

The Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel



Fanshawe Road, Cambridge (21/50252/PREAPP)

7th March 2023

Confidential

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 [Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel](#) provides independent, expert advice to developers and local planning authorities against the four core principles of the Charter: connectivity, character, climate, and community.

Attendees

Panel Members:

Maggie Baddeley (Chair) - Planner and Chartered Surveyor

Paul Bourgeois (Character, Climate) - Industrial Innovation Lead at Anglia Ruskin University

Vanessa Ross (Character, Landscape) – Chartered Landscape Architect, Director, arc Landscape Design and Planning Ltd

Georgina Bignold (Character, Architecture) – Director, Proctor & Matthews Architects

Helen Goodwin (Character, Community) - Head of Programmes, Design South East

Dr Deb Upadhyaya (Character, Urban Design) – Director at Atkins

Applicant Team:

Susie Newman (Architect)

Ian Bramwell (Architect)

Mike Martin (Landscape architect)

Belton, Paul (Planning Consultant)

John Mason (Planning Consultant)

Jake Smith (Client)

Simone Marsberg (Development Manager)

LPA Officers:

Joanne Preston –Design Review Panel Manager

Katie Roberts – Panel Support Officer

Aaron Coe – Planning Case Officer

Helen Sayers - Principal Landscape Architect

Anne-marie de Boom – Consultant Urban Designer (CIP Sites)

Scheme Description and Background

The Scheme involves the demolition of 3 existing apartment blocks (32 flats) and garages and provision of 84 new houses and apartments.

The Site

The site is in Cambridge city, within the Coleridge ward. The site is outside of all designated conservation areas and there are no listed buildings within close proximity to the site. The site 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 site has the following constraints:

- The site's garden and landscaped area fronting Fanshawe Road is designated as Protected Open Space.
- The site is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). A small part of the site to the north is an area at a medium risk of surface water flooding.
- There is a number of trees within the site boundary; none of the trees within the site are subject to tree protection orders.

Planning History

The site does not fall within a designated conservation area. The site is already in residential use and the principle of a residential re-development of this site is therefore considered acceptable.

Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 67 states that proposals will not be permitted which would lead to the loss of open space which is of environmental and/ or recreational importance unless the open space can be satisfactorily replaced in terms of quality, quantity and access with an equal or better standard. The applicant is required to demonstrate that the quantum of protected open space is not being reduced, the quality is enhanced, and the public accessibility is improved. As existing, there is 0.46 hectares of protected open space within the site boundary; the

proposal involves a total 0.49 hectares of reprovided, enhanced open space which is more accessible to the public and is therefore considered to comply with policy 67.

There have been six pre-application meetings to date for this site. The design and layout of the scheme has evolved through engagement with the Council's planning officer, urban designer and landscape architect.

The Proposal

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing 32 affordable dwellings on the site and erection of 84 homes (45 affordable apartments, 39 market houses/ apartments). The scheme comprises 53% affordable. The current proposal consists of six separate blocks of residential accommodation (E1,E2,E3 and W1,W2,W3).

E1 consists of 17 x 2 bedroom (4-person) apartments, 4 storeys in height proposed to the east of the site, stepping up to 5 storeys in height towards the central landscaped area.

E2 consists of 17 apartments (4x 1 bed 2-person, 8 x 2-bed 4-person and 5 x 3-bed 5-person apartments). 3 storeys in height are proposed to the east of the site, stepping up to 4 storeys in height towards the central landscaped area.

E3 consists of 5 terraced house properties (3-bed, 5 person) at 2 storeys in height. W1 and 2 consists of 28 apartments (18 x 1-bed 2-person, 5 x 2-bed 4-person, 5 x 3-bed, 5-person). The entire block is proposed to be 5 storeys in height. W3 comprises 3 terraced house properties (3-bed, 5 person).

Declarations of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

Previous Panel Reviews

This is the first time the scheme has been reviewed by the Panel.

Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel views

Summary

The panel is of the clear view that the Fanshawe Road project is a good scheme that could be pushed a lot harder to become a CIP exemplar project; it has the potential to be beautiful, and at least match or at best exceed the design quality of other recent CIP developments, such as the Ironworks and Colville Road.

