Basham Associates)

Local authority's request

The scheme was presented to the Panel at pre-application stage in November 2021. A reserved matters application was submitted in December 2021. Consultation on the application ended in January 2022 which identified issues with the proposals.

Officers have been focussing on layout and structuring issues to-date and are generally supportive of the changes that have been made through discussions on post-submission amendments, in terms of the site layout, hierarchy of routes, integration of green spaces, and priority to pedestrians and cyclists. However, further work is required:

- The southwestern corner (to the north of North Lane) which is a 'leaky' space with poorly defined public and private spaces, presents a public fronting rear elevation, creates a private end to an important public secondary road, and has a poorly legible pedestrian/cycle connection to the open space adjacent to the supermarket site;
- The character of the mews streets behind the park frontage;
- Boundary strategies around ground floor living spaces; and
- BRE assessment on ground floor apartments (living space and amenity space).

Further discussions are also required with the applicant to explore concerns raised in officer comments about townscape/architecture, including the streetscape along the central park frontage and the hierarchy/diversity between key buildings.

Officers welcome the Panel's comments on the key issues above.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel summary

Connectivity – “places that are well-connected enable easy access for all to jobs and services using sustainable modes”

The car parking ratio is currently understood to be around 1.2 which is generally acceptable. However, there is also a need to anticipate future patterns of vehicle ownership and how will the development seek to enable and accommodate such preferences over time.

The design speed is likely to be lower than 20mph which the Panel support. This has partly been achieved due the tight geometry of the layout which minimises the space dedicated to vehicles which is good in principle however consideration needs to be given to the unintended consequences of this in terms of conflict with other road users or overrunning onto soft landscape areas.

There are no problems in principle with the mews streets, however the Panel questioned whether it is necessary for a 6m carriageway and suggested 5m where possible. This reduction in carriageway would allow any additional space recovered to be put to better use.

The shared surfaces are acceptable, but consideration should be given to using contrasting materials to differentiate the carriageway and areas where vehicles are not expected to encroach.

Entrance into the mews needs addressing to ensure that there is a clear visual pedestrian priority at the junction by creating continuous footways, including indicating footways over raised tables.

Need to ensure that there is sufficient provision made for the delivery vehicle movements.

Whilst the 3.3m wide garages are good, the panel questioned the extent of the actual physical provisions for cycles in the stores at the back of the garage.

The Panel noted there is no incidental on-street parking in the mews street for very short visits or stops. Without this there is a risk that people will start fly parking in any available space which will then cause disruption and conflict.

Character – “Places with distinctive neighbourhoods and where people create ‘pride of place’

The Panel considered there is a need to find more space for landscape and this is closely linked with Climate. The predominance of hard heat absorbing surfaces will make the spaces very warm and this needs to be mitigated by increasing the quantum of greening on horizontal and vertical surfaces.

Some of the renderings of the tertiary streets and the mews showed very small spaces for planting. More thought needs to be given to addressing this to ensure meaningful planting can be achieved.

Consideration should be given to the protection of edges from vehicle movements to prevent damage of the planting and compaction of soil.

More space should be included for productive planting in public and private spaces.

More greening will help manage surface water runoff. There was no great sense of how the SUDS relates to biodiversity. This is the main issue holding the scheme back and preventing it becoming an exemplar development. If the biodiversity, landscaping and water strategies can all work together that would greatly enhance the scheme.

It is critical that effort is given to reducing the embodied carbon in the hard landscaping either through planting or using materials e.g. limestone to actively absorb carbon dioxide.

The Panel admired the character of several of the apartment typologies in the way they are designed to look onto the park. There are however one or two apartment blocks that lack protection and privacy at ground floor level especially where there are pedestrian routes passing living room windows. It was suggested that there should be some green boundary treatment in these locations to provide a bit more privacy.

The development achieves a high density whilst still delivering 115 houses.

.

The under-croft parking is showing the same brick as the facing material. This is welcomed and the developer should be encouraged to retain this level of detail and not revert to blockwork within the under croft because this materiality will be a visual feature from the public realm.

