



Cambridgeshire Quality Panel

Eddeva Park (GB2) Reserved Matters

Friday 7th January 2022

Virtual Meeting

Panel: Lynne Sullivan (chair), Ashley Bateson, Lindsey Wilkinson, Oliver Smith, Phil Jones and Steve Platt.

Local Authority: James Truett (GCSP), Yole Medeiros (GCSP), Chenge Taruvinga (GCSP).

Observers: Joanne Preston (GCSP), Bonnie Kwok (GCSP), Maggie Baddeley (Chair of Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel)

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

Development overview

This Land Limited proposes a reserved matters (REM) application for the appearance, landscape, layout and scale, for the erection of 80 residential dwellings (Phase 2) of the development granted outline permission on 24 May 2021 (19/1168/OUT, as amended by 19/1168/NMA1). The Quality Panel reviewed the outline application on 20 November 2019.

The outline permission included the full approval of both access onto Worts' Causeway and Babraham Road (i.e., not a reserved matter). Currently there is a live reserved matters application (21/04186/REM) for Phase 1, for the appearance, landscape, layout and scale of the main infrastructure, including the primary street and the southern gateway, along with the respective provision of a local area of play, foot and cycle ways and SuDS elements. The reserve matters application also includes utilities and engineering works to cater for this area and for the central square. This reserve matters application is not the subject for this review.

Presenting team

The scheme is promoted by This Land, with BPTW and Chadwickdryerclarke Studio architects and Farrer Huxley landscape design. The presenting team is:

David Akham (bptw), Robin Dryer (chadwickdryerclarke studio), Mark Clarke (chadwickdryerclarke studio), Richard Moorcroft (Brookbanks), Khalid Shaban (This Land), David Lewis (This Land), Maveika Menzel (Farrer Huxley), Isabelle Milne (Farrer Huxley), Kiru Balson (Max Fordham)

Local authority's request

Officers from Greater Cambridgeshire Shared Planning have asked the Panel to focus on the tenure distribution of social and affordable rented units, landscape, and sustainable drainage.

Cambridgeshire Quality Panel summary

The Panel thanked the presentation team for their comprehensive presentation. Eddeva Park (GB2) will be an exciting development and there are elements the Panel supported including being an all electric development. However, some of the

aspirations were not being met, and more detail was needed to ensure they were deliverable.

Whilst this review is for phase 2 more consideration of phase 1 was needed to demonstrate there was cohesion between the two.

The strategy to embed landscape in the development is laudable but is not being delivered and requires re-thinking. The Panel acknowledged the constraint of the gas pipe easement. The eastern edge buffer was also creating a constraint as a lot of uses were being concentrated in this area.

These views are expanded upon below, and include comments made in closed session.

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

The Panel noted this part of Cambridge had few facilities, and the nearest primary school was 2 miles from the site. Early provision of community facilities is important for the emerging community of residents. It is unfortunate such provision is proposed for later phases of the development.

The eastern edge is a multifunction space and hosts several LAPs. The Panel were concerned this space was not sufficiently overlooked to encourage social activity. LAPs should be located along desire lines in parts of the development better overlooked.

The Panel considered the affordable units were not tenure blind as they were in two high density blocks in ‘The Lanes’ and ‘Mews’ character areas. The distribution of social and affordable rented units should be revisited. There was also concern that the decked parking area in Zone H was not overlooked, and that there is a lack of street activity and active frontage around the podium – these could be problematic.

The Panel questioned how the community garden will work and felt more consideration was needed towards its management and use, as they felt the fronts and backs of those homes were potentially both accessible from public space and lacked hierarchy and privacy.

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

The Panel stressed the importance of phase 1 (that includes the principal street and green square) and phase 2 working together. The Panel would like to have a better understanding of the movement hierarchy: how people cross the principal street; where people want to go; and where do the routes connect to?

The Panel raised concern the principal street does not meet LTN 1/20. Cycle provision should be segregated and have priority over the side routes. The promoter explained where space is available the cycle and pedestrian path was being widened.

The Panel observed buildings surrounding the central community square appear to be encroaching into the space indicated at outline. It was important this space, previously represented as the green ‘heart’ of the development, is delivered as per the outline. The Panel were also concerned the inclusion of a swale may create an unusable muddy area and not allow the space to be fully utilised.

The Panel commented there was a need for better legibility throughout the site, including better definition of fronts and backs to dwellings. A number of resident parking is off plot and the allocation of parking is unclear.

Shared surface space for the secondary and tertiary streets was welcomed. The Panel would like to have seen detail of bin storage and how it relates to the collection routing within the development.

The Panel stressed the need for quality cycle parking provision and to avoid conflict with communal car parking provision.

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

The Panel welcomed the approach to embedding landscape in the development, but the gas main easement (south east of the site) inevitably dominated space allocation, as well as the enlarged buffer on the eastern edge. The Panel appreciated the narrative in the presentation however the integration of landscape as a multi-functional amenity in the wider development was not being delivered.

Five character areas was felt to be too many and was not helping deliver spatial cohesion. More landscape throughout the development could be utilised to better define these areas. It was suggested character areas should not be divided by roads, but that the connecting routes are part and parcel of the character. Nonetheless, the Panel commented the woodland villas seems successful as a distinct character.

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

The Panel welcomed the development being all electric. More detail was needed to demonstrate consideration of this in the design. For example, the location of air source heat pumps, and charging points for electric vehicles. The promoter confirmed each dwelling will have their own air source heat pump, and the Panel commented consideration will need to be given to their location, access and noise impact. The Panel asked for more clarity as to the performance standards the development is aspiring to meet and encouraged the promoter to look to the Future Homes Standard for 2025 and the emerging local plan.

A number of homes had large vertical glazed sections. It was important, and will soon be a building regulations requirement, to model for overheating so that window openings are of an appropriate size.

Integrating landscape in the development mentioned above, will also help in terms of the microclimate and reduce overheating. The Panel encouraged the promoter to consider green roofs and these can work with PVs. The strategy proposes PVs, and the Panel would like to see consideration of roof orientation to maximise their use.

The Panel encouraged the promoter to look further at material selection to reduce whole life carbon.

As Cambridge is an area of water stress, the Panel would like to see more consideration of measures to reduce water consumption, for example rainwater harvesting and rain-fed planting.

Specific recommendations

- Better integration between phase 1 and the phase 2.
- Need to understand desire lines to key amenities.

- A large amount of Community space is in the eastern buffer which is poorly overlooked.
- Landscape needs to be better integrated into the development.
- Landscape can help better define character as well as add to climate resilience.
- Appropriate location of swales to not impact on community use space.
- Review distribution of tenure mix as affordable housing is not considered tenure blind.
- Need to review the deck for car and cycle parking to ensure it is a safe space.
- Better clarity on the fronts and backs to dwellings.
- Continue to refine the carbon reduction strategy and consider materials to be used.
- Consider the marketability of homes and using future standards of performance.
- Being an all electric site, design to be informed by the infrastructure needed i.e. the location of air source heat pumps and electric charging points for cars.

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

Contact details

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

Author: David Carford

Issue date: 24 January 2022

Appendix A – Background information list and plan

- Main presentation
- Landscape presentation
- Local authority background note
- Promoter note

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

SITE CONCEPT



01 WOODLAND VILLAS

02 THE LANES

03
COMMUNITY
GARDEN

04
COURTYARD
HOUSES

05 MEWS

ILLUSTRATIVE LANDSCAPE PLAN



- Community Square (1)
- Ecological Buffer (2)
- Linear Park with community play and leisure area (3)