The Fanshawe Road site is in a highly accessible location and although it is a difficult site in some regards, the design team has helped to understand its constraints and done well to describe the options. But by creating a landscape-led, specifically 84-home proposal that is founded on the intention to create a new, almost entirely public open space that connects the site with the Coleridge recreation ground, matters of public/ private space delineation are unresolved and impact on all other aspects of the project. This new space instead needs to be an attractive, manageable and maintainable space in itself, one that is primarily designed to help create, and serve the site's new residential community well.

The issues that arise from the current design of the open space have led to the panel having consequential concerns around the proposed scale, bulk, massing and design of the proposed apartment buildings within and in relation to the new landscape – particularly those concerns relate to block W1 and 2.

Recommendations are therefore made in relation to redefining and finessing the purposes and design of the open space, and rearranging heights, redistributing massing and revising the design of buildings to respond better to their immediate and wider neighbourhood settings.

The Panel otherwise acknowledges and accepts that it has only been possible for the applicant team in the review to present limited information on energy, services and the related choices being made.

The key sustainability recommendations are that all of the new homes should be built to Passivhaus standards, and the ambition should be for a stretched target of biodiversity net gain.

Climate

Sustainability

The Panel accepts that it has only been possible for the design team in the review to present limited information on energy services and the related choices being made. The team is nonetheless commended for the sustainability intentions summarised in the review, and advised by the panel to set stretched targets. The panel assumes that the design team is well-aware of the 4 steps of the Buro Happold report (Cambridge City Council – [Sustainable Housing Design Guide](#), May 2021), and how to push boundaries; many Cambridge projects are doing just that. It is unclear to the panel however why the entire project has not been specifically promoted from the outset as a Passivhaus project by CIP.

In noting that all of the affordable housing is designed to meet Passivhaus standards, including block W2 (market apartments) which will share construction methods with W1, the panel is disappointed that all of the other market dwellings will only be built to comply with Building Regulations. Analysis particularly of form factor and fenestration is showing that the E1 market apartments could 'easily reach' the Passivhaus standards, and the terraced homes in blocks E3 and W3 will be 'very close' to Passivhaus; according to the CIP as client, it has not been possible to date in market sale properties to find a way to recover the value of Passivhaus standards. The significant differences between construction methods are noted by the Panel but the underlying reason for the disparity is unclear. The panel's knowledge of saleability is contrary to that of CIP; the market is perceived to have shifted and much greater value is placed on low energy, market dwellings. Many developers and housebuilders are offering solar PV and battery storage as market sale options, with the market itself dictating this approach. Even swapping in triple glazing achieves appreciable improvements.

The panel agrees that it is appropriate for the dwellings to all have Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR), that will also give better air quality in buildings.

The applicant team having a consultant onboard now is commended; the panel recommends that the energy strategy and in-use performance analysis now take into account solar PVs and battery storage, potentially community for either or both. Noting that there are 49 car parking spaces on-site, all should have charging points; the cycle storage rooms should likewise have facilities for electric bike charging.

Consideration should be given to using off-site, modular construction as part of the project's sustainability strategy. This size of site is also ideal for setting a target relating to creating a local supply chain, which could extend to up to 80 or 100 miles and still be effective. Likewise, the re-use and recycling of materials throughout the delivery phase should be factored into the strategy, e.g. with leftover construction materials being given to local communities to use as part of wider circular economy objectives.

Creating a sustainable landscape

Sustainability concerns around climate resilience arise from the current landscape proposals for the site. Whilst the design of the central public open space works quite well as shown, a great many layers now need to be added, to ensure its longevity. For example, the site masterplan shows a 'flexible lawn with slight form', with incidental play and a play area for younger children. The panel supports the idea of articulating this space and it not just being a horizontal plane but from a biodiversity and climate resilience perspective, a key discussion needs to be about moving away from proposing any sizeable lawn areas. As a principle, they are to be avoided, apart from for sports pitches. The panel therefore suggests that the consideration of future levels should be an integral part of the sustainable drainage strategy (SuDS) for the site. SuDS can be a driver of character and a positive asset with regard to biodiversity, water quality, creating visual interest and being part of play too; the panel supports the design team being mindful of, and considering how a swale might best be incorporated. Specifically with regard to the children's play area, potential structures are shown in the presentation - yet the area of the site where is it currently

positioned is the one area with no shade. As a design principle, providing some form of shade and shelter will clearly enhance the site's overall climate resilience.

