



<b>Planning Committee Date</b>	22 June 2022
<b>Report to</b>	Joint Development Control Committee
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
<b>Reference</b>	21/04036/REM
<b>Site</b>	Lots S1 and S2 North West Cambridge Development, Eddington Avenue, Cambridge CB3 0LH
<b>Ward / Parish</b>	Girton/ Girton
<b>Proposal</b>	Reserved Matters approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 373 dwellings, access roads, cycle and pedestrian routes, cycle and car parking, landscaping, utilities and associated ancillary structures at Lots S1 and S2, North West Cambridge Development following outline planning permission S/1886/11 as varied by planning permission S/2036/13/VC
<b>Applicant</b>	Present Made Eddington Property Company Limited and University of Cambridge
<b>Presenting Officer</b>	Guy Wilson
<b>Reason Reported to Committee</b>	Third party representations Application raises special planning policy or other considerations
<b>Member Site Visit Date</b>	N/A
<b>Key Issues</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.Compliance with the outline planning permission</li><li>2. Housing mix and tenure</li><li>3. Scale, massing and layout</li><li>4.Sustainable design and construction</li><li>5. Biodiversity and trees</li><li>6.Amenity</li></ol>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>APPROVE</b> subject to conditions <b>Part Discharge outline planning conditions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 1 – Layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping</li><li>• 8 – Design code compliance</li><li>• 11 – Hard and soft landscaping details</li><li>• 12 – Arboricultural assessment</li></ul>

- 20 – Distribution of market & keyworker housing
- 27 – Detailed surface water drainage strategy
- 35 – Biodiversity survey & assessment
- 43 – Cycle parking details
- 50 – Noise attenuation / insulation
- 51 – Lighting details
- 55 – Waste & recycling details
- 64 – Public art
- 65 – Fire hydrants

## **1.0 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for 373 dwellings, access roads, car and cycling parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure and amenities. 2-3 storey houses are proposed on the northern part of the site. 4 apartment buildings of 4-5 storeys are proposed to be arranged around a central podium courtyard on the southern part of the site.
- 1.2 The proposals are in general compliance with the outline planning permission parameter plans approved as part of the outline planning permission, as well as relevant site-wide strategies. There are a number of areas where the Proposals do not fully comply with the Design Code including the guidance on storey heights, parking, and block typologies. However, it is considered that this is justified with the proposal adopting an innovative landscape-led approach to the northern part of the site (S1), and apartments buildings on the southern part of the site (S2) adopting an appropriate scale and massing for the site with a high-quality landscape proposals and architectural design.
- 1.3 The development will provide significant social benefits in the form of 373 houses and flats for private rent, diversifying the housing offer at Eddington. A range of dwellings are proposed, all designed to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. All dwellings are designed to be accessible and adaptable to the different needs of individuals with all dwellings meeting the Lifetime Homes Standards and Building Regulations M4(2). The development will offer a range of amenities to residents, contributing to the development of a new community at Eddington.
- 1.4 The development will also offer significant environmental benefits, with all dwellings designed to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5, with a fabric-first approach utilising modern methods of construction, supplemented by connections to the District Heating system and extensive photovoltaics. Dwellings will also be connected to the site-wide non-potable water network, with estimated potable water use of 80 litres per person per day. The development complies with the site wide Biodiversity Strategy and will also deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain, extensive and diverse planting proposed throughout the site. Landscaping also includes

a number of SuDS features including swales and rain gardens for water management. The layout and design of the site is intended to promote active travel.

- 1.5 The development will deliver significant economic benefits including significant employment during construction as well as long-term employment associated with the on-going management of the site.
- 1.6 Officers recommend approval of the application subject to conditions and informatives.

## **2.0 Site Description and Context**

- 2.1 The site is a broadly 'J' shaped measuring approximately 4.9ha. predominately flat with ground levels varying from approximately 22-24m AOD, and is predominately covered with grass and ruderal vegetation. Milne Avenue, a secondary street within Eddington, bisects the site on a southeast-northwest axis. The site is formed of two development parcels, with S1 north of Milne Avenue where it crosses the site, and S2 being the southern part of the site.
- 2.2 There is established residential development along Huntingdon Road to the north and east of the site, primarily in the form of detached dwellings in substantial plots. To the southeast of the site is a neighbourhood park and swale, with residential development beyond. The site is bordered by the temporary Ridgeway pedestrian/cycle route to the west, with future development parcels beyond this.
- 2.3 The site forms part of the North West Cambridge allocation in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. The site is in Flood Zone 1, where there is a low risk of fluvial flooding.

## **3.0 The Proposal**

- 3.1 The application is for 373 dwellings, comprising 112 houses and 261 apartments together with shared amenity spaces, gardens, and parking.
- 3.2 Houses are proposed to be arranged as semi-detached or as terraces set within a hierarchy of streets ranging from a loop road, liveable streets, and pedestrian routes. 2-storey pitched roof, and 3-storey flat roof houses are proposed.
- 3.3 The apartments are proposed to be arranged in a group of four blocks arranged around a central podium garden with parking below. The proposed blocks are designed to step down from 5-storeys on the south and western boundaries of the site, to 4-storeys (including a set-back top floor) towards the proposed housing in the north east.

- 3.4 The scheme is proposed as Build-to-Rent (BtR) with all dwellings offered for private rent and the scheme owned and managed in the long-term by a single operator (Present Made).
- 3.5 The proposed density of the site (within the red-line site boundary for this application) is 75 dwellings per hectare (dph). For S1 and the houses on S2 the density is approximately 35dph, The density of the apartment blocks on S2 is approximately 165dph.
- 3.6 A total of 233 car parking spaces are proposed across the site a ratio of 0.6 spaces per dwelling, with a mixture of on-plot, limited on-street, and in the parking undercroft provided. There are also currently 18 visitor parking bays on Milne Avenue adjacent to the development, and 4 visitor bays are proposed to be delivered on Dobb Terrace. 792 resident cycle parking spaces are proposed, at a ratio of just over 1 space per bedroom plus 39 visitor spaces.
- 3.7 The application has been amended to address representations from Third Parties and consultees and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.
- 3.8 Prior to submission of a formal application, the proposals evolved through pre-application discussions with Officers, and the proposals were presented to the Joint Development Control Committee, Cambridgeshire Quality Panel, and North West Cambridge Community Forum.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

- 3.9 Condition 6 of the outline planning application (S/2036/13/VC) requires development to be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Statement (ES) which accompanied the outline applications. The ES concluded that subject to appropriate mitigation measures secured by conditions and planning obligations, the development would not have any significant environmental impact. The topics covered within the ES are:
- Socio-economic issues
  - Landscape and visual issues
  - Ecology and nature conservation
  - Geological resources (SSSI)
  - Archaeology
  - Cultural heritage
  - Agricultural circumstances
  - Traffic and transport
  - Noise
  - Air quality
  - Hydrology, drainage, and flood risk
  - Geotechnical issues and contaminated land
  - Utilities and services
  - Sustainability considerations

3.10 The proposals comply with the parameters agreed through the outline planning permission and do not vary materially from the outline consent. The ES does date from 2012, however it is considered the development is not likely to result in significant effects in relation to environmental issues which haven't previously been considered. On this basis it is considered an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required as part of this reserved matters application.

### 3.11 Procedural Matters

3.12 Following submission of the application, representations were received questioning the accuracy of the submitted site location plan. This is understood to be due to the boundary between the neighbouring property (Arcady) and the University of Cambridge not being accurately reflected in Land Registry documents. The application site has been revised as a consequence to effectively move Lot S1 5m to the northwest. The application has been subject to a full reconsultation.

3.13 A resident has highlighted that the submitted location plan was mislabelled to show land edged in blue as the extent of the University of Cambridge land ownership. The area edged in blue actually shows the extent of the outline planning permission. The plan has been updated to correct this error.

3.14 Additional information and amended plans to reflect minor changes to the scheme, specifically changes around underground bin points, have also been subsequently received in response to comments from and discussions with consultees.

### 4.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
S/1886/11 & 11/1114/OUT	Proposed development comprising up to 3000 dwellings Up to 2000 student bedspaces 100000 sq.m. employment floorspace of which: up to 40000 sq.m. commercial floorspace (Class B1(b) and sui generis research uses) and at least 60000 sq.m. academic floorspace (Class D1) up to 5300 sq.m. gross retail floorspace (Use Classes A1 to A5) (of which the supermarket is 2000 sq.m. net floorspace) Senior Living up to 6500sq.m. (Class C2) Community Centre Indoor Sports Provision Police Primary Health	Granted 22.02.2013

	Care Primary School Nurseries (Class D1) Hotel (130 rooms) Energy Centre and associated infrastructure including roads (including adaptations to Madingley Rd and Huntingdon Rd) pedestrian cycle and vehicle routes parking drainage open spaces and earthworks	
S/2036/13/VC & 13/1402/S73	Section 73 applications to vary condition 69 (Drawing Numbers) of S/1886/11 & 11/1114/OUT	Granted 25.11.2013 & 21.11.2013
13/1402/NMA1 & S/1220/18/NM	Non-material amendment to S/2036/13/VC & 13/1402/S73 to amend condition 34 (Site Wide Biodiversity Strategy) to allow changes to the approach to monitoring and the provision of bird nest boxes in place of the originally proposed artificial badger set	Granted 20.04.2018
S/1716/18/NM & 13/1402/NMA2	Non-material amendment to Condition 44 (Parking Management Arrangements) on applications S/2036/13/VC & 13/1402/S73. The Car Park Management Plan has been revised so that the scheme for pay and display parking enforcement can be operated on private land, by a contractor that is a member of the British Parking Association	Granted 08.06.2018 & 29.05.2018
S/0227/20/PO	Modification of planning obligations in relation to Keyworker housing allocations	Granted 20.01.2020
S/2036/13/NMA1 & 13/1402/NMA3	Non-material amendment to planning permission S/2036/13/VC & 13/1402/S73 to amend wording of condition 5 (Phasing Plan) of the consent, to read "The development shall be carried out in accordance with the North West Cambridge Phasing Plan, dated December 2020.", such as to allow an alternative sequence for the delivery of development plots within the scheme	Granted 17.02.2021

S/0655/14/RM	Ridgeway (central section) - Reserved Matters (access appearance landscaping layout and scale) pursuant to S/2036/13/VC for surfacing of a shared used pedestrian and cycle path along the Ridgeway Green Corridor (02) and works along Bunker's Hill to create a shared use pedestrian and cycle route connecting the Ridgeway to Huntingdon Road (including vegetation clearance fencing demolition and resurfacing) along with associated landscaping and drainage swales	Granted 19.06.2014
S/0977/14/RM & 14/0630/REM	Secondary Street (Milne Avenue) and Neighbourhood Park - Reserved Matters Application (access appearance landscaping layout and scale) pursuant to S/2036/13/VC and 13/1402/S73 for the Secondary Street and the Neighbourhood Park (including play facilities) hard and soft landscaping car and cycle parking a bring site utilities and associated ancillary structures	Granted 19.08.2014 & 22.07.2014
S/2219/15/RM & 15/1663/REM	Lots M1/M2 (Athena) – 240 market residential units (121 units in Cambridge City Council and 119 units in South Cambridgeshire District Council) access roads (including cycle and pedestrian routes) cycle parking car parking landscaping utilities and associated ancillary structures	Granted 07.12.2015
14/1028/REM & S/1447/14/RM	Lot 4 - 70 residential units including 49 market units and 21 key worker units access roads (including cycle and pedestrian routes) cycle parking car parking landscaping utilities and associated ancillary structures	Granted 18.09.2014 (not implemented)
22/01168/REM	Lot 4 - Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 88 dwellings, a shared surface service road (for	Granted 07.06.2022

refuse collection and pedestrian access), cycle parking, car parking, landscaping, utilities and associated ancillary structures following outline planning permission S/1886/11 as varied by application S/2036/13/VC

