

## Partners Responses to Orchard Park Questionnaire

	Question	Response/Comment	SCDC Action to take forward
Q1	What has worked well in Orchard Park?	C1. I really like the community feel and the camaraderie that I feel here. The School and Hotel are a success also. (Community Councillor)	A1 - 4. Details of facilities, timeline and supporting comments will be added to SCDC website including any promotional/factual information produced by SCDC/partners about Orchard Park.
		C2. We are still finding ourselves as a community but there are some real positive achievements like our school and the community centre but what is working the best has to be the groups that have formed out of residents coming together. This is what will define the community at the end of the day. (Community Councillor)	
		C3. Some of the house builders have produced very attractive developments. The public open space has been well designed and laid out. (Developer)	
		C4. The Circus – a lovely open space at the centre of the development that allows townhouses to be built without reducing the light and airy feel of the development. The large POS – With basketball hoop, and play equipment for all ages, as well as an informal green open space. It seems to be well used and forms a focal point for the community. Mixture of designs – Each element of the development has its own character. Flexibility – During the downturn there was sufficient flexibility to welcome more affordable housing onsite. Engaging the community once problems started to arise, and tackling the issues they raised. (Cambridgeshire Horizons)	A4. SCDC will continue to work closely with partners and communities on all growth sites, and is currently developing a joint engagement strategy with our partners.
		C5. Some very good design and layouts, eg, Martin Grant Homes at the Circus, Courtyards etc. Good play areas/open space, School. (Local authority)	A5. Best practice designs will be taken forward in design guides for future developments.
Q2	What has not worked so well in Orchard Park?	C1. The building! It seems to be fractured and no site gels with another. The play areas and local amenities are very slow in coming, which is inexcusable. Parking is also difficult; I don't	A1. This lesson has been learnt, for example, a phasing plan for Trumpington Meadows will be agreed before any development commences. It will ensure development starts at

		<p>think anyone was realistic when the amount of cars for the development was considered. The last thing that annoys me is the quality of the planting around the area, many of the plants are dead/dying and paved areas are full of weeds giving a scruffy impression to visitors. (Community Councillor)</p>	<p>the northern end of the site adjacent the existing community of Trumpington and then works South towards the M11. This should minimise the impact on new residents as the building moves southward completing infrastructure and planting as it goes. Parking is being addressed through a personalised travel planning project, car clubs and the use of the guided bus once opened.</p> <p>In this current planting season, street trees are being replaced where necessary and maintenance carried out.</p>
		<p>C2. In completed streets, paving and above all that we do not have our shopping centre yet this is one of the most asked about issues in Orchard Park and must be resolved soon. (Community Councillor)</p>	<p>A2. SCDC and County are working together to speed up adoption times whilst requiring the developer to compete surfaces outside occupied homes. This is working in Orchard Park with special arrangements being put in place for less mobile residents to aid movement around the development. The provision of shops is market led but SCDC continues to work with Gallagher's and has recently granted detailed planning permission for the local centre.</p>
		<p>C3. The design guide is poor. It is overly prescriptive yet based on a very basic and poorly thought through sketch design. The phasing has not worked well which left some new occupants in the middle of sites, which would not be built out for perhaps several years. The Council were greedy in their section 106 demands which put pressure on the viability of the development and which was partly a cause of the site grinding to a halt. The Council did not properly engage with all of the landowners but tried to impose what they had agreed with Gallagher on the others. The Council were too concerned to meet all of the demands and threats of the RSLs to the detriment of the project as a whole. The design review panel was a waste of time because it did not adopt a consistent approach; some schemes appeared in front of it 3 times whilst other schemes were refused a second presentation; it seemed</p>	<p>A3. With the appointment of a joint urban design team, greater consideration is being given to the timing and content of design guides and codes and will provide consistent advice on schemes. All landowners signed the S106 agreement for Orchard Park.</p>