The applicant team has rightly begun to consider how the project will achieve biodiversity net gain (BNG), being aware that planning policy in Cambridge is for a 20% uplift. The stated project intention is to achieve this level of uplift primarily by retaining as many on-site trees as possible, and planting new native species, together with woodland and meadow flora and native hedges around the car parking areas. Also, bio-solar, green and biodiverse roofs are proposed (especially where stepped roofs mean that residents will look out onto them).

In part because of timing - the design team is just about to engage with the project ecologist - the panel considers that this specialist input should be obtained as soon as possible. The project should aim to be more aspirational, by seeking to achieve more than 20% BNG. Accepting that the national standard is 10%, the panel considers that aiming for a 30 or even 40% BNG on-site would be appropriate here. In order to do so, the design team needs to gain a full understanding of the existing position on-site and second, use that research and analysis to drive design from now onwards. To achieve an acceptable level of BNG using the Natural England metrics, the panel considers that the relationships between biodiversity and people's future use of the landscape will require careful analysis and thought here, as a key input to the overall process. In addition, not only the recreation ground needs to be taken into consideration but how the site will knit together with the existing green infrastructure in the wider area; looking beyond the red line site boundary could be key.

It is the panel's overall conclusion that the outcomes of a full BNG analysis and devising a SuDS strategy are likely to have a major impact on project design, alongside and consistent with the other comments made on landscape during the review itself, as summarised below.

Community

Public/ private open space

The panel agrees that the site is in a highly sustainable location, and is very much part of an attractive, low-density neighbourhood. What is missing from the current proposal however is a real sense and understanding of what kind of a place this project will create, and what kind of a place it will be for the development's future residents. The panel perceives these deficiencies as deriving from the current conditions on-site and some of the design drivers being misdirected. While there is currently 0.46ha. of 'protected open space' on-site, much is for private use and under-utilised. The public open space within the site and fronting Fanshawe Road is accepted as not well-used: no-one sits out or plays there and it is considered to be more of a visual amenity. There is no real sense of ownership at present. The panel understands too, that the same is more or less true for the communal garden with its washing lines to the rear of the existing buildings. Again, there is little or no sense of ownership, apart from the ground floor apartments that currently have small private gardens.

The current redevelopment proposal for open space on-site is for it to be entirely reconfigured and increased to 0.49ha., almost all of which will be publicly accessible. The dynamic of the defined space will therefore be almost entirely changed; as currently proposed, the only private open spaces will be the gardens of the terraced houses, and small, defined areas serving ground floor apartments. This is the intention, despite the applicant team not being aware of whether there is a deficiency of open space in the local area, or not. More clarity is therefore sought by the panel around the reasoning underlying the applicant team's creation of an open space that is not just for the new residents but for everyone – yet existing residents already have the recreation ground.

In principle, the panel endorses the design team starting the landscape design process by having identified aspirations around biodiversity, bringing the community together and opening up the site to create views through to the recreation ground. It is clear too that the proposal has been through quite a journey and that providing additional, public open space has been a key design driver. But with regard to the

exploration of options for defining boundaries and the quantum of what will be public or private open space, it is not clear that such optioneering has taken place. While the panel understands the intention of creating a public open space linking physically and visually with the Coleridge recreation ground, there is a strong concern that the replacement open space may simply feel private, despite the intention for it to be public. There is alternatively a concern that for the site's residents, they will feel that they are living in a (public) park; section CC in the presentation highlights the extensive (46m) width of parkland between blocks W2 and E2. Either way, there is a need to be clear about how the open space will feel 'owned' by residents in the new scheme - and how the wider local community will use it, if it is to be truly public.

Other questions are raised by the panel too, around the wider purpose that the new open space will serve, and how will it be different - yet complementary - to the recreation ground. For example, whether the new development provides sufficient space for the residents' needs, and whether they will feel secure. As proposed, the apartment blocks in the scheme each have more than one shared entrance (fronting both the new streets and the open space). This blurring of fronts and backs may well undermine security and legibility. The overlooking and surveillance of the open space, routes through the site and of parking areas also need to be taken into account in this context. To help overcome potential issues, the possibility should be explored of introducing direct access to ground floor apartments to activate the ground floor, make the access roads more street-like and resembling the surrounding residential area more.

These fundamental issues that all relate to the delineation and use of public/ private space on-site need to be resolved as soon as possible, as in the panel's view, they have important implications that are further explained below, for then reconsidering the current siting, orientation, massing and height of the proposed apartment buildings.