## **5.0 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)

EIA Directives and Regulations - European Union legislation with regard to environmental assessment and the UK's planning regime remains unchanged despite it leaving the European Union on 31 January 2020

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

### **5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018**

LP/1 – Superseded Policies referred to in Adopted Area Action Plans

S/1 – Vision

S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S/5 – Provision of New Jobs and Homes

S/6 – The Development Strategy to 2031

CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change

CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments



CC/4 – Water Efficiency  
CC/6 – Construction Methods  
CC/7 – Water Quality  
CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems  
CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk  
HQ/1 – Design Principles  
HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development  
NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character  
NH/3 – Protecting Agricultural Land  
NH/4 – Biodiversity  
NH/6 – Green Infrastructure  
NH/7 – Ancient Woodlands and Veteran Trees  
NH/14 – Heritage Assets  
H/8 – Housing Density  
H/9 – Housing Mix  
H/10 – Affordable Housing  
H/12 – Residential Space Standards  
SC/7 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space & New Developments  
SC/9 – Lighting Proposals  
SC/10 – Noise Pollution  
SC/11 – Contaminated Land  
SC/12 – Air Quality  
TV/2 – Planning for Sustainable Travel  
TV/3 – Parking Provision  
TV/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments  
TV/10 – Broadband

### **5.3 North West Cambridge Area Action Plan 2009 (NWCAAP)**

NW1: Vision  
NW2: Development Principles  
NW3: Implementing the Area Action Plan  
NW4: Site and Setting  
NW5: Housing Supply  
NW6: Affordable Housing  
NW7: Balanced and Sustainable Communities  
NW11: Sustainable Travel  
NW17: Cycling Provision  
NW18: Walking Provision  
NW22: Public Art  
NW23: Open Space and Recreation Provision  
NW24: Climate Change & Sustainable Design and Construction  
NW25: Surface Water Drainage  
NW26: Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal  
NW27: Management and Maintenance of Surface Water Drainage Systems  
NW28: Construction Process  
NW29: Strategic Landscaping  
NW31: Infrastructure Provision

#### **5.4 Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Plan 2021**

#### **5.5 Supplementary Planning Documents**

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

- 5.6 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009

Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010

Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

#### **5.7 Other Guidance**

- 5.8 Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2019 – 2023

## **6.0 Consultations**

### **6.1 Parish Council – No comments**

6.2 No comments have been received from Girton Parish Council.

### **6.3 Highways Development Management – No objection**

6.4 As the proposed streets do not junction with an existing or proposed adopted public highway and are to remain private under the control of the applicant, the Highway Authority has no comment to make on this application.

### **6.5 County Transport Team – No comments**

6.6 No comments have been received.

### **6.7 Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection**

#### Initial Comments

6.8 At present we object to the approval of the Reserved Matters Application for the following reasons:

6.9 Key information is missing from the drainage layout general arrangements

6.10 Hydraulic calculations to show the performance of the system for a range of summer and winter storm durations from 15 minutes up to the 10080 minute (7 day) should be undertaken;

6.11 Half drains times are in excess of 24 hours.

6.12 It's noted that Table 4-1 of the drainage strategy indicates Lot S1 has a total impermeable area of 12,390 m<sup>2</sup>; however, hydraulic calculations for Lot S1 show a total contributing area of 11,720m<sup>2</sup> has been accounted for. 670m<sup>2</sup> has not been accounted for within the calculations, and drainage features may be undersized.

#### Subsequent comments

6.13 It's noted that Planning Condition 27 of the aforementioned outline planning permission stipulates that any reserved matters application shall include a detailed surface water drainage strategy, which must be in accordance with the agreed site wide surface water strategy, pursuant to the reserved matters site for which approval is sought. A detailed review of the provided drainage strategy has therefore been undertaken as a part of this reserved matters planning application.

- 6.14 Following review of additional information and discussion with the applicant, the Lead Local Flood Authority have no objection in principle to the proposed development.
- 6.15 The additional documents demonstrate that surface water from the development can be managed through the use of various SuDS techniques restricting surface water discharge to suit the overall site surface water management plan.
- 6.16 Water quality has been adequately addressed when assessed under the Simple Index Approach outlined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual.
- 6.17 An informative on the control of pollution is recommended.

**6.18 Environment Agency – No objection**

- 6.19 Have no objection in principle. It is necessary to consult with the LLFA in respect of its statutory consultee role in planning. Notwithstanding this, infiltration drainage, including soakaways, will only be acceptable where it has been demonstrated that the land is uncontaminated.
- 6.20 The design of any surface water system should ensure there is no possibility of contamination polluting surface or underground waters. The use of soakaways would need to be supported by infiltration testing. Foul water should be discharged to the public sewer, and Anglian Water should be consulted. If unexpected contamination is found during development a remediation strategy should be put in place. Opportunities should be provided for wildlife enhancement.
- 6.21 General Informatives are recommended on pollution control.

**6.22 Anglian Water – No objection**

Initial comments

- 6.23 Foul Water - We have reviewed the applicant's submitted foul drainage strategy documentation and consider that the impact on the public foul sewerage network has not been adequately addressed at this stage. Anglian Water have found that this proposal may result in an increased risk of flooding in the downstream network.
- 6.24 Surface Water - We have reviewed the applicant's submitted surface water drainage strategy and have found that the proposed method of surface water discharge does not relate to an Anglian Water owned asset. As such, it is outside of our jurisdiction and we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water discharge.
- 6.25 The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves

the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented. A connection to the public surface water sewer may only be permitted once the requirements of the surface water hierarchy as detailed in Building Regulations Part H have been satisfied. This will include evidence of the percolation test logs and investigations in to discharging the flows to a watercourse proven to be unfeasible.

Subsequent comments

6.26 Foul Water – we have reviewed the applicant’s submitted foul drainage strategy and flood risk documentation and consider that the impacts on the public foul sewerage network are acceptable to Anglian Water at this stage.

**6.27 GCSP Urban Design – No objection**

Application as submitted

6.28 Whereas the proposals for Lot S1 meet the general description of the Neighbourhood Village Character Area, the proposals for Lot S2 are larger, denser and more urban than envisaged in the Design Code. Furthermore, it delivers predominately apartments rather than family housing, more appropriate to the Ridgeway Character Area, effectively stretching this more urban character further out than envisaged in the Code. This has a knock-on effect on the compliance with Design Code elements such as the Block Structure, Building Heights, Massing, and Frontages.

6.29 In pre-application discussions the applicants stated that the build-to-rent model requires a denser development, than that a finer-grained development of smaller blocks and higher proportion of family dwellings would not be viable.

6.30 In considering the proposals, it has been acknowledged that there is a general trend to build at increased densities when compared to the time the Design Code was written. But the proposed apartment-led scheme is very different from the housing-led scheme envisaged in the Design Code, and therefore the scheme is unlikely to fully comply with the Design Code. Where there is divergence, the key consideration will focus on the key objectives in the code of providing a suitable transition from the higher density Local Centre to low density development on Huntingdon Road, and to coordinate the development with adjoining land parcels (existing or future).

6.31 Lot S1

- 6.32 The site is residential other than the introduction of a small pavilion to strengthen placemaking, which is welcomed.
- 6.33 The proposals for S1 comply with the parameter plan requirements.
- 6.34 Access to the site aligns with the Design Code. Although not fully compliant with the Design Code, the hierarchy and design of streets including the loop road, Green Spine is supported.
- 6.35 A 20m wide no-build zone is retained against the edge of existing properties on Huntingdon Road. This is partly proposed to be used for private gardens, but will also contain an ecological zone. Further details is required to show how this area will be planted, maintained, and secured.
- 6.36 Houses front on the Ridgeway and Milne Avenue to create an active frontage, with parking to the rear. This is supported. Some terraces will exceed the 30m frontage length advised in the Design Code however this is considered acceptable.
- 6.37 The Design Code also sets out that houses should follow a traditional urban block structure with back-to-back gardens and defined frontages. The approach to S1 differs with a series of green lanes and liveable streets with less defined boundaries between public and private space, and where vehicle access is permitted but is subservient to walking. This approach has been much debated and refined through the pre-application process to balance privacy, security, and visual interest. Subject to management and maintenance by Present Made, it is considered acceptable.
- 6.38 The proposed arrangement of house types and heights are considered acceptable. The house types are relatively narrow and deep, and the modular construction method proposed means there are limited house types, meaning units do not hold corners and present blank side facades. This is proposed to be addressed through soft landscaping, public art, and flank wall amenity features such as seating, together with the use of a pavilion to create a focal point at the key Ridgeway/Milne Avenue corner. This strategy is an innovative solution and is acceptable. The management and maintenance of these features will be important.
- 6.39 Internal layouts of homes are acceptable.
- 6.40 Most homes have 1 on-plot parking space, with narrow streets and landscaping used to prevent on-street parking. Cycle parking is proposed to be incorporated into garden boundaries which is supported.
- 6.41 The proposed materials and finishes to homes is supported.
- 6.42 S2 Houses

- 6.43 Flank wall treatments for the end terraces for houses on S2 are not identified in the Design Code.
- 6.44 There are still concerns about the lack of privacy to rear gardens, with a building-to-building distance of 20m between houses and apartments.
- 6.45 S2 Apartments
- 6.46 The proposals for apartments comply with the parameter plans. The proposed storey heights of 4-5 exceed those set in the Design Code, which range from 2-3, 3-4, and 4 across different parts of Lot S2. The block also exceeds the 30m-60m maximum advised in the Design Code, with individual blocks up to 86m, and no through routes, affecting cross-parcel permeability. This non-compliance has been subject of discussion. The proposals importantly retain a hierarchy of height and massing, stepping down away from the Ridgeway and Neighbourhood Park. Pedestrian desire lines are also not significantly affected by the large block sizes. The architectural design of the blocks is also effective in reducing the apparent massing and scale of the blocks, and introduces a finer-grain rhythm to surrounding streets. As such the height and massing is considered acceptable.
- 6.47 Ground floor apartments face the street and most are individually accessed from the street, which will help activate the street and is welcomed. However many ground floor units only have access to the street, resulting in long walking distances to secure bike storage.
- 6.48 Further details of ground floor boundary treatments are requested.
- 6.49 Ground levels across the blocks vary by almost 1m and further detail on the interface of the site and the level floor plate is requested, to demonstrate all units can have level access.
- 6.50 The proposals use a series of bays and recesses, with 'champagne' coloured metal cladding to parts of the top floor, and set back elements. Different material treatments to blocks are proposed, with brick set within a slender frame, use of 'champagne' coloured window frames, balconies and other detailing. Brick patterns and colours vary between blocks, with light grey and buff tones proposed. The main entrance/ communal area is defined by a feature building. The architectural treatment of blocks is supported.
- 6.51 Blocks A, B, and C each have two cores whilst Block D has a single core, with entrances from the street defined by understated entrances. This is acceptable.
- 6.52 Some internal routes appear convoluted, and on upper floors there are long double-loaded corridors, some without natural daylight. There is a serious concern that the lobbies and corridors will feel restrictive and oppressive. These should be designed out as far as possible. Can double

height lobbies be provided, more natural light to corridors, and stair and lift cores rearranged to provide more windows?

