

Appeal

APP/W0530/W/22/3291523

Land at Teversham Road, Fulbourn
CAMBRIDGESHIRE, CB21 5EB

Proof of Evidence

Gary Young

For South Cambridgeshire District Council

V2_26 April 2022

P L A C E 5 4
A R C H I T E C T S

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This proof of evidence has been prepared by Gary Young of Place 54 Architects to support South Cambridgeshire District Council with the Appeal by Castlefield International Limited Against refusal of Planning Permission for reserved matters S/3290/19/RM pursuant to outline planning permission S/0202/17/OL for Land at Teversham Road, Fulbourn
- 1.2. I was invited to provide proof of evidence by SCDC on 10th March 2022. I have visited the site and locality of the application on 3rd April 2022.
- 1.3. My evidence will concentrate on the issue highlighted in the Council statement of case para 5.0 Reason for refusal 01 RfR1 which refer to the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area having particular regard to the both the approved outline planning permission and the Fulbourn Village Design Guide SPD 2020.
- 1.4. I am a qualified architect with 40 years' experience in the practice of architecture and urban design, formerly a director from 1980 of Farrells architects, founding director in 1992 of award winning practice Higgs Young Architects, now Place 54 Architects. I have experience in residential masterplanning and outline planning submissions for new garden towns and garden villages including Cambourne in Cambridgeshire, Otterpool Park in Kent, town residential extensions including Bicester Eco Town, and village residential extensions at Brightwell Oxfordshire and completed residential designs, including award winning houses in Netherlands completed 2005 and Tomorrows Garden City Letchworth completed 2012. Ref Appendix 6.1
- 1.5. I support the Council statement of case para 5.0 that the scale and design of the apartment buildings A and B would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and on this issue the reason for refusal 01 RfR1 was justified.

2. Issue with compliance to parameters of the height of the blocks A and B

- 2.1. The heights to the eaves and ridge of the proposed elevations of the blocks A and B exceed the heights approved in the Outline application parameters and are a reason for refusal.
- 2.2. The approved outline application parameters plan M06 E has stated a maximum heights above grade up 6m to eaves and 10.5m to ridge.
- 2.3. The submitted elevations for block A 28815-P13-90-P3 and block B 28815-P13-100-P3 have indicated heights to underside (U/S) eaves of +6.7m from an internal ground floor (GF FFL) indicated as +0.0 level. There are parts of the elevations not annotated with heights with eaves which are even higher than the annotated +6.7m. Fig 2.3.1 & 2 illustrates the maximum parameter eaves height the red line and proposed eaves height in excess of parameter height in purple line. We have also measured the proposed ridges not annotated and indicated by red line maximum parameter ridge height and proposed ridge height in purple. Refer also to 2.6 & 2.7 below.



Fig 2.3.1 block A 28815-P13-90-P3 – red line = parameters height, purple =proposed height



Fig 2.3.2 block B 28815-P13-100-P3 – red line = parameters height, purple =proposed height

- 2.4. The proposed eaves heights of block A and B as stated numerically on elevations therefore exceed approved parameters heights by 0.7m.
- 2.5. There is also a difference between “grade” on parameters which is a description of external levels and GF FFL +0.0 level on elevations which is a description used for internal level. This is typically + 0.15m between grade and GF FFL meaning the eaves heights exceed parameters by 0.85m.
- 2.6. The submitted elevations do not have annotated heights to ridge. The Council officers report states block A has a part with ridge height of 11.4m and block B ridge height of 11.5m.
- 2.7. The heights to the ridge of the proposed elevations as above 2.6 and fig 3.2.1.& 2 therefore exceed the height approved in the Outline application parameters by +1m
- 2.8. There are further issues of excess height caused by raising the proposed internal ground floor further above grade or existing levels for proposed drainage which is being dealt with separately in a proof by WSP.

3. Issues with the character of proposed scale and design of the blocks A and B

- 3.1. The scale and siting of the proposed two and a half storey buildings located centrally within the site would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and are a reason for refusal. The proposed designs of blocks A and B significantly erode the character of the existing open view and green space of Poor Well from Cow Lane fig 3.8.1 & fig 3.8.2, which provides a positive connection between the village and adjacent countryside.
- 3.2. In addition to the factual issue of non-compliance with the approved heights there are issues of scale and design in the assessment of blocks A and B which are subjective. These subjective issues and their evaluation are well described in the Council officers report paras 141 to 148, with a balance of opinion which has led to the officers recommendation for approval. I consider however, the report has given more weight to positives from mitigations than I would offer. I would suggest, balancing the evidence gathered in a study of the proposed design, the site Fig 3.8.1 & 3.8.2 and the context of the village fig 3.6.1-8 a conclusion that the design of blocks A and B does harm to the character of the village. The mitigations in the officer’s report therefore are not sufficient and there are reasons for refusal through poor quality design.
- 3.3. The Officers report para 145 acknowledges additional height of block A and B is in conflict with note 10.10 of the Fulbourn Village Design Guide SPD 2020 regarding scale, however seeks to balance this, suggesting a design mitigation from the orientation of gables and variation of the ridge heights on blocks A and B. This assessment considers a specific view from the south from Cow Lane across Poor Well. The proposed designs will, however be seen in the round from within the open space and the views from north with

the two and half storey scale exceeding the approved heights would not be an appropriate design for the village edge as noted in my para 3.5.

