

NOTES OF A MEETING

- Subject: APPROVAL OF DETAILS
3 PHASES OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PAPWORTH EVERARD
S/1424/08/RM, S/1624/08/RM, S/1688/08/RM**
- Purpose: TO AGREE A CONSENSUS APPROACH BETWEEN
THE PCC, SCDC and their urban design and landscape
advisors**
- Date: 16.12.2008**
- Present: NB, CC – SCDC
Fiona Goodville, Paul Hicks, Chris Howlett - PCC
RD, NP – professional advisors to SCDC**

1.0 PREAMBLE

- A number of procedural issues were discussed concerning the outline consent, associated planning conditions and their applicability to the approval of reserved matters.
- The PCC also considered issues of drainage remained unresolved with Anglian Water.
- PCC noted that applicants had declined to meet them to further discuss reserved matters
- It was agreed that the key purpose of the meeting was to consider the various plans submitted. There was some confusion as to what plans had actually been received, submitted and commented upon. To resolve this, it was agreed that
 1. NB would circulate/ re-circulate all relevant phase 2 plans (for the middle and southern phases). **ACTION – NB TO CIRCULATE.**
 2. This meeting would consider in detail phase 1 (for the northern part of the site).
 3. It was agreed that there were issues of overall co-ordination / design coherence across the entire site that would require attention in addition. These would include key views, continuity of landscape design, and other issues.

2.0 ANALYSIS OF NORTHERN PHASE (APPLICATION 1424)

2.1 Layout

It was agreed that there were issues of general principle and matters of detail. The key matters of principle were agreed as

- The introduction of the larger house types and its setting out in a more geometric format has diminished the design quality.
- There are a considerable number of small areas of space that cannot obviously be defined as either public (and publicly maintainable) or private (and defensible). These will therefore present problems of spatial organisation, maintenance and appearance. Clear definition of land to be adopted and land to be privately

conveyed would assist open area design, and associated enclosures (see bullet point below). Plots 7,9,28, 29, 38, 47 and 48 are examples.

- The layout does not distinguish between, adequately define, or provide a purpose/function /visual hierarchy for masonry walls, fences, railings and other enclosures, for example hedges.
- A plan showing the building storey heights and how they are related to urban design principles is required to properly consider the reserved matters.
- The housing layout and landscaping need to be considered simultaneously as one urban design exercise. Therefore, to fulfil reserved matters, there should be information on surface materials, planting etc (in addition to matters including boundary treatments etc) raised above.
- Access to rear gardens along with wheelie bin standings and put out routes + rear and side gates inadequately defined. Plots 9 and 44 for example appear to have no satisfactory rear access.

The matters of detail were identified as

- Plot 1 - re-orientate to face pos.
- Plots 1, 2 and elsewhere - turning heads / open parking in front of houses to public view; revised lha. standards may no longer require turning areas to dwellings on estate distributor road.
- r/o/Plots 6 & 8 - parking court large and awkward/ geometric in layout; has detrimental effect on setting of listed building; how enclosed – fences, brick walls?
- Thatched Cottage Green / Plot 29 - inadequate design response/ more separation to setting of listed building; higher ground to plots 28 & 29 not fully acknowledged / accounted for; views / framing/ planting issues.
- Plot 19 – backs of garages poorly orientated to street scene and in relation to back edge of footpath.
- Plot 78 – A satisfactory response to urban design comment.
- St John's Lane – the larger dwellings are less well orientated in relation to the curved road alignment and will not produce the same quality of street scene as previous layout; related issues re front garden depths and loss of private garden areas.
- Turning Head to Plot 66 – unsatisfactory in urban design terms.
- Turning Head adj. Plot 63 – Over-large; effect of large expanse of hard surface exacerbated by unsatisfactory relationship of turning head and driveway.
- Plots 30 & 32 – improved in relation to urban design advice.
- Plot 41 and Corner – space for tree planting has been eroded; now not practical to include large trees to give strong enclosure to street scene.
- Plots 51 – 54 – important elements in spatial organisation / enclosure of Church View Square; quality of house design; requires full integration/ co-ordination with other phases.

2.2 Building Materials

Key agreed principles were:

- The development will be very visible in the Cambridgeshire landscape and have a major impact on the settlement. Materials should therefore be appropriate to Papworth, as defined in local and district design guides.