		to depend on whether the scheme was on Gallagher's part of the site. Too much time was wasted in disagreements between South Cambs and the County Council. There were too many people to deal with all of whom had differing opinions; planning officers, officers with responsibility for particular aspects, the county council, the parish council, the design review panel, the council members etc. The Councils should co-ordinate themselves better so that the process is more streamlined and consistent. (Developer)	
		C4. Phasing – Issues relating to the phasing of the development have been exasperated by the economic downturn. Commercial land – A large patch of the development, which still stands empty. Additional community facilities – have taken some time to bring on-line, in particular the tennis courts etc... which are yet to be developed at the rear of Orchard Park. (Cambridgeshire Horizons)	A4. SCDC is working on bringing undeveloped land forward using innovative approaches where possible and encouraging developers to apply for other sources of funding e.g. Kick-start Two. Work commenced in June 2009 on POS1, which includes tennis courts, pitches a play area and skate park. It is due to be complete in March 2010.
		C5. "Pepperpotting" of social housing to my mind has not happened with large chunks of social housing not really integrated either physically by appearance. Phasing plan. To my mind, this needs to apply to the whole scheme and not be skewed because affordable housing money is available. The community implications apply just as much to RSL tenants as private occupants through not having facilities available. Better phasing would have meant complete phases completed/adopted etc without the fragmentation there currently is. Handover of community facilities. There needs to be a clearly agreed and signed off specification for such facilities at the start and once completed to that specification, they are handed over. The fact that they do not meet what people expected is irrelevant - the time to get things right is the start, not the end. (Local authority)	A5. Affordable housing clusters were agreed for Orchard park. Unfortunately the market housing has not been developed as quickly as planned so there does appear to be a lack of integration at this point. Phasing plans for Trumpington Meadows will be agreed before any development commences. It will ensure development starts at the northern end of the site adjacent the existing community of Trumpington and then works South towards the M11. The addition of a community technical officer shared with the city council is facilitating better building specifications for all community buildings.

<b>Q3.</b>	What Improvements would you like to see in Orchard Park and how/who do you see leading on these?	C1. We, the Community Council, are trying to work to sort these problems, amongst others. (Community Councillor)	A1. SCDC is committed to working with the Community Council attending meetings and continuing to chair the Orchard park Liaison Group.
		C2. Litter on the streets and where they are building to be kept tidy at all times with single access to the sites. Even though the roads have not been adopted as residents that pay council tax this should be something that between the developers and SCDC is resolved soon. (Community Councillor)	A2. SCDC are working with the Community Development Worker to fund litter-picking equipment for the community. SCDC and County are working together to speed up road adoption times whilst requiring the developer to compete surfaces outside occupied homes.
		C3. The local centre needs to come forward soon so that the residents have some facilities available in close proximity to where they live. (Developer)	A3. The provision of shops is market led but SCDC continues to work with Gallagher's and has recently granted detailed planning permission for the local centre.
		C4. Continued research into uses of K1 and the wider retail strategy, to allow the progression of a local centre and other innovative development work. (Cambridgeshire Horizons)	A4. SCDC and partners are working on bringing undeveloped land forward using innovative approaches where possible and encouraging developers to apply for other sources of funding e.g. Kick-start two.
		C5. Just get the remaining sites developed out, roads adopted etc. Commercial facilities need to be available as soon as possible so that yet more building work doesn't start just as the residential work is all concluded. This will be market led so difficult to achieve. (Local authority)	A5. SCDC and partners are working on bringing undeveloped land forward using innovative approaches where possible and encouraging developers to apply for other sources of funding e.g. Kick-start two. A planning application for the commercial centre is being considered in December 2009 by SCDC planning committee.
<b>Q4.</b>	What steps could we take to ensure lessons are learned for the developments still to come in the district?	C1. Many, but the most important lesson is to keep the developers moving and working but not to have too many projects on the go at once. It would have been nice to have some completely finished areas of refuge on the Park. I don't think enough onus was placed on the importance of a local shop or pub, which is surprising since this was one of the main complaints in Cambourne. (Community Councillor)	A1. This lesson has been learnt, for example, a phasing plan for Trumpington Meadows will be agreed before any development commences. It will ensure development starts at the northern end of the site adjacent the existing community of Trumpington and then works South towards the M11. This should minimise the impact on new residents as the building moves southward completing infrastructure and planting as it goes.
		C2. This can only really be said when Orchard Park is totally finished. (Community Councillor)	A2. No comment.
		C3. Do not pretend that planners or planning consultants or	A3. With the appointment of a joint urban design team, greater