Community engagement and the new residents

CIP advises that their engagement with (now former, and some still current) residents began in 2020/ 21. In mid-2022, the City's Scrutiny Committee endorsed the project, leading to engagement for helping existing tenants to move away.

Decanting has resulted in some six tenants and three leaseholders remaining; many of those who have moved out already still live in the local area. Everyone has been given the opportunity to return in the future. No information has been provided to the panel however, in terms of what the-then existing community said about the value they derived from living in their existing homes, and their everyday lives. The panel notes that the wider local engagement that has very recently only taken the form of a reasonably well-attended public exhibition that has shown: general support for the new and enhanced open space and the project being landscape-led; how the existing connection to the recreation ground is valued by local people; and that while some are 'warming' to the existing buildings, their poor condition is fully understood.

In these circumstances of there being only relatively limited engagement findings available, the panel suggests that the applicant team works through 'day in the life' scenarios for the project's likely new residents (of all ages), to consider and understand how the development will work for each of them, and for this new community to foster a sense of shared belonging.

Recreation and play

The applicant team advises that the Coleridge recreation ground is very well-used by the local community. Although it is fenced and gated, the gates are always open. It is the design team's intention to look at the existing play area in the recreation ground; the play area on-site will be for younger children, as they are not provided for in the recreation ground, where in any event, the equipped play area is on its northern boundary. The panel questions this approach however, as once again it raises the question of whether the new play area will feel accessible to off-site residents as potential users. A further concern is that it is not a family-friendly approach, to just cater for younger children so far away from the older children's play area in the recreation ground. This comes back again to gaining a fuller understanding of how the on-site open space will be used, in relation to the recreation ground.

Housing mix and tenure

The panel endorses the principle of how market housing is being spread throughout the site, accepting that for management purposes the affordable housing (amounting

to 55% i.e. 45 homes) is provided in separate buildings with their own entrances and cores. The housing mix will comprise one, two and three-bedroom apartments and eight 3-bedroom, market homes; the panel is advised that the number of affordable 1-bed apartments proposed relates directly to the housing needs in the City (which are 50% 1-bed; 20% 2-bed; 25% 3-bed and 5% 4-bed). While the individual affordable apartments satisfy current space standards, the design team is asked by the panel to recognise - and seek to maximise - flexibility and adaptability in their internal layouts, to meet future residents' potential needs (particularly acknowledging post-Covid home working arrangements). In making this recommendation, the panel understands that the scope for creating flexible and adaptable affordable housing living spaces must be balanced with providing accommodation of the size needed, at a rent that occupiers can afford.

To further foster the creation of a cohesive community, the panel suggests that within all of the apartment buildings and outside them, spacious indoor entrance lobbies and outdoor, sheltered spaces should be provided as places to linger, and for opening up the possibility for social interaction.

Connectivity

The site is in a highly accessible location, being a 10-minute cycle ride and 30 minutes' walk to/ from the city centre; the railway station is even closer. While it is well-connected to the north and east, there is however only one connection through the site to/ from the recreation ground on the eastern boundary of the site – there is a perception of that route being poor quality and a little unsafe. The applicant team advises that community engagement has referred to anti-social behaviour along it. This access is one of the three existing vehicular access and pedestrian routes on-site; two are to be retained. It is to be retained, as it also serves an existing private garage; the western access to the Fanshawe Road allotments is likewise kept and improved. The proposals to improve both of these access routes are endorsed by the panel. The third and new access point, the proposed southern entrance to the recreation ground from the site's public open space on its northern boundary, should be a clear 'statement' gateway that clearly shows that the new parkland is not exclusively for the new residents. In this way, the new route through the open space

will serve to improve the wider local neighbourhood's connectivity through the Coleridge recreation ground to the city centre or railway station.

Throughout the site itself, the panel considers that there needs to be a hierarchy of routes, including shared spaces where appropriate. Different materials should be used to delineate the different spaces within that clearly-defined movement hierarchy.

Unfortunately, the proposed layout of the site is dominated by parking, although it is clear to the panel that the design team is not wanting this to be the case. Where the car parking areas end abruptly at the northern site boundary, immediately adjacent to the recreation ground, the perception is created of entering a car parking zone abutting a park. The ambition should be to show what lies beyond the car parking areas; public art could be used to focus on the transition from the development to the recreation ground. The panel makes this suggestion, being aware of a CIP commitment made already, to introduce art into the project e.g. in the design of proposed gates.