The house typologies with the under-croft parking provide a lot of flexibility for car and cycle parking within the plot. However, it is unclear whether there is a physical separation between the driveway and garden area.

The rear of the apartments at the end of the mews street block prevents people walking through into the district centre. It is important that the pedestrian route is designed as a public space to facilitate the permeability through the green space, if necessary, modifying the apartment footprint.

The emerging architectural treatments especially the frontage to the major public space with brickwork, with variation in colour, and articulation in the façade is very promising.

Community - “places where people live out of choice and not necessity, creating healthy communities with a good quality of life”

The development aspires to be an exemplar for high density living and this is considered a positive. The redistribution of density across the whole site has improved the park frontage and enabled the mews houses and spaces to have more articulation.

The walk-up blocks have been revised and improved with the inclusion of additional private space and bike storage space.

The relationship between the double fronted blocks on the park frontage and the FOGs in the mews street needs to be very carefully addressed if they are to be successful semi-public spaces.

The panel questioned the arrangements put in place for the management of the biodiversity over the long term and the communal green spaces, and how the places are going to be used to generate a sense of community. Again, food-producing landscapes would be a great way to help build the community.

Climate – “Places that anticipate climate change in ways that enhance the desirability of development and minimise environmental impact”

The panel encouraged the applicant to calculate embodied energy for the whole site, not just the buildings, and noted MMC can be deployed to reduce embodied energy in construction. They re-emphasised the importance of greening and consolidation of planting and street trees to deliver ambient cooling, and suggested a plan showing greened areas including roofs would be helpful.

The energy strategy requires more thinking through. It is appreciated that the development is caught in the transition across the building regulation requirements, but it is still disappointing that gas infrastructure is to be put in without clear detail on how this will be future proofed.

Thought needs to be given to how and where heat pumps are going to be sited particularly in terms of condenser units outside. In small, enclosed gardens the units can be noisy and bring down the temperature in those spaces. This can be mitigated by reducing the loads on these heat pumps and combining them with other technologies. Low flow temperature radiators, HW storage and underfloor heating are likely to be needed to optimise costs and comfort and need to be considered at design stage.

Battery storage will reduce the requirement for grid reinforcement and will be beneficial.

The development should aim for installing Mode 3 EV charging points.

Specific recommendations

- The Panel was very pleased with the way the scheme is evolving and there now needs to be a focus on details to deliver the scheme’s full potential.
- It is a great site in terms of connectivity and it is good to see the desire lines being incorporated through the site to link to local amenities.
- It is good that parking has been reduced but a creation of a car club across the site would help to avoid the misuse of the parking and increase resident amenity.
- The mews streets are very tight so it is important that they create community and pedestrian friendly environments. The planting is key and greater diversity in the shared surfaces would be welcomed.

- Pedestrian priority at junctions and raised tables needs to be manifest.
- A strong landscape and biodiversity strategy is needed to match the level of detail being developed and maximise the potential for an exemplar of healthy living.
- Community development will be key and this can be supported by the ambition for a lively, greened environment not dominated by the car.
- Climate resilience can be enhanced by the integration of landscape. Thought needs to be given to future-proofing for heat pump installations.
- There is a diversity of space and typologies and this will be an exemplar of a mixed community. It is important however that vehicle movements and parking is managed within the mews spaces.
- The issue of privacy at ground floor level is an issue that needs to be resolved.

The opportunity for ongoing engagement with the developer and design team would be welcomed as the scheme develops.

Contact details

For any queries in relation to this report, please contact the panel secretariat via growthdevelopment@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Author: Colum Fitzsimons

Support: Judit Carballo

Issue date: 3 May 2022

Background information list and plan

- Drawing A – road layout
- Main presentation
- Local authority background note

Documents may be available on request, subject to restrictions/confidentiality.