- 6.53 At pre-app concerns were raised about the spaces between blocks, in particular in relation to safety and security. Hidden corners have been designed out, together with the use of soft planting, overlooking and lighting to soften and secure these spaces. This is supported.
- 6.54 The main access to the podium is via a series of steps, with lift access close by. It is understood the podium would be locked to non-residents at night. This is considered acceptable. Vehicular access to the car park is from Dobbs Terrace which is considered acceptable.
- 6.55 Almost all apartments are single-aspect. Concerns about daylighting and overheating have been addressed by careful detailing and material choices, including balcony arrangements and window sizes. Whilst these elements are welcomed, the large number of single-aspect units remains a concern. Assessment of overheating requires scrutiny by the Sustainability Officer.
- 6.56 Conditions are recommended in relation to materials, design of flank elevation features, and a management and maintenance plan.

Subsequent comments

- 6.57 The applicant has clarified that the S1 ecology buffer is not proposed to be publicly accessible. A 1.2m high fence and gates are proposed, is this sufficient to keep people out?
- 6.58 The proposals have been amended to show flank wall treatments to the end of terrace units on S2, which is acceptable.
- 6.59 The applicant has provided further detail on travel distances from ground floor apartments to bike stores, with the longest distances varying from 67 to 145m from front door to bike store. This represents a significant detour. Ground floor residents may bring bikes into their apartments or store them outside. This may take up valuable internal space, or lead to clutter outside.
- 6.60 There is still concern in relation to the 20m back to back distance between the S2 houses and apartments facing them, with single aspect apartments overlooking houses being a different condition to two rows of houses. The cross-sections highlight the importance of trees along this street, and the advice of the landscape officer is sought to ensure the size, species, and planting conditions of trees is sufficient to provide sufficient privacy.
- 6.61 Concerns remain about the number of double loaded and largely windowless corridors within the apartment blocks.



6.62 The advice of the sustainability officer is sought in relation to whether the large number of single-aspect units proposed is acceptable.

6.63 Concerns regarding level changes and details of thresholds around apartments have been addressed.

#### **6.64 County Archaeology – No objection**

6.65 Archaeological matters have previously been addressed under the associated outline planning permissions 11/1114/OUT and S/1886/11. We have no objections and no further requirements for development in this location and do not consider further archaeological works to be necessary in relation to the current application for Reserved Matters.

#### **6.66 GCSP Sustainability Officer – No objection**

Initial comments

6.67 The Sustainability Strategy is based around the sustainability principles established at outline planning stage, which is welcomed. The proposal includes a range of approaches all of which are supported, including: Connections to the site-wide district heating system, and extensive use of photovoltaic panels (1.35kWp per apartment and 4 kWp per home); Connection to the site-wide non-potable water network; Minimisation of construction waste including through the use of Modern Methods of Construction; Use of green roofs; and Integration of production planting and gardens.

6.68 A key area of sustainability discussed as part of the pre-application process is the approach to mitigating the risk of overheating, particularly due to the large number of single-aspect apartments proposed, and the associated difficulties in providing adequate ventilation.

6.69 The DAS and Sustainability and Energy Statement include detail on the approach that has been taken to address this, involving parametric modelling of each building and façade to determine the optimum approach to a range of environmental considerations including overheating and daylighting. The response to this analysis sees variation in façade design, glazing ratios, window reveals, and balcony design depending on the elevation. For south-west and west facing facades, dumbbell balconies allow enhanced ventilation. The approach to design and modelling is welcomed. In addition to this modelling, a sample of units have been assessed using the CIBSE TM59 overheating analysis, with apartments tested against 2020, 2050, and 2080 climate scenarios. All spaces are compliant without mechanical cooling for 2020 and 2050, with some spaces failing the assessment criteria under the 2080 scenario. It would be helpful if the applicant could clarify what additional measures have been considered for use, or future retrofit.

- 6.70 It is noted that some units are subject to noise constraints where opening windows may not be the first choice for residents. Whilst windows will be openable, these units are proposed to be fitted with mechanical cooling. Clarification would be helpful on whether acoustically attenuated natural cooling has been considered, as has been used elsewhere in Eddington, as well as which units are affected, and the system proposed for all affected apartments and houses.
- 6.71 The outline planning permission requires compliance with Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. A pre-assessment has been included within the Sustainability Statement showing a minimum score of 85.08% is achievable. It is recommended additional points are targeted to provide a buffer. It should also be clarified what housing typology the pre-assessment relates to, and it would have been useful to see a pre-assessment for different typologies.
- 6.72 In conclusion, the scheme is supported subject to clarification of the above points.

#### Subsequent comments

- 6.73 The applicants have addressed all of my points with regards to overheating/ventilation and I am satisfied with the response on these issues. With regards to Code pre-assessments, they have confirmed that two house types have been assessed and given that we have the conditions related to certification, this approach is considered acceptable.
- 6.74 On the approach being taken to the ancillary uses, it is recognised that it would be difficult at this stage to provide complete details, and given the area of floorspace, their requirements will be relatively small in comparison to the rest of the scheme. It would be useful if the applicant could set out a high level commitment to ensuring that these spaces are as energy efficient as possible and utilise sustainable materials and construction techniques, connecting to site wide infrastructure where appropriate.

#### **6.75 GCSP Landscape Officer – No objection**

##### Initial Comments

- 6.76 Although Blocks A and B are five storeys and more than envisaged in the Design Code, they are compliant with the Code and Parameter Plans in terms of height. From a landscape and visual impact perspective the height is acceptable.
- 6.77 The overriding landscape/ public realm design concept has been to create shared spaces to promote community living and has been subject to lengthy pre-app discussions. The proposed built-to-rent scheme will be supported by a robust management regime, managed by the applicant.
- 6.78 S1 Landscape – The use of the proposed shared spaces are crucial to their success. The main circulation street has a relatively tight, variable

configuration which somewhat blurs the vehicle/pedestrian edges with planting beds which interrupts the line of the carriageway and should foster slow and careful driving. The design of the street is not compliant with the Design Code but is expected to foster a place for people and landscape and is supported. Tracking diagrams have been provided, however we would request that several fully dimensioned sections are provided to explain the kerbs, edges of planting beds, parking areas, width of footpath etc.

- 6.79 The two liveable streets have an even tighter configuration, and rely on 'green paving' to demarcate sinuous and traffic calmed routes. There remains a slight nervousness about the green paving, and that vegetation will not survive during dry periods.
- 6.80 Garden boundaries such as those along the green lane are not high enough to preclude some views but are high enough for privacy.
- 6.81 We would request further information on how the ecological buffer is proposed to be secured and accessed, detail on boundary treatments, and further details of the ponds and swales.
- 6.82 We do not have enough information on how existing trees will be protected during construction, particularly protection of roots and branches during excavation for swales etc.
- 6.83 The success of the proposed flank wall treatments such as follies will rely on the quality of materials used etc. Details of flank wall treatments should be provided, and this can be secured by condition.
- 6.84 The podium courtyard offers a flexible space which is designed to engender community use for all ages, and is welcomed.
- 6.85 Much of the podium courtyard is mounded and it is anticipated that the area will be irrigated and recommend a automatic irrigation is used.
- 6.86 We fully support the use of biodiverse roofs.
- 6.87 We fully support the choice of species contained within the planting palette, particularly the use of larger tree species with broad canopies. The Ginkgo biloba is questioned however as although beautiful is exceptionally slow to mature.
- 6.88 The choice of hard landscaping materials is supported other than the use of self-binding gravel which can have a loose and slippery surface.
- 6.89 The use of site-won soils is supported, and the use of Amsterdam soils for tree planting to accommodate vehicle movement above root zones.

Subsequent comments

- 6.90 With regard to S1, there remains concern that the landscaped areas in such a tightly configured arrangement will be free of overrun and intense wear.
- 6.91 We note the commitment to landscape management and maintenance. The cost of management and maintenance will be considerably higher than a traditional development. Adequate maintenance will be needed through the lifetime of the development to ensure planting is retained and the development does not acquire a scruffy appearance.
- 6.92 We previously requested dimensioned sections of the streets, a number of which have been provided. An informative cross section would have been through the parking spaces between the semi-detached units where there remain concerns about damage to planting beds.
- 6.93 Concerns about the long-term maintenance of the green paving remain.
- 6.94 The section for Stockholm soils is the amended DAS is not dimensioned but the layer of soil looks shallow which may result in root activity lifting paving above. Please review the depth.
- 6.95 The utilities general arrangement appears to show conflict between utilities and tree locations. This should be reviewed and coordinated. This should not be left to the construction stage when little can be done to resolve any issues.
- 6.96 We need details of if/how utilities will need additional protection where they share space with Stockholm soils. This can be conditioned.
- 6.97 We still require further technical details of ponds, swales, headwalls, etc. within the ecological buffer. This can be conditioned.
- 6.98 An arboricultural assessment has been provided. An arboricultural method statement can be conditioned.
- 6.99 The choice of materials is fully supported, except perhaps the self-binding gravel which may have a loose and slippery surface. This should be tested before being used site-wide.
- 6.100 Further information on the appearance of solar panels and mitigation of their landscape and visual impact should be provided.
- 6.101 Issues with S2 landscape have been resolved. The inclusion of an automatic irrigation system for the podium is welcomed.
- 6.102 Conditions are recommended on hard and soft landscaping, tree protection, and roof planting irrigation systems.

Subsequent comments

6.103 The additional cross section across the parking areas of the semi-detached housing of S1 is very useful. It addresses the issue of the rain garden being run over by car wheels. The remaining issues were clarification which can be provided through condition.

#### **6.104 GCSP Ecology Officer – No objection**

6.105 The survey effort, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements proposed are acceptable.

6.106 I welcome proposed planting to support biodiversity. I also support the proposed number, specification and locations of integrated bird box provision, in excess of that required by the approved site wide Biodiversity Strategy.

6.107 I agree that the proposals for Lots S1 and S2 of the North West Cambridge Development are in accordance with the aims and objectives of the site wide Biodiversity Strategy, and are also predicted to deliver an onsite net gain for biodiversity if the proposed habitats are subject to a suitable management plan. I note that this BNG does not include additional wetland and grassland habitat already enhance or created on site as part of the wider site landscaping and SUDs along the West Pit brook, prior to measurable BNG requirements.

6.108 I note a previously closed badger sett may be active or occupied prior to construction and agree with current monitoring proposals to inform a further Natural England closure license as required. If minded to approve we could request a condition that asks for either a copy of the relevant license prior to closure or evidence that a license is not required.