Character

The local neighbourhood

It is understood that the similar apartment buildings on Davy Road to the north of Coleridge recreation ground are in the same ownership as the review site. They are on CIP's 'long list' for regeneration; if the Fanshawe Road proposal progresses, the advice to the panel is that the Davy Road site would be next. A key point to note for the review site is that it provides some 44 affordable new homes – the same number as at Davy Road currently. The Fanshawe Road project could therefore be used for decant purposes.

The existing blocks at both Davy Road and Fanshawe Road have similar layouts - albeit with opposite orientations - that create an ensemble piece. In opening up views from Fanshawe Road, this composition will be lost. According to the panel, a useful move would therefore be to look at this review site and the Davy Road apartments' site together, in a masterplanning exercise that could lead to both

components continuing to talk to one another on redevelopment. The panel considers that if this masterplanning exercise were to be undertaken, a different urban form could emerge for Fanshawe Road.

Landscape

The landscape-led objectives that have become the driving force for the project are laudable. The review proposal has clearly been based on an analysis of the site and the surrounding area's green infrastructure (including the recreation ground, the adjacent allotments and the rear gardens of neighbouring houses).

The following six landscape-based design principles have been explained clearly in the review, and are supported by the panel:

1. Consolidation of open space on-site;
2. Tree retention, as far as possible - the panel wholly supports the design team's work in seeking to retain the Category A trees within the existing Fanshawe Road open space;
3. Orientation of the new buildings north/ southwards for sustainability reasons and to help create an idea of courtyards that would relate to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties;
4. Fashioning the proposed buildings, pushing W1 and 2 northwards, to protect existing trees that are to be retained and the proposed new view across and through the site from Fanshawe Road north eastwards;
5. Keeping the existing western and eastern north/ south routes and creating a series of 'events', activities and spaces from Fanshawe Road through the site and to the parking areas; and
6. Creating a new amenity route that would pass through the central open space and perforate the northern boundary of the site, by means of a new gate.

In developing these principles further in the next design iteration, there are however some specific concerns around residents' amenity, and successfully providing a hierarchy of uses/ outdoor amenity spaces. These concerns require specific attention, in tandem with addressing the matters raised elsewhere in the review in relation to public/ private land issues.

The proposal apparently includes different treatments of the various boundaries of the site but these are not entirely clear from the presentation material. If the open space is to be perceived as for public use, its boundaries will be key. On the northern boundary, it is proposed that there would be a 'barrier' that would include a gate from

the central open space, in order to create enclosure and a threshold for moving into the recreation ground. This is the preferred option of the City's Parks' Department – in-principle negotiations are underway regarding the Council's future adoption of the on-site open space. Accepting that on Fanshawe Road there is no enclosure at present and that the project is changing the character of this part of the site, the site boundary would be defined 'horizontally'. A 1.0/1.2m hedge is being considered, again with a gate. It would be possible to enter the site from its western and eastern edges. Within the site, planting will be used to define the private space of ground floor properties. Between these private outdoor spaces and the public, communal open space, there would be a form of (as yet undefined) physical barrier e.g. a railing or balustrade inside of the planting i.e. the edges of the private 'offer' have yet to be decided. Overall, the panel perceives a clear need to be able to understand how different areas of the site, its spaces and its boundaries can/ will be delineated by the landscape and other means.

In terms of the character of the proposed open space, the images presented are confirmed by the design team as being aspirational, despite also being mindful not to propose anything that will not be manageable or sustainable. One image shows an open lawn, commented on as being adoptable, yet this is one of the least sustainable forms of landscape in climate resilience terms. The panel therefore advocates reviewing all of these landscape precedents, including reconsideration from a maintenance perspective.

Noting the local area's historic land use of extensive allotments until the early 1950's, growing areas should be introduced into the proposed open space. There is a 3-year plus waiting list for allotments in Cambridge. Managed allotment-style gardens and growing areas with raised planters on the site could help meet the evident need, and also bring health and wellbeing benefits - particularly in helping to tackle loneliness, and in providing a space where people can just 'be' (see [Kings Crescent, Hackney](#) for the range of growing spaces provided there, and the [National Allotment Society Guide to 21st century allotments in new developments](#)). Elsewhere on-site, fruit trees and an edible landscape could be integrated with proposed planting e.g. by creating herb gardens.

