



Disability Consultative Panel

Tuesday, 30 January 2024

14:00 – 16:30

Venue

Room Swansley A&B, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne
and via Microsoft 'Teams'

Notes

Attendees

Mark Taylor	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (Chair)
Sue Simms	Former Housing Officer
Katie Roberts	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (Notes)
Jean White	Retired City Council employee
Betty Watts	Cambridge Deaf Association
John Taylor	Resident
Aaron Coe	Principal Planner, CIP and SCIP Projects (for presentation 1)
John Shuttlewood	Planning Enforcement Officer (for presentation 2)
Trovine Monteiro	Team Leader – Built Environment (for presentation 3)

Apologies

Jane Renfrew, David Baxter, Alex Innes, Rosalind Bird

Presentation 1: 23/04686/FUL | Demolition of the existing buildings, garages and hardstanding and the erection of 84 residential units, car parking, landscaping and associated works | 12 - 34 Fanshawe Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB1 3QY

Presenters

Paul Belton, Carter Jonas
John Mason, Carter Jonas
Simone Marsberg, Hill
Ian Bramwell, Mole Architects
Susie Newman, Mole Architects
Jake Smith (Client)
Mike Martin, Turkington Martin

The presenters explained that the site is in Cambridge city, within the Coleridge ward, and currently consists of three large blocks of flats (32 dwellings in total) and garage buildings. The surrounding area is residential in character. To the north of the site is Coleridge recreation ground.

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing 32 affordable dwellings on the site, which are in a poor state of repair, and the erection of 84 homes (45 affordable apartments, 39 market houses/ apartments). The site is well connected and located close to numerous amenities.

Between the 4 apartment buildings is a new central green space, which is now public with pedestrian and cycle routes leading into Coleridge Recreation Ground via two entrances. The new 'squares' between the apartment buildings on both sides will allow views through to the central green space, with apartment building entrances typically accessed from these squares. There will be a range of different size apartments for wheelchair users (M4(3) homes).

A proposed site plan was displayed showing the M4(3) wheelchair user homes and details were provided about the M4 (2) and M4 (3) typical apartment layouts, including the size of the bathrooms and kitchens and the minimum corridor widths.

Panel comments

- BW requested that the wheelchair accessible toilets and bathrooms have sliding doors, which is especially important for those trying to negotiate the doors with bigger mobility scooters and wheelchairs. SS also suggested that the toilet be situated in the middle of a wall and not to the edge of either side.
- JT and MT queried if there would be places to charge mobility scooters in the flats. In response, it was highlighted that the storage room (page 10 of the presentation) will be fireproof and will be large enough to charge both a wheelchair and mobility scooter.
- JT raised the point that mobility impaired people should be able to evacuate the building (5 storeys) using fire evacuation lifts.
- JW mentioned that the flats for the disabled/less able would benefit from having a hoist leading from the bedroom to the bathroom (or even, as the Chair added, there would be a preference for the main bedroom to have an adjoining wall to the bathroom). JW also commented that, in addition to the blue badge car parking spaces, there should be room for nurses, doctors and carers to park for a short visit, as well as space for delivery vans. The Chair added that it would be useful to signpost some of the short stay visitor parking.
- In response to a further comment by JW, MM mentioned that they would make sure there are no level changes on the key routes.
- In response to a comment by BW, it was agreed that residents would probably require a permit, which they would need to pass to a carer to put in their car when necessary.
- JT queried if a barrier to the site would be a possibility. It was argued that there are pros and cons to this approach; although a barrier would provide enforcement before people reach the site, equally there are maintenance requirements and, if the barrier were out of action for any period of time, access would be denied until the barrier is fixed.
- The Chair queried the surface of the paths through to the recreation ground. It was confirmed that it will be a resin bound gravel, which is smooth and a light colour.
- With regard to the shared surfaces, where cars are in use, the Chair queried if there will be any form of upstand on the edge to assist a visually impaired person using a guidance stick. It was confirmed that there might be a small upstand to define the vehicle movement. The planting areas will have an upstand kerb so it would be possible to tap along the route. The possibility of different textured paving was also mentioned and safer routes, where cars are inaccessible, were shown on the slides.
- The Chair commented favourably on the space for wheelchairs in the communal areas and asked if the seating will have a mixture of heights and handrails/non handrails.

It was confirmed that a form of bench is usually provided as well as other seating which has a back and arm rest as well. The priority is choice and comfort.

- The Chair commented on the inclusivity of the play equipment its suitability for a range of children with different needs. MM elaborated on this strategy, adding that the actual detail of the play area, including the sensory elements and gateway structures, will be developed at the next stage.

The Chair concluded by congratulating the team on the quality of their presentation.