6.109 If minded to approve I would also recommend a standard Ecological and Landscape Management Plan to ensure the proposed habitats are establish and maintained to achieve the condition on which the BNG target relies.

#### **6.110 Shared Waste Service**

6.111 Full tracking document are needed to understand the journey of the vehicle.

6.112 There do appear to be trees beside a number of the bins which needs to be avoided as it will interfere with the crane operation

6.113 The strip from the bend at Tertiary Street down towards Milne Avenue has the potential to be problematic as its showing rows of car charging points, a sub station and a loading zone. The set of bins on the bend may be inaccessible if there is insufficient space for our vehicle to line up with the bins. The bin platforms must not open onto the sub-station or charging points.

- 6.114 There appear to be a number of raised traffic calming areas beside bins and street furniture which may provide an obstruction. Road surfaces beside the bins must be flat and level and each set of bins needs to have pressure pads for vehicle feet.
- 6.115 We need a breakdown of flats/houses/number of beds in order to look at capacities.
- 6.116 N.B. the proposals have subsequently been discussed and amended to the satisfaction of officers.

**6.117 Natural England – No objection**

- 6.118 No objection - based on the plans submitted, Natural England are satisfied that the Planning Statement (Bidwells, August 2021) confirms that the proposed scheme will implement biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures, including delivery of biodiversity net gain, in accordance with the site wide Biodiversity Strategy and Design Code and the recommendations of the lot-specific Biodiversity Survey and Assessment, hence we have no objection to the application.

**6.119 GCSP Tree Officer – No objection**

Initial comments

- 6.120 There is no arboricultural or hedgerow objections to this application.
- 6.121 Trees on or adjacent site have no statutory protection.
- 6.122 Tree and hedgerow information: An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (dated July 2021) has been submitted along with Draft Tree Protection Plan (ref. 4727/01/21-0352 V1). As these documents are indicative etc they do not contain some the essential detail required, such as fencing specifications. These documents are sufficient for this stage of the application, but a further detailed Tree Protection Plan will be required if the application is approved.
- 6.123 Defer to the opinion of the consultee Landscape Architect on proposed planting

Subsequent Comments

- 6.124 No objection subject to conditions requiring an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

**6.125 National Highways – No objection**

- 6.126 No objection – The principle of development has been established through the variation to the outline planning permission (S/2036/13/VC). The

reserved matters addressed in this application would not have a material impact on the Strategic Road Network. Consequently, we offer no objection

**6.127 SCDC Environmental Health (Contamination) - No objection**

6.128 There are no details submitted that required comment from a contaminated land officer. Our conditions and the relevant details are being dealt with in separate applications for this site.

**6.129 SCDC Environmental Health (Air Quality) – No objection**

6.130 The air quality implications have been considered. A condition is recommended to secure the EV charging provision as set out within the DAS.

**6.131 Police Architectural Liaison Officer – No objection**

6.132 While it is important that security and crime prevention are considered at an early stage of design, we have had early consultation with the applicant and discussed a Secured by Design application. As is shown in paragraph 7.13 of the Design and Access statement the applicant is targeting SBD Silver accreditation. No further comments.

**6.133 Cambs Fire & Rescue – No objection**

6.134 With regard to the above application, should the Planning Authority be minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority would ask that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants.

6.135 Access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5 Vehicle Access. Dwellings Section 13 and/or Vol 2. Buildings other than dwellings Section 15 Vehicle Access.

6.136 If there are any buildings on the development that are over 11 metres in height (excluding blocks of flats) not fitted with fire mains, then aerial (high reach) appliance access is required

**6.137 Airport Safeguarding (Marshalls) – No objection**

6.138 The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. We, therefore, have no objection to this proposal.

**6.139 Sustrans – No objection**

6.140 National Cycle Network sits about 150 meters to the north-east side of the planning site

6.141 It is important that the commitment to walking and cycling on site is provided to by the developer. These include: Maximize the use of sustainable travel, with priority given to cycling and walking; Bike parking is provided in the garden of houses and throughout the lot; residential lobby entrances provide direct connection from the main pedestrian and cycling route

#### **6.142 Design Review Panel Meeting of 28 January 2021**

6.143 The proposals were presented to the Quality Panel prior to submission of a formal application. The main conclusions and recommendations of the Panel were:

- 1) The Panel would have welcomed plans, sections and elevations in order to better understand how the proposals would work.
- 2) The aspirational proposals need editing to calm the design.
- 3) The Panel were impressed with the SUDs proposals.
- 4) The landscape vision approach, tree planting and community gardens are welcome.
- 5) There is built in conflict in the community spaces that may require significant maintenance and management if not resolved.

6.144 A copy of the review letter is attached in full at appendix 2.

### **7.0 Third Party Representations**

7.1 Representations have been received objecting to the development from 11 addresses:

- Arcady, Huntingdon Road
- Arcady Halt, Huntingdon Road
- Westchester, Huntingdon Road
- Middlefield, Huntingdon Road,
- Farmfield, Huntingdon Road
- Huntingfields, Huntingdon Road
- Howelands, Huntingdon Road
- College Holt, Huntingdon Road
- New Hayes, Huntingdon Road
- 38 Thornton Road, Girton
- Church Cottage, Pitcot Lane, Owslebury (owner of land adjacent to the site)

7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

Scale, Layout, landscaping

- Concerns about the scale, mass, and density of development proposed which relates poorly to the existing residential character



along Huntingdon Road and in Girton, including that the proposed 5-storey block is a departure from the Design Code.

- Concerns about the use of terraced housing along the boundary with Arcady.
- Concern about the impact of the development on existing trees and fencing on/close to the site boundary, and request that high-quality and secure fencing is provided.

#### Flood Risk & Drainage

- Concern about the impact of the proposed drainage features within the wildlife corridor and associated risk of flooding neighbouring properties.

#### Transport and access

- Concern about the lack of traffic analysis.
- Concerns that the right of residents to use the track to the rear of their properties hasn't been considered.
- Suggestion that there should be better linkages between the neighbourhood park and the ecological buffer.

#### Residential amenity

- Concerns about the lack of a construction management plan, and that the provisions of the site wide construction management plan are inadequate, in particular that construction hours should be limited to 8:30am to 5pm Monday-Friday only, and noise muffling is used for vehicles, alongside monitoring of dust and noise and a 24/7 contact for residents.
- Concerns that poor construction management practice on other parcels within Eddington will also be experienced with the current proposals.
- Concerns about the large spoil mounds which have caused significant disruption for a number of years, and a request any spoil is not added to the existing mounds.
- Concern that existing trees and planting are being relied upon to provide a barrier to overlooking and noise etc.
- Concern about the lack of mature evergreen planting proposed for the wildlife buffer

#### Accuracy of plans

- Concerns that submitted CGIs significantly overstate the extent of tree cover within neighbouring gardens.
- Concerns over the accuracy of the application red line boundary, particularly in relation to the neighbouring dwelling 'Arcady'

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

## **8.0 Member Representations**

8.1 No comments have been received from District or County Councillors.

## 9.0 Assessment

### 9.1 Principle of Development and compliance with outline planning permission

Compliance with outline planning permission and parameter plans

9.2 The parameter plan requirements relevant to this site are:

- Parameter Plan 3 –Open Land and Landscape Areas – The Secondary Street (Milne Avenue) has been delivered, the proposal will not prejudice the delivery of the pedestrian/cycle route or green corridor where they borders the site – compliant.
- Parameter Plan 4 – Land Use – The site is zoned for C3 and C4 uses – compliant.
- Parameter Plan 5 – Building Zones:

	Parameter Plan requirement (max-min)	S1 (Zone H)	S2 (Zone E)
Building Frontage	4-150m	14-51m	44-86m
Building Depth	4-25m	9-11.5m	9-19m
Building Height	3-10m (Zone H) 3-18m (Zone E)	8.3-9.5m	10.3-16m

As can be seen in table 1 above, the proposals are compliant with Parameter Plan 5.

- Parameter Plan 6 – Building heights – The maximum height permitted S1 is 33.5m AOD, and the maximum building height proposed is 33m AOD. Within S2 the maximum height permitted is 39m AOD and the maximum building height proposed is 39m AOD – Compliant

9.3 On the basis of the above the proposed development is considered compliant with the parameter plans.

Design Code

9.4 The Design Code for Eddington sets out a detailed set of requirements and guidance ranging from defining character areas, block typologies, to details such as indicative planting mixes. There are a number of areas where the proposals diverge from the Design Code, which is discussed further in the design section below.

Conditions

9.5 There are a number of planning conditions attached to the outline planning permission which set requirements for reserved matters applications.

Those relevant to this site are:

Condition 1 – Reserved matters details

Condition 6 – Environmental statement compliance

Condition 8 – Design Code compliance statement

Condition 11 – Landscaping details

Condition 12 – Tree surveys and assessment

Condition 20 – Plan showing distribution of market and keyworker units

Condition 22 – Lifetime Home standards

Condition 23 – Code for Sustainable Homes

Condition 27 – Detailed surface water strategy

Condition 35 – Biodiversity survey and assessment

Condition 40 – Car parking

Condition 43 – Cycle parking details

Condition 50 – Noise attenuation scheme

Condition 51 – Lighting details

Condition 53 – Construction method statement

Condition 54 – Detailed waste management plan

Condition 55 – Waste and recycling details

Condition 64 – Public art

Condition 65 – Fire hydrants

9.6 Compliance with these conditions is discussed further in the relevant sections below.

Uses

9.7 The development is for 373 dwellings. Although proposed as Built to Rent (BtR), the proposed houses and apartments are all dwellinghouses within Use Class C3, and as such are part of the 1,500 market dwellings approved under the outline planning permission.

9.8 The proposals include a number of other facilities including a bike workshop/ kiosk within S1, a pavilion within the podium garden, games court, and communal amenity space. These facilities and amenities are limited in scale and primarily for the use of residents and are considered to be ancillary to the main residential use of the site.

## **9.9 Housing Provision**

9.10 The development proposes a total of 373 dwellings across lots S1 and S2, split between 112 houses and 261 apartments. All units within the site are proposed as market housing, as a 'built-to-rent' (BTR) scheme where the applicant (Present Made) will retain ownership and management of the housing.

## Tenure

- 9.11 The tenure mix at Eddington was determined through the outline planning applications, which set out that housing (C3) would be split 50:50 between open market housing and 'keyworker' housing for staff of the University and associated institutions, in place of conventional forms of affordable housing. Provision for housing for older people and 2,000 postgraduate rooms is also made under the outline planning permission.
- 9.12 The outline planning permission does not set any requirements in relation to private rented accommodation and there are no policies in the Local Plan or NWCAAP relating to Build to Rent development. Annex 9 of the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy sets out how Built to Rent schemes will be assessed, however this is only a material consideration, and the current application is for approval of reserved matters, it can only be afforded limited weight in relation to this application.
- 9.13 No 'keyworker' housing is proposed within the site. Condition 20 of the outline planning permission requires details of the distribution of market and 'keyworker' housing to be provided within any residential reserved matters application, and for the number of 'keyworker' units fronting onto any street to be limited to 25, with no corresponding limit specified for market housing.
- 9.14 Other than a reserved matters scheme on Lot 4 which has not been implemented, no development lots within Eddington have been for a mixed tenure. The application sets out that a single management structure is essential to the success of the BTR scheme, to ensure the site is well-managed in the long-term, and has the critical mass to support amenities for residents.
- 9.15 Within the context of the wider site, it is considered the provision of BTR accommodation will increase the diversity of housing within Eddington and as such the proposals are considered to support the delivery of a mixed and balanced community. On this basis the proposed tenure is considered acceptable.