Masterplan – Emerging Layout



Architectural Character – Park Frontage



Appendix 2 – Response to Cambridgeshire Quality Panel Report

Comment	Applicant's response
Connectivity	
<p>Car parking - The car parking ratio is currently understood to be around 1.2 which is generally acceptable. However, there is also a need to anticipate future patterns of vehicle ownership and how will the development seek to enable and accommodate such preferences over time.</p>	<p>No response provided.</p>
<p>Design of roads and design speed - The design speed is likely to be lower than 20mph which the Panel support. This has partly been achieved due the tight geometry of the layout which minimises the space dedicated to vehicles which is good in principle however consideration needs to be given to the unintended consequences of this in terms of conflict with other road users or overrunning onto soft landscape areas.</p>	<p>No response provided.</p>
<p>Width of roads in mews streets - There are no problems in principle with the mews streets, however the panel questioned whether it is necessary for a 6m carriageway and suggested 5m where possible. This reduction in carriageway would allow any additional space recovered to be put to better use.</p>	<p>Mews streets are 6-7m in width to accommodate reversing manoeuvres from garages and parking spaces. However, the carriageway zone is reduced with areas of soft planting, including pergolas for vertical greening.</p>
<p>Materials for shared surfaces - The shared surfaces are acceptable, but consideration should be given to using contrasting materials to differentiate the carriageway and areas where vehicles are not expected to encroach.</p>	<p>Contrasting colour pavers are also employed to demarcate private entrances.</p>
<p>Visual pedestrian priority for mews streets - Entrance into the mews needs addressing to ensure that there is a clear visual pedestrian priority at the junction by creating continuous footways, including indicating footways over raised tables.</p>	<p>Raised tables at junctions provide convenience for pedestrian, pram and wheelchair crossing. Contrasting pavers define areas of unadopted shared surface street.</p>

<p>Delivery vehicle movements - Need to ensure that there is sufficient provision made for the delivery vehicle movements.</p>	<p>Visitor spaces are provided at entrances to mews areas and at shared surface turning head areas to provide convenient visitor/loading/delivery bays close to apartment block entrances. These areas are tracked for larger vehicles.</p>
<p>Location of cycle stores in garages - Whilst the 3.3m wide garages are good, the panel questioned the extent of the actual physical provisions for cycles in the stores at the back of the garage</p>	<p>Cycle storage has been reviewed to provide more convenient cycle parking to the front of plots. A split provision solution provides 2 cycles at the front of plot with any additional required cycles within rear gardens. Cycle stores are integrated into the building form. FOGs are the only typology that retains cycle parking within a garage. These garages are wider to accommodate cycle parking to the side of vehicles with sufficient space to manoeuvre past parked vehicles (as per Design Guide dimensions).</p>
<p>Incidental on-street parking in mews street - The Panel noted there is no incidental on-street parking in the mews street for very short visits or stops. Without this there is a risk that people will start fly parking in any available space which will then cause disruption and conflict.</p>	<p>Visitor spaces are provided at entrances to mews areas and at shared surface turning head areas to provide convenient visitor/loading/delivery bays.</p>
<p>Character</p>	
<p>Space for landscape and reducing hard surfaces - The Panel considered there is a need to find more space for landscape and this is closely linked with Climate. The predominance of hard heat absorbing surfaces will make the spaces very warm and this needs to be mitigated by increasing the quantum of greening on horizontal and vertical surfaces.</p>	<p>The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. The mews street behind the park frontage, in particular, is improved to reduce the dominance of surface parking and provide pockets of communal open space and urban greening throughout to reduce localised overheating. Greening includes specification of climbing plants to walls defining the edges of public spaces and pergolas providing vertical greening within mews street areas</p>
<p>Meaningful planting in tertiary and mews - Some of the renderings of the tertiary streets and the mews showed very small spaces for planting. More</p>	<p>Mews streets and tertiary streets have been reviewed and amended to increase the level of soft planting, with additional soft landscaped buffer to</p>