- An overall cohesive and consistent choice of materials, with limited and logical variations within it is preferable to one group of buildings in one mixture of materials, with other groups in other materials, with no apparent rationale.
- A buff Cambridge stock brick with small plain tile roofs to 2 storey and 2.5 storey buildings with pantiles to single storey buildings was the preferred choice for the overall materials pallet. Slate, red bricks etc may be appropriate to give carefully contrived variation.
- The detailing of the buildings should reflect the choice of materials; for example, steeply sloped roofs are appropriate to plain tiles, but pantiles are appropriate with roof slopes of 30 – 35 degrees.

2.3 Building Design

It was noted that

- the submitted plans are very much “standard designs” with limited adaptation to the Cambridgeshire vernacular.
- The Argyle type is highly visible from Ermine Street.

Details that were considered unsatisfactory included

- The heavy brickwork parapet kneelers.
- Wood/pvc box bargeboards and eaves.
- Brick on edge soldier courses.
- The 6 panel door to house type 497 is too elaborate for the dwelling size/design.

Do PCC wish to include their detailed comments for each type? Is NP comfortable with this? At the meeting we concluded that the rear extension to the Malvern? Type was quite agreed as awkward but at this stage, did not structure discussion and did not consider in detail the other house types.

It was also concluded that

- Individual plot design variations were necessary on key plots and these should be detailed.
- Certain house types did not appear to have full detailed drawings.
- Some straightforward architectural detailing, for example, brick arch lintel heads above doors and windows and stone sills, was necessary on the rear elevations, on the basis that the rear elevations would be seen from within the housing area and from distant views.
- More information was needed on materials and detailing, for example were the sills indicated on the drawing artificial or natural stone, or wood, or brick?
- Like materials, there should be an overall and consistent theme for detailing, with logical variations.

3.0 PROGRAMME AND ACTIONS

- NB to distribute phase 2 application plans asap.
- All to give dates to NB for reconvened meeting to consider phase 2 – suggest during 2nd and 3rd weeks in Jan?
- NB to advise applicants of re-scheduling to Feb committee.

Prepared by: **RD**
16.12.08

Choice of Building Materials and Notes on Associated Architectural Detailing

Application: Housing Developments at Papworth Everard
By: RD
Date: 7th January 2009
Status: Draft Document for Discussion.

Introduction

The SCDC Design Guide 2005 (Draft SPD) sets Papworth Everard within the Western Claylands. Within this landscape character area it is stated that

- Buildings are generally one and a half or two and a half storeys in height and domestic in scale.
- Walls materials include plaster frame construction (mostly cream in colour), warm red brickwork and occasionally yellow brick. Farm buildings are typically of brick, weatherboarding and flint.
- Roof materials include plain clay tiles, pantiles, longstraw thatch and Welsh slate (the latter only from the 1850's onwards).
- Timber frame (ie. 17th c and earlier buildings) details include high pitched roofs, casement windows or horizontal sliding sashes, gable and window drip boards; 4 or 6 panel doors on more formal houses, plank doorson cottages; chimneys set laterally on the roof ridge.
- 18th c houses (which occur in a few villages) have details that include 4 or 6 panel doors, gauged brick arches over windows and distinctive cornices.
- 19th c houses (which also occur in just a few villages) have details that include sawtooth dentil courses, 4 or 12 panel sash windows, decorative/contrasting/polychromatic brick banding, detailing and chimneys at gables flush with gable walls.

A key principle of the guide is to “Ensure new developments reflect the form, scale and proportions of existing vernacular buildings and pick up on traditional building styles, materials, colours and textures of the locality.”

The Guide also introduces the concept of a “materials hierarchy”, with socially important buildings such as country houses generally using higher quality materials than for example agricultural stores and outhouses. The importance of design compatibility / historical accuracy between materials and architectural detailing is also emphasised.

The table overleaf gives an indication of materials and associated notes that provides a starting point for a co-ordinated choice of materials on all the proposed Papworth Everard housing schemes.