## Mix

- 9.16 A detailed breakdown of the proposed housing mix is set out in the table below:

Type/Block	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed	Total units
<b>Block A</b>	45	24	0		69
<b>Block B</b>	35	43	0		78
<b>Block C</b>	32	37	4		73
<b>Block D</b>	25	14	2		41

<b>Apartments</b>	137	118	6		261
<b>Houses</b>			100	12	112
<b>Total</b>	137	118	106	12	373
<b>Total %</b>	37%	32%	28%	3%	

- 9.17 As shown in the table above, the proposed development is weighted towards smaller units. This mix is based on market research by the developer to understand local demographics and demand within the private rented sector.
- 9.18 The Council commissioned Savills to produce Build to Rent Market Demand, which was completed in 2020. This indicated the demand for private rented accommodation is weighted towards single people and couples without children compared to the general population. Eddington is also a relatively high-density development, with a significant proportion of keyworker accommodation and a higher proportion of small units than the wider Cambridge area. On this basis the mix is considered to reflect local demand and the character of North West Cambridge and as such is considered acceptable.

#### Accessible Homes

- 9.19 The outline planning application requires that 50% of dwellings are built to the Lifetime Homes standard. All dwellings are proposed to be built to the Lifetime Homes Standard, as well as the optional Building Regulations M4(2) standard for Accessible and adaptable dwellings, exceeding the requirements of the outline planning permission, which is supported.

#### Conclusion on housing provision

- 9.20 Details of housing provision have been provided and are considered sufficient to discharge condition 20 of the outline planning permission in relation to this site.
- 9.21 It is considered the development will increase the diversity housing provision within the wider site and support the delivery of a mixed and balanced community at Eddington, in the context of the NWCAAP vision of creating a new University Quarter in North West Cambridge. The proposals offer a range of housing sizes and types for different groups, and are designed to be accessible and adaptable to individual's needs. On this basis the proposals are considered to comply with the outline planning permission, Local Plan Policies HQ/1 & H/9 and NWCAAP Policies NW2 & NW7

#### **9.22 Appearance, Layout, Scale and Landscaping**

- 9.23 A detailed Design Code was approved under condition 7 of the outline planning permission which includes detailed guidance on the delivery of a sustainable mixed-use new community in North West Cambridge. The

Design Code recognises that future designs may come forward which are not fully Design Code compliant, and that any areas of non-compliance should be clearly justified.

#### Layout, scale, and massing of houses

- 9.24 The Design Code specifies that housing along the development edge should generally be 2-3 storeys, with semi-detached, detached, and terraced houses permitted. 2 storey semi-detached dwellings are proposed, with 2-storey terraces along the southeast boundary with the neighbouring dwelling, Arcady. The layout, scale, and massing of houses along the boundary is considered to be in compliance with the Design Code. A 20m buffer is also proposed between the site boundary and the proposed dwellings as required by the Design Code.
- 9.25 One key area where the site is not consistent with the Design Code is in relation to car parking, with parking for a number of houses proposed as on-plot driveway parking to the front or rear. This in turn results in houses in the central part of S1 being set back behind parking spaces, rather than 2m privacy strips. This approach was discussed extensively through the pre-application process, with the proposals amended to significantly reduce the amount of on-plot parking and to introduce more vehicle-free routes. Benefits of the proposed layout include facilitating a landscape-led approach, with set back houses generating space for larger trees. The relatively open garden arrangement also allows them to act as social spaces, in order to foster a sense of community. As such whilst a departure from the Design Code the layout is considered acceptable.
- 9.26 Concerns have been raised by neighbours that development along the site edge is out of character with existing development along Huntingdon Road, particularly in relation to the proposed terraces. The development has its own distinct character which will differ to neighbouring development, particularly given development along Huntingdon Road is exceptionally low density. The proposed layout of the site however has been designed to provide an appropriate transition to existing development, with 2-storey houses along the development edge, a 20m landscape buffer, and a mix of semi-detached houses and short terraces which is consistent with the Design Code.
- 9.27 Overall, the layout, scale, and massing of the proposed houses is considered acceptable.

#### Layout, scale, and massing of apartment blocks

- 9.28 The apartments on S2 are proposed to arranged in a perimeter block of four buildings set around a central podium, stepping up from 4 storeys with the top floor set back on the northeast elevation, to 5 storeys on the southern and southwestern elevations.

- 9.29 The apartment blocks do diverge from the Design Code in a number of respects. Guidance on storeys for this part of the site range from '4 storeys generally' fronting the Ridgeway, '3 storeys generally' fronting the green corridor and Neighbourhood Park, and '2/3 storeys generally' for the rest of S2. The proposals also exceed the Design Code's guidance on frontages which recommends frontages of 30-60m fronting the green corridor and Neighbourhood Park, and 12-30m for other frontages. The closest block typology in the Design Codes to the proposals is the apartment led 'residential perimeter block, however this is not recommended for this part of the site, with finer-grained typologies which combine houses as well as apartments instead being recommended. The Design Code also envisages that this block would be broken up, with tertiary/ mews access routes within it.
- 9.30 A number of elements are used to reduce the scale and massing of the proposed apartment blocks. Firstly, the top floor on parts of Blocks B, C, and D have been set back. For Blocks A and B metal cladding is proposed to the top floor to contrast with the predominately brick facade and given the top floor a lighter appearance. The facades of the buildings are also proposed to be articulated by a series of bays, with a concrete frame and balconies also used to further break up the elevations. In combination, these elements serve to reduce the perceived scale and massing of the buildings.
- 9.31 S2 is also in a relatively prominent location, fronting a proposed park within the Ridgeway on one side, and a green corridor and neighbourhood park on another side, with the taller elements intended to frame these open spaces. As such it is considered, as set out in the Design Code, that the buildings should be an appropriate scale to define the urban fabric and create a sense of place.
- 9.32 There is also a significant benefit in the proposed block structure in that it allows for a substantial podium garden, with capacity to accommodate a greater range of planting and amenities than would be achievable with a more fragmented space.
- 9.33 On the basis of the above, it is considered the scale and massing of the blocks is acceptable.
- 9.34 The layout of the apartment blocks is designed to ensure active frontages and to be permeable for pedestrians with ground floor units having direct access from the street. The courtyard access is also accessible via steps from Milne Avenue, with a gate to restrict access at night. This is considered a reasonable balance between making the site accessible whilst also secure. Entrances to cores and the podium garden are well defined with most cores being accessed through landscaped courts.

Density

- 9.35 The outline planning permission and Design Code do not set specific requirements in relation to density, instead supporting a design-led approach in accordance with Policy NW5 of the NWCAAP which sets out that an overall minimum density of 50dph will be achieved across the wider site, with higher densities around the local centre, and development at an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing.
- 9.36 The red line site area is approximately 4.88ha, with a proposed density of approximately 75 dwellings per hectare (dph). This comprises a density of approximately 35dph for the area of houses, and 165dph for the apartments. For comparison apartments on Lot S3 (overlooking the Park & Ride) have a density of 260dph, whilst the approved scheme on Lot 4, with a mix of houses and apartments, has a density of 120dph.
- 9.37 The density proposed for the apartments is considered appropriate, reflecting higher density development towards the Ridgeway and close to the local centre. Housing immediately neighbouring the site along Huntingdon Road is exceptionally low density, and density varies significantly within the surrounding area. With the provision of a landscape buffer, the proposed density for the houses is considered an appropriate balance between respecting local character and ensuring the efficient use of land.
- 9.38 Landscaping, open space and amenities
- 9.39 The outline planning permission sets out that the primary open space within Eddington will be delivered in the Western Edge Parkland, the green gap between Phase 1 and the eastern part of the site, and through a series of green corridors which lead into the Western Edge. The site is adjacent to a neighbourhood park and green corridor, as well as being adjacent to the Ridgeway which is anticipated to deliver an additional park to the southwest of the site.
- 9.40 Within the site the primary open space proposed is the podium garden, which is typically 38m wide and is over 110m long. This space will provide a high-quality shared amenity space, with a pavilion and games court also proposed for use by residents. The podium will also support a range of planting including larger tree species with canopies of up to 8-12m. Sections have been provided to demonstrate that the podium will have sufficient soil depth to support the mix of trees and planting proposed. The provision and design of the podium garden is supported.
- 9.41 Privacy strips are proposed around the edges of the apartment blocks, which vary depending on the elevation to reflect different street/ public realm designs and uses. These are typically 1.5-2m deep with gravel and paving behind hedgerows. These privacy strips are considered compliant with the Design Code and will ground the development and provide some privacy.



- 9.42 A landscape-led approach has been taken to Lot S1, and the houses on S2. The design seeks to maximise planting within the site with car-free green streets, and with rain gardens and green paving used to calm traffic as well as green paving to parking spaces and other area. Hedging and climbing plants are proposed boundaries and flank walls. Tree planting has been carefully considered in the street design to seek to resolve conflicts between trees and vehicles, as well as underground services. The landscape design has been subject to extensive discussion through the pre-application process to seek to ensure the vision for the site is deliverable.
- 9.43 Water management and biodiversity have been effectively integrated into the landscape proposals with a typically 10m wide 'wet woodland' ecology buffer proposed along the edge of the site, rain gardens, species rich turf, and biodiverse green roofs all also proposed.
- 9.44 As well as the facilities in the podium courtyard, a bike workshop/kiosk is proposed on the corner of the Ridgeway and Milne Avenue. This is intended to be a flexible space which could be used as a bike workshop, café, exhibition space etc. This building will activate this corner and is considered a positive addition to the scheme.
- 9.45 Overall, the landscape design is considered to be high quality, with a wide mix of planting amenities to support biodiversity, water management as well as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the development and amenity of existing and future residents. As noted by the Landscape Officer, the landscape design is complex and will require regular maintenance to ensure it is effective and its quality is maintained in the long-term. A condition (Condition 7) is recommended to secure a detailed landscape and ecological management plan for the site. Conditions are also recommended in relation to details of landscape features (Conditions 5 and 6), proposed amenity buildings (Condition 4), details of roof planting irrigation (Condition 10), and implementation of landscape works (Condition 9).
- 9.46 Architectural Design
- 9.47 Three house types in a contemporary style are proposed across the site, with a mix of pitched and flat roofs. Buildings are proposed to be finished in textured buff brick with a varied brick pattern to add interest. Grey slate tiles are proposed for pitched roofs. Windows, window panels, railings, and other metalwork are proposed to be finished in a bronze colour which will be similar in appearance to that used in the neighbouring Athena development.
- 9.48 Whilst only 3 housetypes are proposed, there is variation in how they are proposed to be arranged, with more formal and defined frontage to the

Ridgeway and Milne Avenue, and with houses staggered and set back within the site. All of the housetypes have blank flank walls, which was raised as a concern during pre-application discussions. In response the applicant has proposed a range of flank wall treatments to activate the sides of buildings, including climbing plants, public art and amenity features such as alcove seating. The proposed bike workshop/kiosk will also help to define the Milne Avenue/ Ridgeway corner. Whilst these elements will require long-term maintenance, they are considered an innovative and interesting feature and an acceptable means to add visual interest to flank walls.