thought needs to be given to addressing this to ensure meaningful planting can be achieved	mews typologies. Greening includes specification of climbing plants to walls defining the edges of public spaces and pergolas providing vertical greening within mews street areas.
Protection of verges - Consideration should be given to the protection of edges from vehicle movements to prevent damage of the planting and compaction of soil	This has not been considered.
Productive planting - More space should be included for productive planting in public and private spaces	The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. The mews street behind the park frontage, in particular is improved to reduce the dominance of surface parking and provide pockets of communal open space and urban greening throughout to reduce localised overheating. Greening includes specification of climbing plants to walls defining the edges of public spaces and pergolas providing vertical greening within mews street areas.
SUDS and Biodiversity - More greening will help manage surface water runoff. There was no great sense of how the SUDS relates to biodiversity. This is the main issue holding the scheme back and preventing it becoming an exemplar development. If the biodiversity, landscaping and water strategies can all work together that would greatly enhance the scheme	The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. This contributes to an integrated blue/green infrastructure strategy across the site with a number of raingardens integrated throughout green spaces to collect and slow down water run off from unadopted hardscaped areas.
Reducing embodied carbon - It is critical that effort is given to reducing the embodied carbon in the hard landscaping either through planting or using materials e.g. limestone to actively absorb carbon dioxide.	The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping.
Character of apartment typologies - The Panel admired the character of several of the apartment typologies in the way they are designed to look onto the park. There are however one or two apartment blocks that lack protection and privacy at ground floor	See response to recommendations.

level especially where there are pedestrian routes passing living room windows. It was suggested that there should some green boundary treatment in these locations to provide a bit more privacy	
Materials for under-croft parking - The under-croft parking is showing the same brick as the facing material. This is welcomed and the developer should be encouraged to retain this level of detail and not revert to blockwork within the under croft because this materiality will be a visual feature from the public realm.	Undercroft parking has been reviewed and amended to include secure, private garages with solid garage doors. This will provide greater security and flexibility of use to garages whilst providing a defined frontage to the mews areas. Internal facing material will therefore not be visible to the street scene.
Physical separation for undercroft parking and garden area - The house typologies with the under-croft parking provide a lot of flexibility for car and cycle parking within the plot. However, it is unclear whether there is a physical separation between the driveway and garden area.	Undercroft parking is secured by a solid garage door to the street frontage. The garage is open to the rear where tandem parking space is a drive-through arrangement in to rear gardens. This area is paved with permeable block paving and open to the garden to provide flexibility of use for residents. Residents may choose to own only 1 car, making use of the block paved area as a patio space. A low gravel bed and concrete base board contains the extents of the parking space to prevent drive-through to the remaining garden space
Pedestrian permeability to rear of apartments for northern corner - The rear of the apartments at the end of the mews street block prevents people walking through into the district centre. It is important that the pedestrian route is designed as a public space to facilitate the permeability through the green space, if necessary, modifying the apartment footprint.	The block in the NW corner has been reviewed and amended to provide a more bespoke form to respond to the particular conditions, terminating views from tertiary/mews streets, providing key outlook to open spaces beyond the site boundary, wrapping and containing a reduced parking court.
Architectural treatments to frontage on public space - The emerging architectural treatments especially the frontage to the major public space with brickwork, with variation in colour, and articulation in the façade is very promising.	Architectural detail has been further developed.
Community	

<p>Doubled fronted blocks on park frontage and FOGS - The relationship between the double fronted blocks on the park frontage and the FOGs in the mews street needs to be very carefully addressed if they are to be successful semi-public spaces</p>	<p>The layout has been reviewed and amended to improve connectivity. Reduced apartment blocks and associated reduction in parking density has facilitated the linking of all parking courts in to an integrated and connected mews street. The green mews typology is activated by a series of FOG typologies and provides significantly more communal space in a series of pockets that increase connectivity for residents. Apartment block layouts have been reviewed and amended to provide habitable room windows and balconies overlooking the mews area to the rear.</p>
<p>Biodiversity and communal green spaces - The panel questioned the arrangements put in place for the management of the biodiversity over the long term and the communal green spaces, and how the places are going to be used to generate a sense of community. Again, food-producing landscapes would be a great way to help build the community.</p>	<p>Fruiting trees have been included as part of the proposals in communal areas. The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. This contributes to an integrated blue/green infrastructure strategy across the site which includes varied species, ecology habitats and edible landscape, particularly within a community garden on the Eastern boundary of the site.</p>
<p>Embodied carbon - The panel encouraged the applicant to calculate embodied energy for the whole site, not just the buildings, and noted MMC can be deployed to reduce embodied energy in construction. They re-emphasised the importance of greening and consolidation of planting and street trees to deliver ambient cooling, and suggested a plan showing greened areas including roofs would be helpful.</p>	<p>Reductions have been made across the parcel reducing the hard standing and improving the planting schemes proposed to ensure overheating is reduced as far as possible. Green roofs have been provided on the cycle stores.</p>
<p>Energy strategy - The energy strategy requires more thinking through. It is appreciated that the development is caught in the transition across the building regulation requirements, but it is still disappointing that gas infrastructure is to be put in without clear detail on how this will be future proofed.</p>	<p>A plan is to be submitted with the application demonstrating where air source heat pumps can go. The units have been designed to be able to accommodate an air source heat pump (ASHPs) safeguarding the future ability to make the swap from gas to ASHPs. Plot typologies have been reviewed to consider location for</p>