House Type	Suggested Materials	Notes
2.5 storey house forms (19 th c design type)	<p>Walls: warm red Cambs. stock bricks.</p> <p>Roof: small plain tiles</p> <p>Wooden Joinery</p> <p>Dressings</p>	<p>Gauged brick window and door arches, 3 course platbands (at first floor level) corbled eaves and brick plinths are associated details.</p> <p>Multi mix incorporating buffs, pinks and red/browns.</p> <p>Dormer design should reflect materials – therefore gabled dormers most appropriate.</p> <p>Wood / pvc box eaves and fascias are not acceptable.</p> <p>Sash windows and 4 or 6 panel front doors with plank type rear doors.</p> <p>Recon stone sills to doors and windows</p>
2 storey form (18 th c influence)	As 2.5 storey above.	
Other 2 storey forms	<p>As above but</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. casement windows more appropriate 2. plank doors 3. 1 or 2 Cambs buff stocks may be appropriate 4. 1 or 2 red brick and flint panel buildings at key visual locations. 5. 1 or 2 slate type roofs in combination with the buff stock bks. 6. 1 or 2 rendered buildings – cottage type, in combination with buff pantiles. 	<p>Brick arches most appropriate above doors and windows.</p> <p>Could use thatch on cottage buildings in very specific key visual locations!!</p> <p>Porches, dormers etc to use same material as main roof and incorporate appropriate design details.</p>
Single Storey Buildings, including garages	<p>Walls: -Red stock bks -Chosen white stock bks -Black stain horizontal weather boarding. -Red stock brick with flint panels (on key focal point buildings). -red and buff stock bks In alternate banded courses (single course or 3 course bands). - Render</p> <p>Roofs: predominantly buff single roll pantiles; some triple roll and 1 or 2 orange pantile ok.</p>	<p>Brick plinth detail most appropriate with horizontal boarding, flints etc.</p> <p>Cream painted</p>

NOTES OF A MEETING

**Subject: APPROVAL OF DETAILS
DAVID WILSON SITE
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PAPWORTH EVERARD
S/1688/08/RM**

**Purpose: TO AGREE A CONSENSUS APPROACH BETWEEN
THE PCC, SCDC and David Wilson Homes and their
architects / advisors on DETAILED DESIGN ISSUES
following JANUARY COMMITTEE MTG**

Date: 21.1.2009

**Present: NB - SCDC
Paul Hicks, Chris Howlett - PCC
RD – professional advisor to SCDC
John Finney – CCC Highways
Samantha Ley – Senior Land Manager DW Homes
Phil Leggett – Planning Manager DW Homes
Chris Hatfield – DW Homes
David Goodwin – CHBC Architecture**

1.0 PROGRAMME, SUBMISSIONS, CONDITIONS

- PL noted that DW were content to accept the planning conditions on the outline consent. NB explained that there were legal problems with some of the conditions; therefore there would have to be an alternative form of agreement. **AGREED** that **NB and DW** to meet w/b 26.1.09 to resolve legal mechanism to handle those matters that cannot be dealt with by planning condition.

2.0 ATTENUATION TANK / SUMMERFIELD GREEN

- SL stated that the attenuation tank was not needed; pond at bottom of site can be deepened and will have standing water in it at all times. Associated safety issues noted. Also potential ecological issues / opportunities. **SL TO CONFIRM** water levels and permanency.

3.0 SPECIFIC URBAN DESIGN ISSUES / RESOLUTIONS

- **Plots 160 – 161** – path to be repositioned as previously agreed (**DG to revise**)
- nuity of frontages required. **AP to revise.**
- **Plots 163 & 164** – noted that NP had recommended dwellings to be aligned with road. **Agreed to stay with revised (tabled) CHBC plan.**
- **Plots 155 & 156 - ????**
- **Plot 120** – revised shallower plan depth with hip form noted **and agreed.**
- **129 – 132** – show brown path to rear gardens and garage court; add tree planting on enlarged verge to rear of 128.