- 9.49 Each of the apartment blocks is proposed with a different combination of bays, balconies, a light brick frame, and different styles of brick panels in grey and buff tones. The top storey on Blocks A and B is proposed to be finished in a bronze metal cladding, which matches windows, railings and other metal work. A 'signature building' with a rounded corner is proposed on Block A to define the primary pedestrian entrance to the site, adjacent to steps up to the podium garden.
- 9.50 The proposed architectural design of the apartment buildings is considered to be well-considered, helping to significantly break up the massing of the buildings. Whilst there are a wide range of design elements proposed, these are tied together by a constrained material palette. As with the houses, the proposed design and detailing reflects the contemporary character established within Phase 1 of Eddington, whilst also introducing some variation.
- 9.51 Overall, the proposed appearance of both the houses the apartment buildings is considered high-quality and is supported. Conditions are recommended to secure details of materials for the houses and apartments (Conditions 2 and 3).

#### Accessibility

- 9.52 As set out above, all dwellings are designed to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard and Building Regulations M4(2). Level thresholds are proposed to all dwellings, as well as all balconies and private amenity areas. The podium garden on S2 is at first floor level with the primary access being a set of steps. There is however lift access to the podium from each of the blocks, including from close to the main access stairs.
- 9.53 8 parking spaces in the podium car park are proposed to be designated accessible bays. Whilst not formally marked-up as such, most on-plot parking spaces for houses across S1 and S2 are sized and designed to be wheelchair accessible. As a consequence, the proposed level of accessible parking, at 35% of spaces across the site, is well in excess of the 5% NWCAAP requirement.
- 9.54 The streets within the site have been designed with accessibility in mind, with segregated pedestrian paths through most of the development, and a

largely level surface to allow ease of access for all users. Shared surfaces are proposed within the site, however dedicated pedestrian footways are provided on the loop road within S1, whilst the green lanes will have very limited traffic.

#### Public art

- 9.55 A Public Art Strategy was secured as part of the outline planning application, which will deliver a number of commissions across the wider site. Whilst public art is envisaged to be delivered along the Ridgeway, the site wide strategy does not propose any public art within the site. Public art is however proposed to be incorporated into the flank wall treatment for houses. Details of this is proposed to be secured by way of a condition (Condition 5).

#### Conclusion on design

- 9.56 Details of compliance with the Design Code are included in the Design and Access Statement, which is considered sufficient to discharge condition 8 of the outline planning permission in relation to the site. Details of hard and soft landscaping and public art which have been included in the application are considered sufficient to discharge conditions 11 and 64 of the outline planning permission.
- 9.57 The proposals do diverge from the Design Code in a number of respects as discussed above. However the Design Code does allow for schemes to depart from the Design Code, and it is considered that this is sufficiently justified with appropriate scale and massing for the site, a layout which is designed around walkability, and is landscape-led. The layout, scale, massing, and detailed design of the development is considered to represent a high standard of architectural design and the development will make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The development is considered to comply with the outline planning permission, Local Plan Policies HQ/1, HQ/2, H/8 and NWCAAP Policies NW2, NW5, & NW22

#### **9.58 Trees**

- 9.59 A tree survey accompanies the application. There are a number of trees within the site, the majority of which are trees which have been planted along the length of Milne Avenue. There are also a number of established trees and hedging along the boundaries of dwellings along Huntingdon Road, including a Category A cedar.
- 9.60 The majority of trees within the site are proposed to be retained through the course of the development, although 8 trees along Milne Avenue are proposed to be removed to facilitate changes to junctions etc. along Milne Avenue, and will be compensated by replacement planting. One large group of Category C trees (mostly elm and hawthorn) is proposed to be reduced. The 20m offset from the boundary for buildings will limit the

potential for any impact on retained trees along the boundary and in neighbouring properties.

- 9.61 A tree protection plan has been submitted which shows Tree Protection Fencing to be installed around the root areas of retained trees. Construction works, including creating of drainage features and any regrading of the site will only be permitted outside of the protective fencing. An Arboricultural Method Statement has also been submitted which provides further detail on how any potential impacts on retained trees will be mitigated. The submitted information is considered sufficient to discharge condition 12 of the outline planning permission in relation to the site.
- 9.62 Subject to a condition securing implementation of the proposed tree protection measures (Condition 11), the impact on trees is considered acceptable in accordance with the outline planning permission, Local Plan Policy HQ/1 and NWCAAP Policy NW2.

### **9.63 Heritage Assets**

- 9.64 The nearest designated heritage assets are the Grade II\* Listed Girton College, and Grade II Listed Girton College Lodge, located approximately 300m to the northwest of the site along Huntingdon Road. Given the distance to these buildings and intervening development, it is not considered the proposals will have any material impact on the setting of these heritage assets.
- 9.65 A detailed archaeological assessment of the wider development site was undertaken as part of the outline planning application, and as confirmed by the County Council archaeological officer, it is not considered any further archaeological works are required in relation to this site.
- 9.66 It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, massing and design, would not harm the character and appearance of the area or any heritage assets and is compliant with the provisions of the outline planning permission, the NPPF and Local Plan policy NH/14.

### **9.67 Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design**

Sustainable design & construction

- 9.68 The outline planning permission requires all dwellings to be built to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5. Whilst the Code has been withdrawn it continues to apply to legacy developments such as Eddington. For comparison to current policy, Code Level 5 requires, amongst other things, measures equivalent to a 100% cut in carbon dioxide emissions in relation to space heating, water heating, and lighting compared to a dwelling built to Building Regulations minimum standards; and to limit water use of 80l per dwelling per day.

- 9.69 All dwellings are proposed to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5. Photovoltaic panels are proposed to all roofs, with 4kWhp for each house and 1.35kWhp per apartment. All dwellings are also proposed to be connected to the site-wide district heating and non-potable water networks.
- 9.70 Modern Methods of Construction are proposed for the houses, with modules constructed off-site. This will assist in achieving high levels of airtightness and reduced construction waste compared to traditional construction.

#### Ventilation & Overheating

- 9.71 The Design Code sets out that buildings should be designed to make use of passive ventilation, with mechanical ventilation only used where passive measures are not possible.
- 9.72 All houses have opportunity for through ventilation, and mechanical cooling is only proposed where homes are exposed to higher noise levels.
- 9.73 The majority (80%) of apartments are proposed to be single-aspect limiting the effectiveness of passive ventilation. The need to ensure adequate daylighting for northern facing units, and to control heating in more southern facing units has been considered from an early stage of development, and through discussions with the Council's Sustainability Officer. The applicant has analysed different balcony types, glazing ratios, and glass type and the effect these have on daylight performance, heating demand, and overheating risk. This has resulted in two main apartment typologies with recessed balconies in front of living areas used on south-east and west facades to provide shade and reduce the risk of overheating. On north and north-west facades, exposed balconies positioned in front of bedrooms are designed to ensure adequate daylighting to living areas in winter. Side windows are also proposed to open onto balconies for all apartment types to provide exposure to different wind directions and improve natural ventilation.
- 9.74 A sample of units have been assessed for their overheating potential using the industry standard CIBSE TM59 methodology. This assessment has also accounted for units which are exposed to higher noise levels where opening windows may not be a preference for residents. The development complies with the assessment criteria, with all units are compliant without mechanical ventilation under the 2020 and 2050 climate scenarios. Mechanical cooling is proposed for units which expected to be subject to elevated noise levels from the M11.
- 9.75 Overall, whilst the proposed development includes a significant number of single-aspect apartments, the design of apartments and their balconies has been carefully considered to minimise the risk of overheating and ensure adequate daylighting for all units. The proposals have been subject to extensive discussion through the pre-application process and the

Sustainability Officer is satisfied with the proposed approach. The proposals are considered to ensure adequate ventilation and address the risk of overheating.

#### Electric Vehicles

- 9.76 Electric vehicle charging points are proposed for all parking spaces on S1 and the houses on S2. EV charging is proposed to 16 spaces (10%) within the podium. The outline planning permission does not set a specific requirement for EV charging provision is considered acceptable, and as such the proposed level of EV charging provision is considered acceptable. A condition is recommended to secure the provision of EV charging points (Condition 8).
- 9.77 The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and subject to conditions the proposal is compliant with the outline planning permission, Local Plan policies CC/1, CC/3, CC/4, HQ/1 and NWCAAP Policies NW2, & NW24.

#### **9.78 Biodiversity**

- 9.79 A site-wide biodiversity strategy was approved as part of the outline planning permission, the primary requirement of which with respect to residential parcels is the incorporation of bird boxes. The proposed development is considered to be compliant with the site-wide biodiversity strategy, providing bird box provision in excess of that required. A range of features such as rain gardens and biodiverse green roofs are also proposed which will support biodiversity. Conditions are recommend to secure implementation of landscape works and for a landscape and ecological management plan (Conditions 7 and 9).
- 9.80 Although not a requirement of the outline planning permission, the site is anticipated to achieve a biodiversity net gain with a 1.6% increase in habitat units and a gain of 2.1 hedgerow units, which is supported.
- 9.81 The submitted information is considered sufficient to discharge condition 35 of the outline planning permission in relation to the site. With respect to biodiversity the development is considered in compliance with the outline planning application, Local Plan Policy NH/4, and NWCAAP Policy NW2.

#### **9.82 Water Management and Flood Risk**

- 9.83 The site is in Flood Zone 1 where there is a low risk of flooding from rivers. The site was subject to a detailed flood risk assessment at the outline planning application stage, and a site-wide drainage strategy has been developed which is designed to accommodate a 1 in 100 year storm, together with a 30% climate change allowance. Surface water from the site is directed to the Washpit Brook via a series of swales within green corridors, and attenuation basins within the western edge.

- 9.84 As part of the wider sustainability measures for the site, dwellings are designed to achieve water consumption of 80 litres per person per day, including through the use of a non-potable water system which is fed by surface water from the site.
- 9.85 The surface water drainage system for S1 proposes to use shallow attenuation features including permeable paving and attenuation tanks, as well as an attenuation pond in the wildlife corridor, which then gravity feed into the site-wide drainage system. Within S2 permeable paving, an attenuation tank and the podium garden are proposed as attenuation features which will then drain into the site-wide drainage system.
- 9.86 Attenuation ponds and swales within the wildlife corridor will be lined and are not considered likely to increase the risk of flooding to any neighbouring properties. The applicant has also tested exceedance flow routes for storm event which exceeds the 1 in 100 year plus 30% climate change allowance design, or for blockages. This shows exceedance flows will be directed towards streets and on to swales with proposed buildings and neighbouring properties not impacted.
- 9.87 Additional surface water drainage features including rain gardens and green roofs are proposed, which have not been included in the drainage design, and will provide additional surface water attenuation.
- 9.88 Foul water is proposed to be conveyed using a gravity system into the existing site network within Milne Avenue, with onward flows into the wider public foul sewer network.
- 9.89 Following the submission of additional information by the application, Anglian Water have confirmed they have no objection to the proposals.
- 9.90 The applicant has submitted further details on the proposed surface water drainage system, on the basis of which the Lead Local Flood Authority has confirmed they have no objection to the proposals. The submitted information is considered sufficient to discharge condition 27 of the outline planning permission in relation to the site.
- 9.91 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and the proposal is in accordance with the outline planning permission, Local Plan policies CC/7, CC/8 & CC/9 and NWCAAP Policies NW25, NW26, and NW27.

