

NIAB and Howes Place Draft Appraisal for proposed Conservation Area: 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	Cambridgeshire County Council	The proposed boundary may have to be reduced to exclude the area of a previously permitted planning application for dwellings. This permission accounts for 1593 dwellings in total on the site, but in particular the 187 dwellings permitted to be located in the area known as the NIAB frontage site, for which the junction and link road to the main development lie within the proposed boundary. The appraisal makes no comment on the permitted development and as such it will be difficult to achieve many of the assessments aims. In principle, the County Council supports the positive aspects that a Conservation Area and TPO designation would bring.	Noted – Boundary re-drawn to exclude new housing?	1
2	Highways Authority	NIAB site subject to planning permission, the works for which will require the introduction of a new traffic controlled junction onto Huntingdon Road which will require the removal of some of the trees along the frontage of the road. Advise to research further with help of the City Council's Major Project Team	Noted – Meetings have been held between the Conservation Team and Officers from the Major Project Team.	1
3	English Heritage	<p>a) Appraisal requires photographs and historical maps.</p> <p>b) Proposed boundary includes Nos 198 and 200 Huntingdon Road – while this area may have been part of the original landholding for the NIAB site, these two houses have no apparent association with the NIAB institute and are of no particular architectural or historic interest. There appears to be little gained from including them in the proposed boundary.</p> <p>c) Should the inclusion of the permitted development not be to prevent development but be to control the design,</p>	<p>Noted – Photos will be included in the final published version</p> <p>Noted – Boundary altered?</p> <p>Noted – Boundary altered?</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

		<p>scale, form and massing of any future proposals, then this should be made clear in the guidance section. In addition, the City Council's Urban Design Team should be tasked to work with the Conservation Team, in order to draw up clear guidance for the development of the area, for inclusion within the appraisal.</p> <p>d) Paragraph 2.3.02 should make reference to PPS 15, which has now been issued as a consultation draft.</p> <p>e) Paragraph 3.1 uses of the word 'mock' to describe the architectural style is unfortunate and the style might better be described as 'historical' or 'traditional'.</p> <p>f) Paragraph 3.3 makes reference to the suburbs of Girton and Cambridge. The expanding village of Girton would be better described as a 'dormitory village'.</p> <p>g) The alignment of some 'positive boundaries on the Howes Place Landscape Features Map are incorrectly shown.</p>	<p>Noted – Document altered</p> <p>Noted – Document altered</p> <p>Noted – Document altered</p> <p>Noted – Document altered</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>
4	Natural England	<p>Welcome the extension proposal in particular the intention to retain, protect and replace trees of special interest since these are also likely to be of value to local biodiversity. Proposed boundary lies approx 350m from Traveller's Rest pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), though it is unlikely that the Conservation Area will have any negative impact on this area.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p>
5	Bidwells – on behalf of Barrett Strategic, the NIAB and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	<p>General comments:</p> <p>a) Lack of recognition or acknowledgement within the documentation of the planning situation regarding land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, which is allocated in the Cambridge City Local Plan through Policy 9/8.</p> <p>b) The permissions granted will fundamentally change the context in which the NIAB site and Howes Place sit, as well as the overall character of the area. The impact of this has not been evaluated.</p> <p>c) Ask that the proposed designation be held in abeyance until the outline permission has been determined, so as the impact of the development can be fully gauged.</p>	<p>Noted – Document altered to acknowledge the permissions previously granted.</p> <p>Noted – Document altered</p> <p>Noted – ?</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>