- **112** – realignment to NP’s recommendations noted. **Agreed that** 2 rear parking areas to be divided by widened verge with fence to one side with hedge to other; also incorporating specimen tree?
- **Windmill Place** – re-alignment to NP’s suggestion was noted.
- **29 – 30** - bin stores removed!
- **38 - 65** – re-alignment with 39 – 42 noted.
- **27** – garage position change noted.
- **21** – house position adjustment noted along with retention of original house type (see also detailed house type design notes).
- **67 – 69** - resolve through elevational treatments.
- **Plot 66 (with 76-69) – re-align / re-design** so plot 66 presents front face to entry up Summers Hill Drive (CHBC to provide sketch illustration).
- **Plot 81** – boundary treatments notes and principles **accepted**. **Noted that the boundary treatment principles were set out in the brief. PC stated that they would not wish to see fence panels between brick piers (suggested all enclosures of one material only; also hedges to public areas should not be hawthorn or other prickly subjects. Generally accepted that public / private spaces would be screened by 1.8m brick walls; private to private enclosures to be 1.8 m close boarded fences with hedges, lower fences etc in specific agreed circumstances.**
- **87 – 91** – dwelling re-alignment and path re-positioning **noted**.
- **96 – 98** – 2.5 storeys is an issue with PC. DW Homes to investigate
 - i. possibility of substituting the 2.5 storey on these plots with some 2 storey elsewhere.
 - ii. Incorporating some strategic mature tree planting within the tree belt to give “more instant” screening.
- **Plots 95 – 87** – realignment as NP’s suggestions noted; high quality hard landscaping noted as more practical front garden treatment than grass strips.
- **ROADS AND FOOTWAY AND RAMP ALIGNMENTS** – **CHBC to realign road ramps in relation to footways to give continuous pedestrian / disabled access.**

4.0 HOUSE TYPE DESIGNS

- **Entrance House** – **Agreed as a one of design but detailing and materials are crucial – to be developed.**
- **RD to review CHBC amended plans beside NP’s recommendations and report back to meeting on 30.1.09.**

5.0 BUILDING MATERIALS

- **SL to provide RD with DW materials schedule (done 22.1.09)**
- **RD to provide SL with SCDC materials doc (done 22.1.09).**

6.0 NEXT MEETING

- **10.00am 30th Jan. at Cambourne**

Meeting Closed: 17.25 hrs
Prepared by: RD
Date: 26.1.09

NOTES OF A MEETING

**Subject: APPROVAL OF DETAILS
DAVID WILSON SITE
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PAPWORTH EVERARD
S/1688/08/RM**

Purpose: TO FINALISE HOUSE TYPE DESIGNS

Date: 30.1.2009

**Present: NB - SCDC
Brian Johnson, Chris Howlett - PCC
RD – professional advisor to SCDC
David Goodwin – CHBC Architecture
Jason Hanney - CHBC
Patrick McArthey – DW**

3.0 GENERIC ITEMS – Common to all house types

- **Chimneys** – agreed as either 2 or 3 corbled courses in brick to match house types.
- **Window Materials** – DW prefer upv; SCDC prefer wood. **NB TO RESEARCH PLANNING HISTORY FILE TO CONFIRM PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS, IF ANY.**
- **Fascia Details** – 2 corbled courses to eaves agreed, with slim fascia board screwed to upper bkwk course **agreed**, as RD detail.
- **Rear Elevation Detailing** – SCDC requested bk arches and sills to rear elevations, throughout, as previously stated.
- **Window / Door Head and Sill Details**
 - SCDC requested art stone sills to all dwellings, front and rear. **PMc to refer to DW and respond.**
 - RD requested confirmation that, where stone sills specified, the windows & doors will not incorporate pre- formed sills. **AGREED THAT SECTIONS OF WINDOWS/DOORS TO BE REQ'D AS CONDITION TO CONSENT.**
- **Porch Design** – robust section, wood, with simple mortice and tenon type detailing **AGREED** – detailed design **TO BE CONDITIONED.**
- **Rooflights** – Flush to roof slope conservation type preferred by SCDC, but by modern manufacturer (Velux etc); **PMc to confirm.**
- **Patio and Patio Bay Side Windows** – **JH / PMc to investigate incorporation of glazing bars to side windows to form relationship with other windows throughout houses.**

4.0 HOUSE TYPES – DETAILED DESIGN ISSUES.

- **P 431 WD5** – incorp. 4 panel door throughout range.

Type 2 – AGREED REVISIONS – fully rendered to a brick plinth – height and plinth detail tba; brick chimney (to match bricks on plinth / below dpc); pitched porch canopy; stone sills to be added.

