

### Kite 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	Christ's Pieces Residents' Association	<p>(i) All the recommendations are endorsed.</p> <p>(ii) 8.4 – no extensions should be allowed in principle. People should move to larger houses.</p> <p>(iii) 8.5 – happy to ask for volunteers to log garden trees</p> <p>(iv) 8.6 – streetlights are to be changed by the County – the issue of the replacement of street nameplates with cast iron will be taken to the AGM</p> <p>(v) 8.9 – the probable redevelopment of the Police Station is not mentioned. When an application comes in, cars should have their own garaging.</p> <p>(vi) Should more buildings be listed to help protect them?</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) This is not within the Council's remit</p> <p>(iii) Noted</p> <p>(iv) Noted. The City Council has been working with the County Council's contractors with regard to the retention, where possible and subject to contract and funding, of the historic lamp posts</p> <p>(v) As an application has not come forward for the Police Station, it is not deemed appropriate to comment on what may or may not happen on the site.</p> <p>(vi) If buildings are considered worthy of statutory listing, information should be submitted to English Heritage for consideration</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 3</p> <p>(iii) 3</p> <p>(iv) 3</p> <p>(v) 3</p> <p>(vi) 2</p>
2	2 responses from local residents	<p>(i) Dates for the Unitarian Church and the Hall are incorrect</p> <p>(ii) The consultation was not widely enough disseminated</p> <p>(iii) The appraisal defines what is special about the Kite Conservation Area. The status of the</p>	<p>(i) Amendments made to text</p> <p>(ii) Noted. The consultation method was as for previous conservation area reviews</p> <p>(iii) Noted. The appraisal will be a material consideration with regard to</p>	<p>(i) 1</p> <p>(ii) 3</p> <p>(iii) 3</p>

		<p>document and of the issues and recommendations in section 8 is not clear</p> <p>(iv) New development to the rear of buildings should also be required to 'preserve or enhance' as well as the street view. Some recently approved rear developments are out of character</p> <p>(v) Wholeheartedly support the statement that the area justifies conservation area designation.</p> <p>(vi) The area attracts many tourists and it offers visitors another view of Cambridge life away from the colleges. The Kite offers a unique environment with its link to the main shopping area to the commercial benefit of the city</p> <p>(vii) Busy traffic is identified as a major negative feature. New proposals to control parking should reduce the impact of traffic. Recommendations should be implemented immediately</p> <p>(viii) Some of the details about the properties are out of date, for example with regard to paint finishes on houses. The planning department should consider controlling how paint is removed from brick elevations to avoid damage</p> <p>(ix) The City Council should use its statutory powers to ensure that 7,8 and 9 Orchard Street, all listed buildings, are secured. It is hoped any future plans for these buildings will meet the criteria for listed buildings and that short-cuts will not be permitted</p>	<p>planning applications within the area.</p> <p>(iv) Conservation are a consultee on all applications within conservation areas and thus take the character of the area into consideration when commenting</p> <p>(v) Noted</p> <p>(vi) Noted</p> <p>(vii) Public highways within the city are under the control of the County Council and are not within the remit of the City Council</p> <p>(viii) Where incorrect details have been revealed, these have been altered. With regard to the removal of paint, this is not something that the City Council can control</p> <p>(ix) The City Council is in contact with the new owner of these properties and is trying to work towards a suitable scheme for all three buildings</p>	<p>(iv) 3</p> <p>(v) 3</p> <p>(vi) 3</p> <p>(vii) 2</p> <p>(viii) 3</p> <p>(ix) 3</p>
3	Cambridge Past, Present & Future	<p>(i) In general the document is supported</p> <p>(ii) It is disappointing that the wooden Victorian workshop in the courtyard to 37 City Road will be demolished and replaced with houses. This building is not even mentioned in the appraisal</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) An appeal against the refusal of the application for this site was upheld by the Planning Inspector. The Design and Access Statement for the application has photographs showing the interior of the workshops and some of the more decorative details. Some of the</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 1</p>

		<p>(iii) There appear to be several form of 'Maids Causeway'. The City Council should add a footnote as to why the existing choice of spelling has been used.</p> <p>(iv) 4.2.2 line 13 – we challenge the notion that the major element in unifying the character of the buildings is brick – other elements are also important. Also additions suggested for key positive and negative features</p> <p>(v) Additional key positive and negative features to various streets</p> <p>(vi) The City Council is urged to use its statutory powers sooner rather than later to bring 7, 8 and 9 Orchard Street back into beneficial use</p> <p>(vii) The protection of unlisted but 'positive' buildings from demolition is supported</p> <p>(viii) The use of Article 4s is supported to prevent addition of inappropriate roof dormers, rooflights, roof extensions and the protection of front boundaries. Further urge the introduction of Best Practice Guidance in detailing these sorts of features in Conservation Areas</p> <p>(ix) The production of a Tree Management Plan for the Conservation Area is supported</p> <p>(x) The City Council should work with the County Council to draw up a definitive programme of public realm improvements</p>	<p>stained glass will be salvaged for use in the new buildings. Text will be added to the document regarding this building</p> <p>(iii) The existing appraisal uses the form 'Maids' therefore this has been used within the document</p> <p>(iv) Alterations made to text</p> <p>(v) Some alterations made to text</p> <p>(vi) The City Council is in contact with the new owner of these properties and is working towards a suitable scheme for all three buildings</p> <p>(vii) Noted</p> <p>(viii) The introduction of Article 4 directions would need to follow a formal process. The City Council has a guide on roof extensions which is widely promoted</p> <p>(ix) Noted</p> <p>(x) Noted</p>	<p>(iii) 3</p> <p>(iv) 1</p> <p>(v) 1</p> <p>(vi) 3</p> <p>(vii) 3</p> <p>(viii) 3</p> <p>(ix) 3</p> <p>(x) 2</p>
4	Councillor Rosenstiel – Local Ward Councillor	<p>(i) Why has a draft dated 30<sup>th</sup> June only just been consulted on?</p> <p>(ii) The boundary should be altered to include the East Road frontage between Dover Street and</p>	<p>(i) The consultation period was chosen to avoid the summer holiday period</p> <p>(ii) To be considered by the Executive Councillor</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 1</p>

		<p>Burleigh Street to include the Tram Shed building and neighbouring restored buildings which are an important piece of Kite conservation</p> <p>(iii) Why is Petersfield in the Kite Conservation Area? This is particularly odd when the north of Maids Causeway is not within the appraisal</p> <p>(iv) Various comments made regarding terminology and inaccuracies within the document</p>	<p>(iii) The Kite, including Petersfield, was part of the original Central Conservation Area designation in 1969. The area to the north of Maids Causeway are in the Central Conservation Area, but is described in the riverside and Stourbridge Common Appraisal</p> <p>(iv) Alterations made to the text</p>	<p>(iii) 3</p> <p>(iv) 1</p>
--	--	--	---	------------------------------