	PV panels and ASHP. Indicative locations for these will be noted on unit plan/elevation sheets. The final proportion of plots incorporating these features will be covered by Condition.
Air source heat pumps - Thought needs to be given to how and where heat pumps are going to be sited particularly in terms of condenser units outside. In small, enclosed gardens the units can be noisy and bring down the temperature in those spaces. This can be mitigated by reducing the loads on these heat pumps and combining them with other technologies. Low flow temperature radiators, HW storage and underfloor heating are likely to be needed to optimise costs and comfort and need to be considered at design stage.	As above.
Battery Storage will reduce the requirement for grid reinforcement and will be beneficial	This has not been considered.
Specific recommendations	
It is good that parking has been reduced but a creation of a car club across the site would help to avoid the misuse of the parking and increase resident amenity.	Car club has already been set up for DG1 to serve the development site as a whole. 3 parking spaces have been demarcated in the local centre as part of the S106 requirement.
The mews streets are very tight so it is important that they create community and pedestrian friendly environments. The planting is key and greater diversity in the shared surfaces would be welcomed.	The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. The mews street behind the park frontage, in particular, is improved to reduce the dominance of surface parking and provide pockets of communal open space and urban greening throughout to reduce localised overheating. Greening includes specification of climbing plants to walls defining the edges of public spaces and pergolas providing vertical greening within mews street areas.
Pedestrian priority at junctions and raised tables needs to be manifest.	Raised tables at junctions provide convenience for pedestrian, pram and wheelchair crossing. Contrasting pavers define areas of unadopted shared surface street.

<p>A strong landscape and biodiversity strategy is needed to match the level of detail being developed and maximise the potential for an exemplar of healthy living.</p>	<p>The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. This contributes to an integrated blue/green infrastructure strategy across the site which maximises biodiversity and includes varied species, ecology habitats and edible landscape, particularly within a community garden on the Eastern boundary of the site</p>
<p>Community development will be key and this can be supported by the ambition for a lively, greened environment not dominated by the car.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Climate resilience can be enhanced by the integration of landscape. Thought needs to be given to future-proofing for heat pump installations</p>	<p>A plan is to be submitted with the application demonstrating where air source heat pumps can go. The units have been designed to be able to accommodate an air source heat pump (ASHPs) safeguarding the future ability to make the swap from gas to ASHPs. The layout has been reviewed and amended to increase the proportion of soft landscaping and distribute soft landscape more evenly across the site. The mews street behind the park frontage, in particular, is improved to reduce the dominance of surface parking and provide pockets of communal open space and urban greening throughout to reduce localised overheating. Greening includes specification of climbing plants to walls defining the edges of public spaces and pergolas providing vertical greening within mews street areas.</p>
<p>There is a diversity of space and typologies and this will be an exemplar of a mixed community. It is important however that vehicle movements and parking is managed within the mews spaces.</p>	<p>Parking for both car and cycle parking has been carefully thought about in the Mews Streets to ensure the cycle parking is more convenient than the car parking. A series of tracking plans will be submitted as part of the application demonstrating that the spaces are appropriate in relation to refuse and car use. Mews streets are 6-7m in width to accommodate reversing manoeuvres from garages</p>

