

Newnham Croft Conservation Area - Draft Appraisal: Summary of Responses

Formatted

- 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	Cambridge Past, Present and Future	<p>(iii)(i) The review is welcomed</p> <p>(ii) Article 4 Directions should be used to positively manage all conservation areas. It should be made clear that their purpose is to retain or enhance local neighbourhoods not to prevent change</p> <p>(iii) A definition is required for the term 'positive buildings'</p> <p>(iv) References required highlighting methodology used to draft appraisal</p> <p>(v) Ensure descriptions and illustrations/maps are robust so that they can be used at appeal</p> <p>(vi) Maps should be annotated with names of key buildings, green spaces, roads etc</p> <p>(vii) There is an overall lack of seating along main routes/thoroughfares, poorly designed lighting columns and poor access for disabled residents</p> <p>(viii) Grantchester Meadows, Paradise Local Nature Reserve, Lammas Land and St Catharine's College playing Fields are all within the Green Belt</p> <p>(ix) Have other important stakeholders been consulted such as Cambridgeshire County Council?</p> <p>(x) The boundary delineation styles of Lammas Land do not reflect a good park boundary and should be</p>	<p>(iii)(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) Noted. There are references in the report and the draft appraisal regarding possible Article 4 Directions.</p> <p>(iii) Noted. A glossary will be produced for the final version of the appraisal</p> <p>(iv) In the Introduction and section 2 the methodology used is highlighted</p> <p>(v) Noted. Additional information added to the final maps (see points below)</p> <p>(vi) The maps already have the key roads annotated. It would be difficult to add the names of buildings at the scale used. Key green spaces will be added to the final version of the appraisal</p> <p>(vii) Noted. These are not within the control of the City Council</p> <p>(viii) The green belt will be added to the final map</p> <p>(ix) All the relevant stakeholders have been consulted</p> <p>(x) The park boundary is not considered to be a negative feature. The Bowls</p>	<p>(iii)(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 3</p> <p>(iii) 1</p> <p>(iv) 3</p> <p>(v) 1</p> <p>(vi) 1</p> <p>(vii) 2</p> <p>(viii) 1</p> <p>(ix) 3</p> <p>(x) 3</p>

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Appendix 1

		<p>listed as a negative feature. In addition the Bowls Club detracts and needs improving</p> <p>(xi) Comments on text</p> <p>(xii) The suggestion for altering the boundary to exclude Newnham Mill is not supported as it is one of only two listed structures in the conservation area, the other being the South Green Road gas lamp</p> <p>(xiii) Suggest that Old Newnham be linked with Newnham Croft and that St Mark's Court is included in a conservation area</p> <p>(xiv) Support the protection of unlisted buildings</p> <p>(xv) Support the introduction of 'tree wardens' if funding available. Would favour detailed tree and park management plans formulated with local stakeholders. Should include park furniture to ensure overall quality is retained and enhanced</p> <p>(xvi) Tree management plans should consider suitable replacements for lost trees as well as control of excessive sycamore seedlings</p> <p>(xvii) Comments on streets and street furniture</p> <p>(xviii) Comments on traffic and possible parking scheme</p> <p>(xix) The proposed additions to the list of Buildings of Local Interest are supported</p> <p>(xx) Incorrect spellings</p>	<p>Club is not felt to detract from the local character</p> <p>(xi) Alterations made where appropriate</p> <p>(xii) The proposed boundary change will be part of a different exercise. However, conservation areas do not need listed structures within them for them to be 'areas of special architectural or historic interest'. Both of these areas are within the West Cambridge Conservation Area which was recently reviewed. At that time proposals were put forward regarding the realignment of the conservation area boundaries. This will be taken forward at the appropriate time</p> <p>(xiv) Noted</p> <p>(xv) Noted</p> <p>(xvi) Noted</p> <p>(xvii) These are not within the control of the City Council</p> <p>(xviii) These are not within the control of the City Council</p> <p>(xix) Noted</p> <p>(xx) Noted</p>	<p>(xi) 1</p> <p>(xii) 3</p> <p>(xiii) 3</p> <p>(xiv) 3</p> <p>(xv) 2</p> <p>(xvi) 2</p> <p>(xvii) 3</p> <p>(xviii) 3</p> <p>(xix) 3</p> <p>(xx) 1</p>
2	1 Comment Sheet from a local resident	<p>(i) The protection of the setting of the conservation area is supported, but there must be opportunities to introduce innovative development</p>	<p>(i) Applications for development are considered on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>(i) 3</p>

Appendix 1

	(ii)	The protection of unlisted properties is too wide a definition. It should be possible to replace or alter buildings without unnecessary restraints	(ii)	It is possible to alter buildings within conservation areas, provided that the changes 'preserve or enhance' its 'character or appearance'	(ii)	3
	(iii)	Comments on care of trees. Section 8.4.3 should be removed as it gives the address of a property regarding a tree issue	(iii)	The document gives a number of addresses of properties that contribute both positively and negatively to the character of the conservation area. However it is not a 'naming and shaming' approach, it merely highlights where there may be issues	(iii)	3
	(iv)	Comments on the maintenance of roads and on the traffic and parking in the area. The suggestion of a Residents' Parking Scheme is not supported	(iv)	Noted	(iv)	3
	(v)	The possible introduction of Article 4 Directions is not supported.	(v)	Noted	(v)	3
	(vi)	The proposed additions to the list of Buildings of Local Interest are not wholly supported	(vi)	Noted	(vi)	3