	<p>d) Questioning the use of the Suburbs and Rapid Assessment Report to support the proposed Conservation Area designation when the former document is itself not an adopted document.</p> <p>More specific comments in relation to the content of the report:</p>	Noted – ?	
	<p>e) The Suburbs and Rapid Assessment Report defines a study area, which is not the same as the proposed Conservation Area boundary, and consequently this report does not provide information to support the proposed boundary area.</p>	Noted – ?	
	<p>f) Paragraph 1.3, second sentence, should be amended to read: The area is surrounded by existing and former college sports grounds, NIAB operational land and open farmland further north. The third sentence should be amended to: Suburban residential areas front Huntingdon Road.</p>	Noted – Document altered?	
	<p>g) Paragraph 1.4 is inappropriate due to the area comprising of an area of major change, allocated for residential development within the adopted Cambridge City Local Plan.</p>	Noted – Document altered?	
	<p>h) Local Policy section (paragraphs 2.5 – 2.8) should reflect all relevant Local Policies, including Policy 9/8 land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road.</p>	Noted – document altered?	
	<p>i) Paragraph 2.8 has no relevance to the Conservation Area being considered.</p>	Noted – Document altered?	
	<p>j) Paragraph 3.3 refers to trial nursery beds, glasshouses, fields and horticultural nature of the landscape, which will be removed with the development of the area as envisaged through Policy 9/8.</p>	Noted – Document altered?	
	<p>k) Paragraphs 3.4, 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 discuss the current pleached limes, hedgerows and the Mulberry tree planted by King George V. A number of the pleached limes will be removed as part of schemes already consented, including some with TPOs and the Mulberry Tree. This needs to be acknowledged throughout the report.</p>	Noted – Document altered?	
	<p>l) Paragraph 5.3 discusses Nos 14 – 15 Howes Place which are to be demolished as part of the planning permission</p>	Noted – Document altered?	

		<p>already issued. The character of this area will therefore change.</p> <p>m) Paragraph 6.8 discusses the Whitehouse, which is in the ownership of NIAB. The former farm buildings on the NIAB site will be removed with the development of the area as envisaged through Policy 9/8 of the Local Plan and the current planning application. This position needs to be acknowledged.</p> <p>n) Paragraph 7.1 refers to open fields which will be removed with the development of the area as envisaged through Policy 9/8 of the Local Plan. This needs to be acknowledged.</p> <p>o) Paragraph 7.8 refers to the trial grounds surrounding NIAB but fails to note that these will be removed as part of the development of this area and as such the “important break” referred to will no longer exist.</p> <p>p) Paragraph 8.6 discusses an area of grassland described as the “village green” – this area has no such status.</p> <p>q) Paragraphs 9.1 to 9.8 identify issues regarding the current character of the area immediately fronting Huntingdon Road and Howes Place, but do not recognise the allocation of the land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road for residential purposes. This will significantly alter the character of the area and therefore must be considered prior to any designation.</p> <p>r) Paragraph 10.1 discusses the original farm and nursery trial beds as being an integral part of the Conservation Area despite their impending loss. The Conservation Area boundary should therefore be redrawn to exclude this area and not extend beyond the curtilages of the properties on Howes Place and the immediate land surrounding the original NIAB building fronting Huntingdon Road.</p> <p>s) Paragraph 10.6 discusses the placing of dense landscaping screens in front of set back buildings – it is not understood why this is relevant in the context of a Conservation Area appraisal.</p>	<p>Noted – Document altered?</p> <p>Noted – Document altered?</p> <p>Noted – Document altered?</p> <p>Noted – Document altered?</p> <p>Noted – Document altered?</p> <p>Noted – Boundary altered?</p> <p>Noted – Document altered?</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		Overall: The appraisal does not take into consideration the current planning situation on the site and therefore the designation process should be delayed until such a time as all the necessary consents are in place.	Noted – ?	
6	1 completed response form in support of proposed Conservation Area	High and growing level of traffic on Huntingdon Road, which detracts from the setting of the proposed Conservation Area.	Noted	2
7	2 e-mails in support of proposed Conservation Area	Support proposals, esp. Howes Place due to the existing planning permissions in place at the NIAB site. It appears unfair that NIAB have proceeded with development with relative easiness, while Howes Place residents will be faced with the extra restrictions on future development that a Conservation Area brings. Concern regarding the immediate area surrounding the proposed CA esp. the playing field at the back of the Howes Place properties, which contains a large turn of the century cricket pavilion. Possibility for inclusion in the suggested boundary?	Noted – The Conservation Team has a forward programme for Conservation Area Appraisals and new designations and this is the first instance that there has been capacity to carry out this appraisal. Noted – Alter proposed boundary?	3 1