Before the exact public/ private boundaries of the central open space have been defined in response to the panel's comments and recommendations, further discussions should take place between the design team, the ecologist and the City's park's team, to ensure that as it evolves, the proposal's main green space has a 30-year timeframe - and satisfies local authority requirements for management and maintenance.

Buildings

The panel notes that the existing buildings are in a state of disrepair, asbestos has been found on-site, and that apartment sizes do not meet current space standards. It is accepted that it is therefore difficult for CIP to retrofit the existing buildings.

Like the applicant team, the panel sees huge positive potential for the site's redevelopment. The panel understands why the main point of the whole scheme is described as having been to change the orientation of the buildings due to the existing apartments blocking any visual connections to the recreation ground. A higher number of new homes was originally considered; there has been no specific target and the total of 84 apartments and houses has been reached through pre-application discussions and in design development. The panel does not necessarily agree that this total creates a better proposition however for block W1 and 2. Despite the applicant team stating to the contrary, the panel concludes that the specific number of new homes proposed does appear to have been a key factor that has driven the scheme's massing and led it to being unresolved, particularly for blocks W1 and 2, when the nearest 5-storey buildings lie at some distance to the west of the site.

These aspects of architecture and character once again return to the previously-expressed, more fundamental concerns of the panel around the proposal's public/ private open space issues. Achieving the sought-after variations between the site's public and private spaces could be helped by the proposed architecture. As it has very good orientation in terms of sunlight and having regard to visual impact and townscape considerations, there is clearly a principle that larger buildings with greater height than the surrounding houses could be more acceptable, if they were well-sited and of good design. At present, the proposed massing creates too much of

a step-up to the site's larger buildings; scale and form should also be reconsidered, particularly for blocks W1 and 2. A very important aspect of the proposal is the current relationship of the linear W1 and 2 building with the open space; it is long and wall-like, and could respond better e.g. stepping up massing towards this space, and to the recreation ground to the north.

The panel suggests looking more closely at street level views, for understanding what pedestrians will see. For example, looking at the street level view from Sterne Close to the south of Fanshawe Road, there is a view through the site here already therefore a question is raised around how much more open the site should be. Consideration should be given to bookending views using buildings, rather than funnelling space between them. W1 and 2 could potentially be 'kinked' more, jostling the form to further enclose the open space, without taking away views and access.

How the gable ends of buildings are expressed on the Fanshawe Road side particularly needs attention too. They need not to be blank and all of the apartment and housing blocks must turn corners successfully. Street montages could prove to be very helpful in overcoming these and other issues created by the bulk and design of the proposed apartment buildings, that are all very out of character with the surrounding dwellings' pitched roofs. The scope for apartments in roofs should be considered. Overall, there is perceived to be considerable scope for more playing with height in this and other ways.

A better understanding is also needed of each of the proposed apartment blocks and their visual amenity street-side and in relation to the proposed open space – it is not at all clear whether it lies behind, or in front of them.

In conclusion, the eastern blocks are more successful than the western block of W1 and 2. Specifically, W1 and 2 is too high and too long, and also raises concerns in terms of how the conjoined block meets the ground. The spaces immediately around its base are not as resolved as they could be.

As a consequence of all of the panel's concerns that focus particularly around the height, bulk and massing of block W1 and 2, an exploration of a more formalised site layout based on that of an urban 'square' might capture the space better as an

entrance to the recreation ground, and allow massing to be spread around the site, with more height elsewhere.

Materials and detailing

The panel endorses the proposed materials' strategy and it helping to create a development that is characterful e.g. with the use of sawtooth brickwork. Also using other techniques from the locality should be considered too. It is acknowledged that block W1/ W2 uses cantilevered and inset balconies successfully to create 'special moments' that work well together with different materials - and a selection of brick tones for contrast and to lighten the colours on the main building.



Proposed Ground Floor Plan – extracted from the applicant's presentation document

The above comments represent the views of the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel and are made without prejudice to the determination of any planning application should one be submitted. Furthermore, the views expressed will not bind the decision of Elected Members, should a planning application be submitted, nor prejudice the formal decision making process of the council.

Contact Details

Please note the following contacts for information about the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel:

Joanne Preston (Joint Panel Manager)

joanne.preston@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7514 923122

Bonnie Kwok (Joint Panel Manager)

bonnie.kwok@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7949 431548

Katie Roberts (Panel Administrator)

Katie.roberts@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7871 111354