

## **Draft Mitcham's Corner Development Framework: Key Issues**

This document provides key issues arising from representations. Where a section or paragraph of the Development Framework is not listed, there were no representations made in respect of this section/paragraph.

### **Section 1. Introduction and background**

#### **1.1 Purpose and Scope**

##### **1.1.1**

**Support: 8**

**Object: 1**

- Can we encourage a more public/open display of plans, so the whole community can see them.

##### **1.1.2**

**Support: 1**

**Object: 1**

- 'Located to the north east of the City Centre...' rather than 'north west'.

#### **1.2 Structure of the document**

##### **Figures 1 & 2: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area**

**Support: 0**

**Object: 7**

- Enlarge the boundary to include the Jesus Lock pedestrian/cyclist river crossing and landing area on Jesus Green. This is a feeder for much of the traffic through Mitcham's Corner and it would be sensible to deal with in the same development framework.
- Include future development of Wychwood in the Opportunity Area Boundary.
- The cluster of listed buildings forming Jesus College should be identified on this map.
- The significance of Jesus Green should be clearly linked to the setting of the college.
- The relationship between Jesus College and the development within the opportunity area will need to be considered as part of any subsequent applications for development and this should be reflected within the SPD.
- A black line is meant to indicate 'Building frontage'. However, this is not the case. Grey lines mark the base layer of the plan. The only black line is associated with the 'Remnants of Historic High Street'. Suggest 'Building Frontage' is removed from key.
- Key includes 'Opportunity for New Urban Space'. However, there is no such area shown on Figure 1. Suggest that this is removed from the Key.
- Include Whichcote house on Milton Road within the Opportunity Area boundary as it has now been sold to a private developer.

#### **1.4 The Need for Change**

##### **1.4.1**

**Support: 1**

**Object: 1**

- The existing traffic arrangements work well for both pedestrians, cyclists and motorists; this is one of the few junctions in Cambridge of which that can be said. There are rarely hold ups for people or cars/cycles.

##### **1.4.2**

**Support: 0**

**Object: 2**

- Positive change will happen without large scale interventions. Area is growing and developing regardless.
- Mistake in use of an apostrophe - its and not it's would be correct usage here!

## 1.5 Vision and Objectives

### Figure 5: Vision and Objectives

#### Support: 5

#### Object: 15

- Support
- Improve the situation for people cycling and walking.
- What is meant by "severance of the highway layout"?
- No need to reduce the existing speed of traffic through this area.
- "Rediscovering the high street" will be a retrograde step leading to traffic jams and increased pollution, particularly if additional non-electric buses are permitted.
- Objectives need to include maintenance of the efficiency of traffic throughput, which was excellent before all the traffic lights were introduced, and is now moderate.
- Cannot control people parking in the bus lane.
- Not enough proof that traffic, congestion and pollution will reduce.
- Should include "maintaining and improving the junctions throughput for motor vehicles"
- Failure anywhere in the document to make a plan for how buses would serve the area, even though it is stated as one of the strategic objectives under Theme 1.
- Need to use the term "rationalised" in the section referring to bus facilities and connections to them (as used on page 22).
- Removal of gyratory should be an essential not a potential outcome.
- Theme 1: Do not see benefits to Mitcham's Corner from the City Deal; current City Deal proposals are likely to make the situation in the Mitcham's Corner area worse.
- Change 'physical' to 'physically' at Theme 3.
- There needs to be a high threshold of confidence with respect to this before the gyratory system is broken.
- While changes to the public realm are welcome, the whole consultation is based on the idea that a busy through-road can be a 'place': the two uses are contrary. The solution should focus on creating 'places' which have low traffic volumes, and separately roads for through-traffic which separate walking, cycling and motor traffic, with safe junctions for walking and cycling.
- Theme 1 - Creating a connected place  
Not maximise the benefits of "Greater Cambridge City Deal" but "increase the use of sustainable modes of travel, supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge City Deal".
- Leave out "potentially" in "through severing the gyratory system" Removing the gyratory is a precondition for any significant redevelopment of Mitcham's Corner.
- Should be "create a low-speed, simplified and integrated highway space", followed by "considering safety for cyclist and pedestrians around Mitcham's Corner"
- Support low speed simplified system, need more convincing about an "integrated space" with no segregation of cars, cycles and pedestrians. There is no precedent in Cambridge for such an innovative design at a major junction, and people need evidence-based assurance that the approach should be safe (and most importantly perceived as safe).
- Need more visual impressions of the proposals for the junctions and public space, some videos of similar schemes elsewhere would be useful, plus comments by users on how well those schemes have worked.
- Need to explicitly mention safety in this point, as it is a major concern for pedestrians and cyclists who use Mitcham's Corner. Question of how elderly, visually impaired and users of mobility vehicles will be able to cross the highway safely.
- Theme 4 - Sitting and meeting spaces and pop-up markets need careful design.
- Additional objectives - There needs to be an emphasis on affordable residential

accommodation in the Mitcham's Corner area. No more student hostels or apart-hotels, which turn the locality into a dormitory district and diminish cohesion for the community and its sustainability. There needs to be a balance between commercial units and residential property.