		<p>fashionable “community involvement” architects are able to produce a prescriptive design guide which, if rigorously enforced, will produce a good design. Learn from the things which are poor and produce a far shorter design guide which only deals with land uses, density ranges and height / massing ranges and which then lists out things which are not permitted. It is easier to list, for example, no external services on buildings, no satellite dishes etc and any other aspects, which have been found to be unacceptable than to try to design a quality scheme. Leave it to the individual scheme architects to produce the high quality design; they will be able to do a far better job if they are not constrained by a facile design guide, which is rigidly applied by the Council. Adopt a phasing plan which will not leave people living in the middle of a building site for years if market conditions change. Be more realistic about scheme viability and do not place unreasonable section 106 demands on developments. Developers would be able to fund the early on site provision of community facilities if the council did not take up front section 106 money which is not even intended to be spent on infrastructure for the specific development. The Council should prioritise the section 106 payments so that the early payments relate to on site facilities and off site payments are later in the overall development. (Developer)</p>	<p>consideration is being given to the timing and content of design guides and codes and will provide consistent advice on schemes. Scheme viability is being more closely scrutinised; early community provision will continue to be a priority and S106 agreements will be monitored closely.</p>
		<p>C4. I think the most important step to take is to look at the processes that have been used, and replicate those that have worked well (such as the engagement with residents to address their concerns) in future developments. Scrutiny reports appear to have been of great use to capture lessons, but it could be even more positive to formulate them together. Partnership working remains key. (Cambridgeshire Horizons)</p>	<p>A4. SCDC is looking to develop the Quality charter principles in to a “New Communities Compendium (toolkit)” which will assist partners in delivering all aspects of new communities.</p>
		<p>C5. No comment.</p>	<p>A5. No comment.</p>

<b>Q5</b>	Do you have any other comments to make regarding Orchard Park?	1. Love living here and hate any negative press, I am very excited to see how things pan out in the coming months. (Community Councillor)	A1. SCDC and partners have a media plan in place which aims to combat negative press and publicise the positive aspects and activities at Orchard Park.
		2. In short Orchard park is a community in progress and as this we must except that we will still make mistakes but that we do have a wonderful community and together we can make it a place were people want to live. (Community Councillor)	
		3. A survey carried out by Barton Willmore in the lead up to the Barratt appeal found that a large percentage of the residents park on the roads rather than in their designated parking bays. It seemed to be because the parking bays were not conveniently placed. (Developer)	A3. Design guidance for future developments will look to ensure the most appropriate parking arrangements are put in place. More work is planned on the personalised travel planning to make residents more aware of other forms of transport.
		4. It is good to see that (on the whole) Orchard Park is being reflected in a more positive light in the media now. I wonder whether OP residents would be willing to share their experiences with other developments in the future, to help get things started off on a positive footing, avoid any (for them) predictable problems and help residents see the power of engagement right from the start...? (Cambridgeshire Horizons)	A4. The Community Development worker at Orchard Park is facilitating this sort of experience sharing for example, residents at Loves Farm, St Neots are planning to visit Orchard Park to learn from other residents and the Community Council.
		C5. I think the location of the local centre is debatable as to whether successful or not. Prominent main road frontage would have ensured viability with passing trade and not dependent upon limited local households. The school seems to be in a strange location on the edge of the development rather than the centre. The sound fencing coming down is a concern. (Local authority)	A5. The location of the local centre may change depending n the results of the retail study however highways issues will need to be resolved if it was to be adjacent King's Hedges Road. The location of the school was agreed with the County Council. The removal of the sound fence will be subject to further planning permissions alongside the A14 and the widening of the A14.