## **9.92 Transport, access, and parking**

### Strategic Routes

- 9.93 The site is adjacent to the Ridgeway, an off-road walking and cycling route through the site proving connections to Girton via Bunker's Hill, and towards the city centre via Storey's Way. The Ridgeway has been

provided in a temporary form, with the design of the permanent Ridgeway anticipated to be delivered as part of the future reserved matters application for wider Infrastructure works.

- 9.94 Concerns have been raised by local residents about the impact of the development on the route of the Ridgeway, following amendment to the red-line boundary. Indicative plans for the Ridgeway have been included on the submitted plans, however these do not form part of this reserved matters application. Properties fronting the Ridgeway will be set back from Bunker's Hill and it is considered that the amendment to the red-line will not obstruct the delivery of the permanent Ridgeway to a design which complies with the Design Code.
- 9.95 Vehicular access to the site is via Milne Avenue, which has already been provided and which connects to Eddington Avenue. Part of Dobb Terrace is also proposed to be delivered as part of the proposals and has been designed in accordance with the Design Code. Transport and traffic impacts were considered at the outline planning permission stage and appropriate mitigation secured. The County Council as highways authority have not raised any objection to the proposal. Given the limited level of parking proposed and promotion of active travel measures, it is considered that the development is not likely to result in a significant increase in traffic using Milne Avenue and no further assessment is required at this stage.

#### Internal Streets and Access

- 9.96 The development proposes a hierarchy of streets which differ in their design to the tertiary street set out in the Design Code. The Design Code sets out that tertiary streets should be either be a shared space at least 6m wide with a service strip either side, or should be a conventional street with a typical width of 15m overall, a 5m wide carriageway, and footpaths on either side.
- 9.97 The loop road is intended to be a shared space with a typical width of 8m including a 5.5m wide carriageway and a 2m footpath on one side. Liveable streets are proposed off the loop road and Dobb Terrace with a typical width of 6m, with green paving and planting used to provide a winding path for vehicles. A green lane and green spine are also proposed through the site, providing dedicated routes for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 9.98 The implications of this proposed street hierarchy on the character of the development and landscaping is discussed above. The design of the streets with narrow carriageways and extensive traffic calming measures is intended to slow vehicles and ensure the streets are usable by pedestrians and cyclists, with the loop road having a design speed of 10mph.
- 9.99 Footways and motor green routes allow pedestrians to navigate the site without sharing space with motor vehicles, other than on the liveable streets which have a very low design speed of 5mph.



- 9.100 Vehicle tracking diagrams has been provided to show the site can be accessed safely by refuse vehicles, fire engines, and delivery vans.
- 9.101 Whilst departing from the Design Code, the design of the internal streets is considered to provide a safe environment for all users which supports active travel and as such is considered acceptable.
- 9.102 Cycle Parking
- 9.103 The Design Code sets out that cycle parking should be secure and conveniently located in accordance with the NWCAAP cycle parking standards of 1 space per bedroom for dwellings of up to 3 bedrooms, 3 space per dwelling for 4-bed units, and some level of visitor parking provision.
- 9.104 For houses on S1 and S2, an external cycle store is proposed for each dwelling providing 3 spaces for 3-bed units, and 4 spaces for 4-bed units, for a total of 348 resident spaces.
- 9.105 For the apartments on S2 a range of cycle parking is provided for residents, with a cycle store for each block and additional shared stands within the car park. 418 resident cycle parking spaces are proposed, in excess of the 391 required. The submitted plans show 318 spaces to be provided as gas-assisted two-tier stands, 98 as Sheffield type stands, and 12 spaces for cargo bikes/ oversized cycles.
- 9.106 As well as dedicated resident cycle parking, 22 visitor cycle parking spaces are proposed, in addition to existing visitor cycle parking adjacent to the site. There is also potential for a cycle and scooter hire point at the bike workshop/ kiosk building on S1.
- 9.107 Cycle parking for housing is conveniently located within gardens. Cycle parking for apartments is generally located close to stair/lift cores, with cyclists able to access the Ridgeway directly or use the vehicular access onto Dobb Terrace. As most ground floor units do not have direct access to the podium, walking distances for residents are longer, with residents of ground floor units in Block C having to walk up to 145m to access their dedicated cycle stores, although this only affects a small number of units.
- 9.108 The overall level of cycle parking provision exceeds that required by the Design Code and NWCAAP and is supported. Cycle parking is also considered to be generally conveniently located, and the cycle stores for houses are considered acceptable. 75% of cycle parking proposed within S2 is in the form of gas-assisted two-tier stands. The cycle parking details submitted are considered sufficient to discharge condition 43 of the outline planning application in relation to the site.

#### Car Parking

- 9.109 Condition 40 of the outline planning permission requires that car parking is provided in accordance with the standards in the NWCAAP, which sets a maximum parking level of 1 space for dwellings up to 2 bedrooms, and up to 2 spaces for dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms. The standards also require visitor parking provision of 1 space for every 4 dwellings, and 5% of spaces to be accessible. The NWCAAP permits lower levels of parking provision for highly sustainable sites and where reduced car use can be controlled.
- 9.110 150 parking bays are proposed within the podium car park, including 8 dedicated accessible parking bays. There are 76 on-plot driveway parking spaces for houses, whilst there are also 7 off-plot parking spaces for residents within S1. Although not marked up as dedicated accessible bays, on-plot parking spaces are designed to be accessible.
- 9.111 As the site will be owned and managed by a single operator, houses without on-plot parking, and apartments will have the option of renting a parking space. Across the site, the level of resident parking provision will be 0.6 spaces per dwelling. For context, the parking ratio for Keyworker housing approved as part of Phase 1 of Eddington is approximately 0.2 spaces per dwelling.
- 9.112 There are also currently 18 visitor parking bays on Milne Avenue and 4 proposed on Dobb Terrace. There is active monitoring in place to prevent inappropriate parking within the site. There is a car club in operation at Eddington which has been delivered through the outline planning permission, and the developer also intends to operate a car club as part of its offer to prospective tenants. The site is highly accessible, with good active travel and public transport links, as well as a range of facilities on site. As the site is proposed to be managed by a single operator parking within the podium can be pooled, rather than tied to individual houses or flats so that the spaces will be used efficiently, with the operator able to use pricing and other controls to manage demand. Subject to a condition to secure a parking management strategy (Condition 13), the level of car parking provision is considered acceptable.
- 9.113 The use of a podium car park is considered acceptable and in accordance with the Design Code. The Design Code specifies that driveway parking should only be used for detached dwellings, with garages or other parking structures such as basements used elsewhere. Officers have worked with the applicants through the pre-application process to reduce the amount of driveway parking proposed, including removal of parking from units facing Milne Avenue.
- 9.114 The developer has also designed the parking spaces to be flexible so that if residents do not own a car they can easily convert parking bays into additional garden space. Combined with the site layout and proposed landscaping works, it is considered that parking will not be a dominant feature in the streetscene and will not encourage car use over sustainable modes of transport.

## Conclusion on transport, access, and parking

- 9.115 Overall it is considered the proposals are designed to support the use of sustainable modes of travel, with adequate car and cycle parking, and are consistent with the parameters of the outline planning permission, Local Plan Policy T1/2, and NWCAAP Policies NW11, NW17, and NW18.

## 9.116 Residential Amenity

### Neighbouring Residences

- 9.117 The Design Code specifies that a 20m buffer should be provided between the boundary of properties neighbouring the site and proposed buildings, to minimise any potential impact on neighbours.
- 9.118 Dwellings along the edge of the development are proposed to be 2-storey, and a 20m buffer to the boundary is proposed in compliance with the Design Code, which includes a restricted-access wet woodland corridor within the buffer zone will further limit any potential disturbance of neighbours. The distance to the nearest existing neighbours, with most neighbouring dwellings over 40m away from proposed dwellings.
- 9.119 The site is adjacent to dwellings within lots within Hill's Athena development at Eddington. Based on the proposed layout of the site, it is considered the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the amenity of current/future developments of this neighbouring development.
- 9.120 A 1.2m post-and-rail fence is proposed along the boundary with properties on Huntingdon Road to further secure and mark the boundary. The wet woodland corridor will be gated with access intended to only be for maintenance.
- 9.121 The distances between apartments and neighbouring dwellings to the east is in excess of 50m. Houses are either side on or continue the terrace for the neighbouring houses under construction on the M1/M2 (Athena) development, providing adequate separation.
- 9.122 It is not considered that the development will result in any significant loss of privacy or loss of light to any existing neighbouring dwellings.

### Privacy and amenity of future occupants

- 9.123 Distances between houses across the site vary, with back-to-back distances of 18m or more, and at least 22m where there are 3-storey dwellings proposed. These separation distances are considered adequate to ensure acceptable levels of privacy for residents. The extensive tree planting proposals will enhance privacy through much of the year.

- 9.124 Due to the large podium garden proposed, distances between internal facing apartments is in excess of 36m which is considered acceptable. The distance between houses on S2 and apartments in Block C is approximately 22m. This separation distance is considered acceptable given the apartments are proposed with a set-back fourth storey.
- 9.125 The design of the scheme, with constrained distances between houses and garden boundaries typically defined by 1.5m high timber screens or hedging is relatively open. This will to some extent limit the privacy of these spaces, in particular where gardens for houses on S2 are overlooked by apartments. This is however an intentional design choice to maximise the effect of proposed planting and to foster a sense of community amongst residents. On this basis, the relatively open nature of gardens is considered acceptable.

#### Space standards and private amenity space

- 9.126 All dwellings within the site have been designed to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards, as set out in the table below:

House/ Flat type*	Gross Internal Area**	NDSS requirement	Private amenity space (not part of the NDSS requirement)***
House Type A (3b5p)	93sqm	93sqm	Private garden
House Type B (3b5p)	114.7sqm	93sqm	Private garden
House Type C (4b8p)	194.3sqm	124sqm	19sqm terrace and private garden
Apartment Type A (1b2p)	50.1sqm	50sqm	5.3sqm balcony
Apartment Type B (1b2p)	50.2sqm	50sqm	5.2sqm balcony
Apartment Type D (2b4p)	73.1sqm	70sqm	7sqm balcony
Apartment Type E (2b4p)	70.6sqm	70sqm	6.8sqm balcony
Apartment Type G (3b6p)	98.3sqm	95sqm	7sqm balcony
Apartment Type H (3b6p)	101.7sqm	95sqm	7sqm balcony

\*Non-standard flats are not listed above, however are all meet or exceed the NDSS requirements.

\*\*All units have built-in storage in excess of the NDSS requirements.

\*\*\* Terraces for ground floor and podium apartments typically range from between approximately 10-30sqm. Top floor apartments on Blocks C and D also benefit from private terraces.