- 3.4. In my opinion, a design suitable for the village edge character with appropriate design quality for block A and B should have been a two storey design within the approved parameters heights similar to that illustrated in the Outline application design and access statement fig 3.4.1.



Fig 3.4.1 illustration on page 7 design and access statement with outline approval

- 3.5. Fulbourn Village Design Guide 10.10 cautions that increased height above two storeys should be considered with extreme care, any buildings should be sited away from prominent frontages to minimise visual presence and be articulated to avoid any bulkiness. I agree with the above and moreover note 10.6 in the Guide which states gateway buildings should not be used at edges, suggesting that green gateway open spaces are more appropriate.
- 3.6. I have observed the edges of Fulbourn village with views to the open countryside which are illustrated figs 3.6.1-6 and these have a character created by lower horizontal buildings such as two storey houses and single story farm courtyards with boundary enclosure of local materials with planting.



Fig 3.6.1 View west on Hinton Rd



fig 3.6.2 View south on Sanders Lane



Fig 3.6.3 View south off Church Lane



fig 3.6.4 View north on Home End



Fig 3.6. 5 View east on Impetts Lane



fig 3.6.6 View north on The Chantry & Barleyfields

3.7. I have also studied Fulbourn village context and noted that buildings with additional height contributing to the village character are located in the centre and are of a high quality design and craftsmanship, using a palette local materials, creating variety and the distinctiveness of the place.



Fig 3.7.1 View south along Church Lane



Fig 3.7.2 View south from Church Lane



Fig 3.7.3 View north on School Ln to High St



Fig 3.7.4 View north on Manor Walk

3.8. The proposed design of block A and B with additional height is therefore in my opinion a misunderstanding of both the significance of the rural edge location of the site and the function of the proposed open space which includes the chalk stream on the edge of the village adjacent to Poor Well which relates to the open countryside not the village centre.



Fig 3.8.1 & 3.8.2 View from Cow Lane across Poor Well north to site and open countryside

- 3.9. The proposed blocks A and B are designed as a gateway framing the open space with additional height emphasising their verticality rather than horizontality. This creates an object building typical of central urban locations.
- 3.10. A study of village character, supported by the Fulbourn Village Design Guide, suggests that the proposed design with emphasis on verticality is not appropriate in the location on the village edge.
- 3.11. An appropriate design for the village rural edge would be an enclosure of open green space with a horizontal building design creating an intimate residential space or courtyard as suggested in the Illustrative material in support of the outline approval fig 3.4.1 and existing locations in fig 3.6.1-8
- 3.12. The proposed block A and B design therefore does not address the requirement of para 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, which require developments to be of high quality design, to be compatible with its location in terms of scale and appearance and to make a positive contribution to its local and wider context and there are reasons for refusal through poor quality design.

4. Suggested redesign for block A and B

- 4.1. A suggested redesign which would reconfigure the block plan for A and B as a low rise courtyard, is an approach which is similar to that illustrated in the Outline application design and access statement fig 3.4.1. The suggested redesign in fig 4.1.1 would include the two houses adjacent block A and three houses adjacent to block B in order to create cohesive courtyard designs and would accommodate the same number & mix of homes provided as one and two storey flats.
- 4.2. The suggested redesign would create a character similar to Alms Houses or farmstead with courtyard character with two storey terraces. An example of Alms House courtyard design character is located on the edge of Fulbourn Village on Church Lane fig 4.2.1. which would provide a precedent for design character and quality, in a similar village edge location, however this example is one storey.
- 4.3. The proposal would need to be two storey to match the amount of accommodation in the proposed submission. A two storey courtyard design with a mix of traditional and contemporary Alms house illustrated fig 4.3.1 which would provide an example of appropriate character and design quality.



Fig 4.1.1 proposed redesign for block A and B as courtyards



Fig 4.2.1 Thrale Alms House Streatham BTPW



Fig 4.3.1 Alms Houses, Church Lane, Fulbourn

5. Issue of Quality of the proposed elevation design of the blocks A and B

5.1. The elevation drawings of the proposed block A and B 28815-P13-90-P3 & 100-P3 in fig Fig 2.3.1 & 2 use render in a single material with standard colours and details which are not unique to the village. These materials and details are used in many urban developments, therefore do not provide a high quality of design contributing to the village character and do not address the requirement of para 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, requiring developments to be of high quality design.

