

Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area - Draft Appraisal: Summary of Responses

1 = action taken

2 = not within the remit of this document

3 = no action taken

NB: Where the same comments have been made by different methods, these have only been included once e.g. where emails are making the same points as Comments Forms.

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Action
1	Brooklands Av Area Residents Assoc	<p>(i) If Accordia is to be included in the area, we consider it essential that the new appraisal recognises the entirely different characters of the present area and of Accordia, being clearly demarcated by Shaftesbury Road and the tree-belt on its west side. You indicated that separate “character” appraisals for Accordia and for the existing area should be possible. The draft makes comment on the relatively poorer modern buildings in the existing area, particularly the block 21-23-25 Fitzwilliam Road which was built before the area was first designated in 2002. We are particularly keen that a style of architecture which would be in keeping on Accordia is not allowed to “creep” across the road.</p> <p>(ii) it is essential to retain clause 7.07 in the existing appraisal, which provides that the Council will refuse any application for change of use away from residential use, and will encourage the return to residential use of those few properties still in commercial occupation.</p> <p>(iii) 21 Clarendon Road is in residential use, not institutional as mentioned in section 4.1.9.</p> <p>(iv) Though there is strong interest in an Article 4 among Accordia residents, there is no such interest among the owners of the properties in the rest of the area. Whilst these were mostly</p>	<p>Separate character areas are to be acknowledged within the Appraisal (see main report)</p> <p>This content to be included (see main report)</p> <p>Noted. Amend 4.1.9</p> <p>Noted. Delete text 13.5.3 re Article 4 Direction “<i>should</i> also include the family dwellings ...within</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

		developed in the late 19 th century, they exhibit a mixture of styles, some have already had alterations to them, and the effective removal of the scope of “general permitted development” would be inappropriate and most unwelcome.	the existing Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area”. Retain at 8.7.2 text, “ <i>could</i> also be justified”. An Article 4 would be subject to a separate consultation exercise.	2
2	Brooklands Avenue/Clarendon Rd/ Shaftesbury Rd individual residents (additional points to those made under BAARA)			
	i) 5 respondents	i) Opposed to including Accordia within Brooklands Av Conservation area due to its difference of character.	i) Noted. Some of this opposition was qualified as per the BAARA response.	3
	ii) 1 respondent	ii) In favour of including Accordia	ii) Noted	3
	iii) mentioned by 2 respondents	iii) not in favour of an Article 4 Direction applying to Brooklands Av (or other roads within the existing CA boundary)	iii) An Article 4 would be subject to separate consultation	2
	iv) mentioned by 2 respondents	iv) Small area on Trumpington Rd proposed for exclusion, should be retained (in case a phone mast is put on it).	iv) exclusion/inclusion is based on relationship to the CA	3
	v) mentioned by 1 respondent	v) Accept boundary change on North side of Brooklands Av.	v) Noted	3
	vi) mentioned by 1 respondent	vi) 23 Brooklands Av should be considered as a “positive building”.	vi) Agreed. Is already designated as such in the Newtown & Glisson Rd appraisal. Amend 4.2.2	1
	vii) mentioned by 1 respondent	vii) para 8.5 must include that development is to be <u>in sympathy with</u> the conservation area and reinforces its streetscape and rationale.	vii) That development has to be in sympathy with the conservation area is inherent in any permission for development in a conservation area.	3

3	Arcadia Residents			
	i) 17respondents	i)	In favour of the CA boundary changes	i)Noted
	ii) mentioned by 9 respondents	ii)	specific support for an Article 4 Direction	ii)Noted
	iii) mentioned by 1 respondent	iii)	Not in favour of inclusion within a conservation area. Sufficient enforcement exists and with a committed residents group, is sufficient.	iii)Noted
	iv) 1respondent	iv)	Not in favour of an Article 4 Direction: Undue restriction on ability to respond to changing technology	iv) An Article 4 would be subject to separate consultation
	v) mentioned by 1 respondent	v)	The use of the Bunker (ref para 13.4.2) could have an important affect on the residential character of the estate.	v) note added at new 4.4.7
	vi) mentioned by 1 respondent	vi)	How will the Council protect front gardens & boundaries given PD rights?	vi)Below 1 metre tall boundary treatments could only be controlled by an Article 4
	vii) mentioned by 2 respondents	vi)	Street Parking control	vi) None at present
4	University of Cambridge (Planning/Estates rep)		" While we note that the proposed extension of the CA will include additional land in the ownership of the University we do not propose to either support or object to the	Noted

		recommendations of the review.”		
--	--	---------------------------------	--	--