- 9.127 As well as meeting or exceeding nationally described spaces standards, all dwellings benefit from private amenity space in the form of a balcony or terrace for apartments and gardens for houses, some of which also benefit from terraces. Balconies are of a sufficient size to accommodate table and chairs etc. and are considered acceptable. Gardens for houses are generally well-sized at typically 50sqm or more. There are small number of house which have more limited garden space, the smallest being approximately 27sqm, which is still considered acceptable as it provides sufficient space to be usable by residents.
- 9.128 Residents will also have access to communal facilities including the podium garden, as well as easy access to a range of open space within the wider site.
- 9.129 The outline planning permission requires that at least 50% of dwellings delivered across Eddington are built to Lifetime Homes standards. Whilst the Lifetime Homes standard has been withdrawn, all dwellings are proposed to be compliant with the standard, as well as complying with the Building Regulations Part M4(2) standard for accessible and adaptable dwellings.
- 9.130 Overall, the proposed development is considered to ensure existing and future residents will benefit from acceptable privacy and amenity in accordance with the outline planning permission, Local Plan Policies HQ/1 and H/12, and NWCAAP Policy NW2.

### **9.131 Construction Impacts and Environmental Health**

- 9.132 Construction Management
- 9.133 A site wide Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) was agreed under condition 52 of the outline planning application to address the environmental impacts of the construction phase, including in relation to noise and dust. Amongst other things, this sets out approved construction working hours, dust suppression methods, and liaison with local residents.
- 9.134 Condition 53 requires submission of a site-specific construction method statement to demonstrate compliance with the site-wide CEMP. A construction method statement has not been submitted as part of this reserved matters application, and will need to be submitted and approved prior to commencement.

- 9.135 A number of residents have raised concerns relating to construction management, including in relation to working hours, noise suppression, and that there has been poor compliance with construction management standards on other parcels. As details such as construction working hours have already been agreed at the outline planning application, and reflect standard industry practice and standard conditions, it is not considered reasonable to impose stricter requirements in relation to this specific parcel. The combination of a 20m buffer to the boundary and proposed use of modular construction methods are likely to limit the potential for and duration of any disturbance as a consequence of construction activities.
- 9.136 Residents have also raised concerns about the existing earth mounds which are located to the north west of the site, close to the boundary with properties along Huntington Road. These existing earthworks are not part of the current reserved matters application. As the site is largely relatively level and no basement is proposed, it is not anticipated that this reserved matters application is likely to generate significant spoil, or require the importation of significant soil volumes. One of the elements required as part of any construction method statement is details of soil management (including storage or importation), and as such any soil movements to or from the site will require the prior approval of the Council.
- 9.137 On the basis of the above, subject to submission of a construction method statement as required by condition 53 of the outline planning permission, it is considered the development is not likely to have an unacceptable impact on local residents or the local environment during construction.

#### Pollution and contamination

- 9.138 The potential for contamination to be present has been considered through the outline planning application and no further site investigation or remediation work is required as part of this application.
- 9.139 The proposed surface water drainage system is designed to feed into the site-wide drainage network, minimising the risk of groundwater pollution. Pollution during the construction stage can be adequately managed through the submission of a Construction Method Statement as required by condition 53 of the outline planning permission.

#### Noise

- 9.140 A noise assessment was undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement which accompanied the outline planning application. This identified noise from the M11, A14, Huntingdon Road, and internal site roads has the potential to be a disturbance for residents, with the M11 being the primary source of noise.
- 9.141 The application is accompanied by a noise survey and acoustic design statement. This has identified that when windows are open, some units on the southern and western elevations will experience elevated noise levels,

primarily from the M11. With windows closed noise levels will be acceptable, assuming standard double glazing to windows. Noise levels are likely to reduce in the future as further parcels are built out, however all units will be fitted with mechanical ventilation, as well as mechanical cooling where required, in order to achieve acceptable ventilation and comfort levels. The noise attenuation measures proposed are considered acceptable, and sufficient to discharge condition 50 of the outline planning permission in relation to the site.

#### Air quality

- 9.142 Air quality has been considered at a site wide level through the outline planning permission. The primary sources of air pollution in the development are the district heating system, which is outside the scope of this application, and vehicle emissions. The outline planning application does not set any specific requirements in relation to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging to reduce emissions, however EV charging is proposed to all on-plot parking spaces, whilst 10% of spaces under the podium will have EV charging points. The is supported by Officers.

#### Conclusion on Construction and Environmental Health

- 9.143 The associated construction and environmental impacts of the development would be acceptable in accordance with the outline planning application, Local Plan policies CC/6, CC/7, SC/9, SC/10, SC/12 and SC/14, and NWCAAP Policy NW28.

#### **9.144 Other Matters**

##### Waste and recycling

- 9.145 Eddington uses an underground waste collection system for recycling and residual waste, and this is proposed to be used for the site, with bin points located within S1 as well as Milne Avenue and Dobb Terrace. Vehicle tracking has been undertaken to demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can safely navigate the refuse collection routes within the site. Since submission, the proposals have been updated following discussion with the Shared Waste team to ensure sufficient clearance around bin points, and review of vehicle tracking.
- 9.146 The Design Code states that the external distance from building entrances to bin points should be no more than 35m for at least 70% of dwellings, and should be no more than 50m for all dwellings.
- 9.147 70% of units have walking distances from entrances of 30m or less to bins, whilst 20% having walking distances in excess of 50m. Travel distances for some apartments are up to 88m from their main entrance lobby, however residents will be able to reduce this to 60m or less by using an alternative core.

- 9.148 The key reason for most units having walking distances in excess of the Design Code recommendation is that the site is constrained by the wider masterplan, with an assumption that no underground bin points will be installed along the Ridgeway. As such for the apartments the longer walking distance is a trade-off for the benefits of having entrances opening onto the Ridgeway. It is also important to note that bin points are located on or are in close proximity to walking routes into the local centre, so residents will be able combine depositing refuse in the bins with a journey to the local centre. On the basis of the above, walking distances to bins are considered acceptable.
- 9.149 In terms of green waste, houses are proposed to be provided with compost bins. The podium garden will be centrally maintained and as such it is not expected that residents will require green waste bins, however there are designated bulky waste areas underneath the podium which could accommodate green waste bins. If food waste collection is extended to the site in the future, there is space within gardens for houses to store individual food waste bins, and communal food waste bins for flats can be accommodated underneath the podium.
- 9.150 The provision of waste and recycling facilities proposed is considered acceptable in accordance with the outline planning permission, with the information submitted considered sufficient to discharge condition 55 of the outline planning permission in relation to this site.

#### Broadband

- 9.151 A site-wide broadband strategy was secured as part of condition 21 of the outline planning permission. Broadband is proposed to be provided to all units on occupation. Present Made intend to offer broadband as part of rental offer, meaning individual tenants will not need to secure their own connection individually.

#### Lighting

- 9.152 The application is accompanied by a Lighting Concept Report which details the proposed lighting strategy for the internal streets and the apartment blocks. Street Lighting for Milne Avenue has already been separately approved, and lighting for the permanent Ridgeway and other surrounding streets will be considered as part of future applications.
- 9.153 The proposed lighting strategy proposes higher levels of lighting to more trafficked parts of the site including the loop road and accesses to the apartment blocks and podium, with lower level lighting focusing on pathways and key features is proposed elsewhere. This approach is supported. The information submitted is considered sufficient to discharge condition 51 of the outline planning permission in relation to this site.



## Fire Strategy

- 9.154 Fire alarms and sprinklers are proposed for all flats and communal areas for the blocks on S2, and corridors will be smoke vented. The car park will be fire separated from the rest of the building and will be smoke vented. All houses will be fitted with fire alarms in accordance with Building Regulations Approved Document B.
- 9.155 Condition 65 of the outline planning application requires submission of a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants as part of any reserved matters application. Plans have been submitted showing the proposed locations of fire hydrants. This is considered acceptable sufficient to discharge outline condition 65 in relation to this site.

## Security and safety

- 9.156 The proposed development has been designed with secure design principles in mind. The apartment blocks are designed to provide good natural surveillance, with gaps between blocks designed to be suitably lit and overlooked. The podium garden is proposed to be open during the day and locked overnight, which is considered to provide a good balance between security and opening the development up to the wider community.
- 9.157 Houses on S1 are designed to have relatively open gardens, with low boundary treatments. The private amenity spaces, as well as communal spaces are however well overlooked. The active management of the site will also assist in ensuring it provides a safe environment for residents.

## **9.158 Third Party Representations**

- 9.159 The majority of issues raised by residents are addressed in the sections above.
- 9.160 Some residents have raised concern about the potential loss of rear access to their properties along Huntingdon Road. Any right of access is a civil matter and is outside the scope of this application, and the parameter plans do not require provision of any access route along the boundary. The proposals do not prejudice the delivery of any potential future access to the west from the Ridgeway.

## **9.161 Public Sector Equality Duty**

- 9.162 Under the Equality Act 2010, all public authorities, including Local Planning Authorities, must have due regard in exercising its functions for the Public Sector Equality Duty under s149 of that Act.
- 9.163 The development will contribute to the delivery of a range of types of housing to meet the needs of different groups of people across Eddington,

alongside a range of communal facilities which will appeal to other groups. The need for housing to meet the diverse needs of people with a disability, as well as people such as parents with pushchairs has also been considered in the design and assessment of the scheme.

#### **9.164 Planning Balance**

- 9.165 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
- 9.166 The development is considered to be in general compliance with the outline planning permission and design code, although do diverge from the Design Code in a number of areas as discussed above. However, the proposed scale and massing, layout, and appearance of the site is considered acceptable, with a distinctive landscape-led character which will make a positive contribution to the wider Eddington development.
- 9.167 The development is designed to be highly sustainable, minimising energy use, supporting sustainable modes of transport, biodiversity and sustainable water management. The development will provide a mix of high quality and accessible housing, adding to the diversity of housing provision at Eddington and supporting the development of a new community, whilst also minimising any potential harmful impacts on existing residents.
- 9.168 Having taken into account the provisions of the outline planning permission, the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval.

#### **9.169 Recommendation**

- 9.170 **(i) Approve reserved matters application reference 21/04036/REM** subject to:

The planning conditions and informatives as set out in Appendix 1 with authority delegated to officers to undertake appropriate minor amendments of those conditions and informatives prior to issue of the planning permission.

#### **(ii) Approve the part discharge of planning conditions:**

- **1 – Layout, Scale, Appearance, and Landscaping**
- **8 – Design Code Compliance Statement**
- **11 – Hard and Soft Landscaping**
- **12 – Arboricultural Survey**
- **20 - Distribution of Market & Keyworker Housing**
- **27 – Detailed Surface Water Drainage Strategy**
- **35 – Biodiversity Survey & Assessment**

- 43 – Cycle Parking Details
- 50 – Noise attenuation/ insulation
- 51 – Lighting Scheme
- 55 – Waste and Recycling Details
- 64 – Public Art
- 65 – Fire Hydrants

of outline planning permission S/2036/13/VC in so far as they relate to the reserved matters site.

## **10.0 Appendices**

- 10.1 Appendix 1 – Conditions and Informatives
- Appendix 2 – Cambridgeshire Quality Panel Report