5.2. A palette of materials and details should be used which ensures new developments reflect the form, scale and proportions of the existing

vernacular buildings of the area and pick up on the traditional building styles materials, colours and textures of the locality. This is required for any redesign of blocks A and B to add variety and quality to the street scene. This is referenced in the Local Development Framework District Design Guide para 3.43 and 3.44. Some examples of traditional buildings are illustrated from Fulbourn in this proof fig 3.6.1-6 & 3.7.1-4, and other high quality contemporary details are described in in the Fulbourn Village Design Guide page 17.

6. Appendices

6.1. CV qualifications and experience

6.1 CV GARY YOUNG, RIBA, Director, Senior Architect & Masterplanner, Place 54 Architects

QUALIFICATIONS

1995 RIBA Chartered Architect
1981 ARB Registered Architect (ARB 048610H)
1981 RIBA professional qualification in Architecture
1980 Diploma in Architecture from Kingston University
1977 First class honours degree, Bachelor of Arts in Architecture from Newcastle University.

PROFESSIONAL

1998-present Director of Place 54 Architects Ltd formerly Higgs Young Architects Ltd

As director of Place 54 Architects based in London UK (formerly Higgs Young Architects until 2018) Gary Young has over 30 years directed the company delivering masterplans and construction detail for mixed use for private developers & local authorities.

1980 – present Farrells Collaborating-Partner.

Gary Young as a former design director continues as consultant to Farrells leading mixed use masterplans for commercial and residential Garden Town settlements.

PROJECT AWARDS

2007 RIBA Tomorrows Garden City Letchworth & British Homes Awards Home of the Future.
2004 RIBA Competition housing and marina– Lytham Quays.
1993 First Prize European 3 housing Haarlem completed 80 houses and apartments private sale/rent.
1987 Civic Trust Award & 2016 historic listing for Comyn Ching Triangle, Covent Garden with Farrells.

URBAN MASTERPLANS, STRATEGIC VISION, PUBLIC REALM

2016 - 2018 South Molton Street, Retail & Office conversion regeneration strategy and Public Realm.
2003 - 2015 Greenwich Peninsula masterplan and public realm vision for 10,000 homes.
2010 - 2015 Earls Court masterplan and public realm vision for 8,000 homes.
2009 - 2010 Streatham High St Town Centre regeneration strategy & Public Realm masterplan.
2008 - 2009 Church St, NW8 & Golborne Rd W2 regeneration strategy & Public Realm masterplan.
1996 - 2005 Riverside Norwich: Masterplan 14 hectares, 75,000m2 retail & leisure residential.
1985 - 2015 Comyn Ching Triangle, WC2, Civic Trust winning mixed use listed building award 2016.

MASTERPLANS NEW SETTLEMENTS, URBAN EXTENSIONS

2021 – present Sibson Eco Dynamo, masterplan with LDN Collective, Huntingdonshire 4,500 homes.
2020 – present Harrington Garden Town, masterplan with LDN Collective, Oxfordshire 6,500 homes.
2016 – present Otterpool Park Garden Town, masterplan for Folkestone Council, Kent 10,000 homes.
2010 – present NW Bicester Eco Town, zero carbon urban extension, completed 400 homes.
2011 - 2015 Dissington, Garden Village in Northumberland for 2000 homes.
2005 - 2009 Wrotham Park, Hertfordshire, Local Plan submission 2000 homes in green belt.
1995 - 1996 Cambourne completed new settlement in Cambridgeshire, for 4000 homes.

COMPLETED RESIDENTIAL (NEW BUILD)

2011 - present Tenterden, infill houses in conservation area for private sale/rent.
2013 - 2020 Goudhurst eco house with para 55 planning approval for private client.
2013 - 2016 Bridge Street, Chiswick, London W4, 9 terrace houses for private sale/rent.
2011 - 2015 London Road, Brentford, London TW8, 9 flats for private sale/rent.
2007 - 2012 Garden City Letchworth: 2 exemplar homes for North Herts Homes, social rent.
2010 - 2016 NW Bicester Exemplar: A2 Dominion, 400 homes True Zero Carbon, private sale/rent.
1999 - 2005 Riverside Norwich: 220 apartments and houses completed for private sale/rent.
1993 - 2004 European 3 Haarlem: 80 houses and apartments for de Woomantschapij private sale/rent.

COMPLETED COMMERCIAL (NEW BUILD)

2004 - 2005 Porcelanosa showroom, Watford, 3,500m2 Tiles, bathrooms showroom and HQ offices.
1996 - 2005 Riverside Norwich:50,000 m2 retail & leisure various phases & tenants.
1999 - 2015 Gazeley & Warburtons bakeries, shell and fit out up to 20,000m2 various UK locations.