	<p>and parking spaces. However, the carriageway zone is reduced with areas of soft planting, including pergolas for vertical greening. Contrasting colour pavers are also employed to demarcate private entrances. Visitor spaces are provided at entrances to mews areas and at shared surface turning head areas to provide convenient visitor/loading/delivery bays.</p>
<p>The issue of privacy at ground floor level is an issue that needs to be resolved.</p>	<p>Boundary strategies have been reviewed and amended throughout the layout to provide defensible buffer spaces and meaningful ground floor amenity spaces. Some typical strategies employed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dwarf wall with hedge planting behind (providing a solid edge to high trafficked park frontage) ● Soft planting with hedge turned perpendicular to frontage to define edge of plot ● Low gabion walls to provide defined edge to private buffer spaces at key frontages to green links.

Appendix 3 – Response to Disability Panel Report

Comment	Applicant's response
<p>Market wheelchair accessible apartments - In response to a query from one of the Panel members, it was confirmed that the homes in the private sector would not be wheelchair accessible. (The rationale being a larger compliant ground floor WC could not be provided without compromising the other spaces.) The affordable houses are all fully M4(2) compliant however.</p>	<p>All apartment blocks (all tenures) have been reviewed and amended to include lifts to make all apartments fully M4(2) compliant). A detailed overview of accessibility is within Accessibility Strategy – DAS Section 9.</p>
<p>EV Charging (quantity and location) - Clarification was sought regarding EV charging provision. The final percentage of how many homes will have charging points on their on-plot parking is yet to be confirmed. In terms of the apartments, it may be necessary to have an undesignated system for parking spaces.</p>	<p>We have provided an EV charging Plan which covers the following remit:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of at least one active electric vehicle charge point for each dwelling with on-plot parking, which shall be designed and installed on-plot with a minimum power rating output of 7 kilowatts. • The provision of active electric vehicle charge points to least 50 per cent of car parking spaces within each area of communal/courtyard and on street parking spaces to private roads provision, which shall be designed and installed with a minimum power rating output of 7 kilowatts. • Additional passive electric vehicle charge provision of cabling to parking spaces for all remaining communal/courtyard car parking spaces and on street parking spaces to private roads to facilitate and enable the future installation and activation of additional active electric vehicle charge points as required. • The scheme shall enable capacity in the connection to the local electricity distribution network and electricity distribution board, as well as the provision of cabling to parking spaces. • The electric vehicle charge points shall be designed and installed in

	accordance with BS EN61851 or any superseding standard or Building Regulations.
Distance between parking space and front door for apartments – Commenting on the distance between a parked vehicle and an owner’s home it was mentioned that apartments will be serviced by parking courtyards and other owners will be able to park in the rear of their own property. The longest distance will be from the homes that front on to the green edge.	No response provided.
Navigating the parcel safely in a wheelchair/mobility scooter - Commenting favourably on the priority given to walking and cycling, the Panel asked how it would be possible to navigate the parcel areas safely in a wheelchair or on a mobility scooter. It was explained that there would be an orbital cycle route and a different pedestrian route, separated by buffer planting.	Raised tables at junctions provide convenience for pedestrian, pram and wheelchair crossing.
Insulation on FOGs - In response to a query as to whether the flats over garages would be cold, it was explained that it had been necessary to meet new building regulations on thermal bridging and the ceiling of the garages has been dropped slightly in order to allow for additional insulation.	No response provided.
Lifts in Apartments - It was explained that there would be no lifts in the buildings, because of the associated high service charge, which would have to be added to the rent. According to the current building regulations, only buildings over 4 storeys high are required to have a lift. It was confirmed that the staircases will be fire proofed. The rationale behind the absence of lift provision within the apartment blocks on BDW4 is understood, although short sighted. As the majority of disabilities are acquired and not from birth, a tenant in a flat who	All apartment blocks (all tenures) have been reviewed and amended to include lifts to make all apartments fully M4(2) compliant.

becomes disabled (whether ambulant or wheelchair user) should have the option of being able to continue to live in their home without being denied their independence.	
--	--

This page is intentionally left blank