- **P331 R5**
 - Style 1 – **incorp.** robust wood porch design.
 - Style 2 – **detailing to be revised** as P341 Type 2's AND, add sills, **incorp.** a plank door; **incorp** 3 casement window to bay; details of porch to be **conditioned**.
- **Type 03 – incorp.** conservation type (flush with roof slope) rooflight with a mullion; small rooflight to 2nd floor en suite **to be investigated**; **consider** details of door case (**could be conditioned**); re-alignment of large **rooflights agreed**; re-alignment of rooflight, 1st floor window and GF door **agreed**; incorporation of dogtooth detail **to eaves to be investigated & tba**; **arch details recommended** to GF; splayed bays **agreed**.
- **Type 03 (Type 2) – revision of porch and front door details agreed**; conservation type roof light but **no mullion recommended**; **re-align windows as 03 above**; **re-align GF, 1st F and attic windows**.
- **Type 04 – Revised dormer window sizes (1050mm sq) agreed**; dormer detailing **to be conditioned**; rear dormers to be **substituted for con type rooflights**;
- **Type 05 – rooflights as above**; bay window detailing **noted!**
- **Type 06 – revised gables with narrower windows agreed**; other minor **alterations agreed**.
- **Type 07 – as generic points**
- **Type 08 – as generic points**; **incorp 4 panel door + slightly bigger door hood**.
- **Type 09 Style 1– remove bay**
 - Style 2 Plot 119 – revise design**
 - **Type 11 – leave bay** as 4 light window; other suggestions **agreed**.
 - **Type 13 – inc 4 panel door**; dormers **PMc to report back**.
 - **Type 14 – revise** as RD suggestions (plans 1&2).
 - **Type 15 – reconsider** rear elevation (DW)
 - Render on Plot 106 **to be replaced by standard bk type + 4 panel door**
 - + canopy with contemporary windows.
- **Plot 16 – ok** but heads and sills **to be revised**.
- Plot 16 Style 2 – principle of boarding **agreed**; details and colour **to be conditioned**. **JH to revisit** front elevation.
- **Type 17 – revise front door detail**; fundamental problems with lack of rear access – **JH to re-visit**; RD's comments **to be incorp**. **JH / PMc to email revised plans** elevations for SCDC & PC comment.
- **Type 18 - 4 panel door!**
- **Type 19 – ok!!**
- **Type 20 – replace soldier course with bk arches**.
- **Type 23 (one off design) DG / PMc to email revised design**, as introductory unit between entrance design and rest of estate.
- **Type 27 – accepted!**
- **Type 27 Style 2 – as previous comments re render –revert to brick Type 27 – contemporary style**.
- **Type 28 – agreed!**
- **Type 29 – Agreed!**

- **Type 31** – Agreed (& as previous).
- **Type 30** – OK in principle but note suggestions and inclusion of conditions esp. re materials – **DG to confirm / revise.**

5.0 GARAGES

- RD's suggestions noted and **to be considered.**
- PMc **confirmed** most garage doors would NOT incorporate upper lights.
- **Agreed** that piers would be **equalised.**
- Suggestion that side doors to be solid (plank type) and small window incorporated in gables **to be considered**

4.0 BUILDING MATERIALS

Materials related to house types were agreed as follows:

- **Larger House Types and 2.5 storey Houses**
 - **Roofs** – conc. plain tiles red / pink mix colours etc tba.
 - **Walls** – mainly buff Cambs type clay stock brick; one or two key properties to be in red/brown Cambs stock type clay bricks; (unless specified as render.
- **Mid Range Houses**
 - **Roofs (from)**
Conc plain tiles
Pantile type tiles (pink or yellow)
Welsh slate type tiles
 - **Walls (from)** – mainly buff Cambs stock type bk; one or two red/brown Cambs stock type bks to more formal designs; render or horiz. Wood type boarding as specified.
- **Smaller Dwelling Types**
 - **Roofs (from)**
pantile types tiles (pink/red or yellow)
Welsh slate replica tiles.
 - **Walls (from)**
Buff Cambs type clay stock bks
Render
Horiz Wood type boarding
- **Garages**
 - **Roofs** – pantile or slate types
 - **Walls** – buff bk, boards or render.

NOTES

1. **Boarding** – Colours and detailing to be agreed – Planning CONDITION.
2. **Render** – Colours and detailing to be agreed – Planning CONDITION.
3. **RWG's** – black pvc

4. **Windows** – materials to be research re planning history.
5. **Window and Door Sills, Keystones, Kneelers etc**– artificial stone detailing, colour etc to be **CONDITIONED**.
6. Plot 30 – materials for wood, rwgs. Wood windows etc all as one off

Meeting Closed: 14.00 hrs
Prepared by: RD
Date: 02.2.09