

Community Planning Review Meeting Notes

K1 Development

Community Planning Event: Review Meeting

Meeting Notes



Venue	CAR Office, Gwydir Street, Cambridge
Date	Thursday 15 March 2012

Attendees	Ann Jarvis, Stephen Conrad, Robert Copcutt, , Chris Creasey, Ryan Kanteres, Carl Dodd, Michael McKavana, Inaki Izcue, Greg Strachan, Ruth Diver, Deborah Birley	Adam Broadway, Stephen Hill, Melissa Reynolds, Afrieen Patel, Katie Thornburrow,
Apologies	Jacqueline Ogden, Charlotte Ash, Angela Dunbar, Ann Charlton, Humphrey Liddiard, Johanna Davies, Liz Knox, Angela De Burgh, Ivan Ivanovic	

Item	Notes	Actions
Introduction to the Event	Adam and Stephen introduced the meeting. The purpose was to receive feedback from further work carried out by Katie Thornburrow and Jim Ross on the designs coming from the community planning event.	
Presentation	<p>Katie Thornburrow presented the findings from the design work.</p> <p>A brief review of the planning brief was given followed by two sketches showing people's likes and dislikes re the site.</p> <p>Three design concepts were outlined and these were compared to the planning brief. A combination plan was then considered combining the main ideas from all three schemes.</p> <p>This work showed how scheme preferences compared and deviated from the brief.</p> <p>A brief discussion with questions took place</p>	
Group	<p>Stephen highlighted that three key issues needed further discussion. These were around the topics of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking 	

Community Planning Review Meeting Notes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Common house• Open space v private space <p>Each group discussed the topics and fed back their findings.</p> <p>Key points were:-</p> <p>COMMON HOUSE</p> <p>The three priority uses were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dining area for shared meals, with kitchen, and food storage.• Outdoor space, connected to the dining area.• Guest room(s). <p>Then possibly, in no particular order...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Large multi-use area [MUA] with plenty of storage for different users. This could include the shared dining area• Playroom for different age groups; might be part of MUA• Reading / Home working area• Workshops/garden shed• Laundry <p>It was not resolved whether the common house should be in 'the centre' or on edge of scheme. It should though be a natural focal point which everyone passes by everyday. For visitors, it needs to be seen as the 'point of arrival' at the scheme.</p> <p>The common house could be part of a bigger building or free-standing. It might also have to be capable of being built in stages/ with residents doing some of the fit-out and decoration, depending on costs and what people could afford.</p> <p>Springhill's facilities cost each household about £6000, for about 5-6m² of floor space. This would probably have to be financed through a mix of reducing floor space in the homes and/or personal contributions in cash or kind.</p> <p>The group will need to consider its role/connection with wider Orchard Park community, and that the various uses of the 'common house' and other shared facilities should be both distinctive to meet the needs of the group and compliment the community facilities elsewhere in the neighbourhood. The group will need to shape the 'good neighbour offer' from K1 to the rest of Orchard Park eg invitation evenings to shared meals, open days, locations for courses on cohousing/permaculture, access to allotment areas not needed by residents, hire of the MUA, access to informal children's after school groups, use of stores for garden equipment that might be shared around etc.</p> <p>PUBLIC ART</p> <p>The S106 Planning Agreement will require some money to be spent on</p>	
--	--	--

Community Planning Review Meeting Notes

<p>'public art'. The Community Council was keen to see this being spent on things that were integral to the scheme and practical. Some quick suggestions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An amazing tree house• Studio space for resident and visiting artists, maybe with a temporary art 'graffiti' wall or sculpture area• Decorative ceramics or glass for the common house or in a prominent place on the walls of homes to give the scheme a distinct character.• Energy generation/water storage/waste storage and recycling ideas, possibly linked to the OP Innovation Fund for sustainability. <p>Several other ideas about sharks on the roof, and supersize garden gnomes were probably not serious!</p> <p>OPEN SPACE v PRIVATE SPACE</p> <p>Consensus for more shared/common space than private. Some private space accepted at front or back of property.</p> <p>Security was primary issue. Designed for security. All areas including wildlife area must be safe and secure. The scheme should not be used as a short cut.</p> <p>Green Shared open space should consist of allotments which offer chance for shared shed and/or greenhouse, area for children's play, sheltered areas of sitting. BBQ area.</p> <p>Space suggested for food/music. Quality landscaping and inclusion of fruit trees. Wildlife areas with a small pond</p> <p>Flats could have verandahs and roof gardens.</p> <p>Potential for collective recycling...remove the clutter.</p> <p>Group also felt parking should be kept to a minimum. Suggested that trolleys could be available to help transport items from the car parking/visitor parking area. Bicycle use was seen as very important.</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>Consensus that some/most properties should have ONE space close/within curtilage.</p> <p>Support for shared cars...car club/leasing arrangements.</p> <p>Secure bike storage was important.</p> <p>Acceptance re bus services.</p> <p>Concern re residents parking in rows off the main road....not liked</p> <p>Group parking away from properties not liked for residents cars, though could be solution re car club and visitors parking.</p> <p>Various ideas suggested re car parking within the property, including</p>	
--	--

Community Planning Review Meeting Notes

	undercroft/basement/under property (Accordia).	
Project Review	<p>Stephen and Adam reported on the project work to-date.</p> <p>Stephen confirmed that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussions with potential lenders is continuing with a possible consortium being established 2. Enabling Developers/Constructors. Responses to a short prospectus confirm interest from some local/regional organisations. 3. Scheme viability work will now conclude 	
Discussion points	<p>A series of questions were raised through the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Property prices <p>Stephen confirmed that prices would need to reflect the Orchard Park market as a comparison</p> 2. City Council Land Value <p>It was confirmed that City Council are requiring a return on the site sale. The precise value needs further detailed work</p> 3. Scheme mix <p>More work is proposed to establish a mix or options for the site. A mix of unit types is likely, ranging from one-bed units up to four-bed houses.</p> 4. Scheme viability <p>Now that some initial block concepts are available, coupled with work on the mix, a scheme viability test can be carried out.</p> 	
Next Steps	<p>Stephen and Adam reported that their phase one work was now coming to a close.</p> <p>A report will be issued over next couple of weeks to Cambridge City responding to the four areas being tested. Philip Taylor is setting up a steering group meeting to receive the report.</p> <p>An officer paper will be taken to the Environment Committee in June to agree whether to proceed or not.</p> <p>Adam offered to keep everyone informed. To assist with the report, Adam will contact everyone registered to gauge the real level of interest and ascertain further information on the property requirements.</p> <p>Stephen reminded the meeting that the project is now at a stage when the momentum needs to be continued by taken up by the group. If anyone is keen to step forward to chair/manage the Foundation Group please let us know.</p> <p>It was agreed that Adam would ask whether those registered would mind sharing contact emails to keep the group/momentum going.</p>	<p>PT to agree a date/time</p> <p>Adam 26 March</p> <p>ALL Adam</p>

Community Planning Review Meeting Notes

	<p>Robert proposed that a social event be organised amongst members.</p> <p>Adam confirmed that the project will still be marketed actively and he is happy to attend any events to promote the scheme.</p> <p>The meeting ended with Stephen and Adam thanking everyone who has contributed to the progress of the project over the last few months.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
--	--	-------------------