- Only single approach to redesigning the highway system is being suggested – would suggest putting forward at least one other design for consideration and modelling – a scheme with more traditional segregation of vehicles, cycles and pedestrians, or a design that simplifies the connection between Milton Road and Victoria Avenue, eliminating the “dog leg”
- Theme 2 – support promoting connections from Mitcham's Corner to the River Cam. Since this could be achieved through appropriate redevelopment of the site of Barclays Bank or the Tivoli we suggest adding some guidelines on these windfall sites to the Development Framework.
- Agree with the revised boundary which extends down to the riverside.
- Theme 3 – support, space need to be deigned carefully so it is suitable and appealing for casual relaxation as well as occasional public events such as pop-up markets.
- Additional Objectives needed – emphasis on affordable residential accommodation, car parking facilities, additional cycle parking

### 1.5.3

**Support: 1**

**Object: 0**

- Support

## Section 2. Context Analysis

### 2.1 Historical Context

#### The Gyratory

##### 2.1.6

**Support: 1**

**Object: 1**

- Final sentence does not make sense. Suggest updated to 'At the time, this was reported as Cambridge's Chaos Corner'.

### 2.2 Existing Scale and massing.

#### 2.2.1

**Support: 0**

**Object: 1**

- The first bullet point claims that 'Historic fine grain development predominates'. It is not considered that this is a fair reflection of the Opportunity Area which includes a wide variety of built forms.

#### Figure 15

**Support: 0**

**Object: 1**

- It is not considered that the colour distinction between 4 storeys and 5+ storeys is sufficiently clear.

### 2.3 Existing Land Uses and Activity

#### Figure 17: Existing Land Use

**Support: 0**

**Object: 1**

- Figure 17 actually shows Corona Road open to Westbrook Centre. This is an error on the map, but also a very desirable outcome. Such permeability, especially for non-motorized modes, is essential to make Mitcham's Corner a success and it should be expressly included in the final version of the plan.

### 2.4 Opportunities and constraints

#### Strengths

**Support: 0**

**Object: 3**

- Point number 2 Public Transport links are not a strength, but a weakness. Buses are not integrated, do not necessarily serve destinations people need and bus stops are wildly divergent.
- The gyratory system does not handle high traffic levels well. It handles car throughput at the expense of all other "traffic" i.e. cyclists and pedestrians.
- Bullet 3: The strength 'Domestic scale and character predominates' is not accurate. This description fails to appreciate the diversity of scales, styles and uses within the locality. The strength should instead reference 'Areas with domestic scale and character' without stating that it predominates. This would then also better reflect the subsequent bullet point which acknowledges 'Areas of architectural richness and a fine urban grain'.

#### Weaknesses

**Support: 0**

**Object: 4**

- The introduction of traffic lights made things worse and increases pollution. Need to reduce the number of jobs in the city.
- The negative impact of pollution is missing from the list.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bullets 1 and five duplicate the same point.</li> <li>• Perceptions of safety are not a good indicator use actual figures relating to cycling and pedestrian injuries.</li> </ul>	
<b>Opportunities</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fourth bullet point should be amended to better bring through the vision statement's aspiration to use the historic environment to bring about positive benefits. We suggest that the proposed wording be amended as follows: "Building on existing assets: conservation area, opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to enhance the character of the place (conservation areas, listed and locally listed buildings, surviving Victorian buildings and street patterns, proximity to river, vibrant community)."</li> <li>• Bullet 5 should include details of what the allocation is.</li> <li>• The potential to constrain future options at this junction means any sale of highway land would have to be very carefully considered it is an option and this document should reflect it as an option.</li> </ul>	
<b>Figure 18</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification on Central Conservation Area Boundaries needed. Figure 18 might be more accurately labelled Castle and Victoria Conservation Sub-Area.</li> </ul>	

### Section 3. The Gyratory: a Vision for Change

#### 3.1 Introduction

##### Purpose

##### 3.1.2

##### Support: 0

##### Object: 3

- This movement plan would create a colossal traffic bottleneck. There is no hint I could find of how the junction between Milton Road and Chesterton Road will be controlled.
- Paragraph 3.1.2 refers to 'an option for achieving the vision and objectives for the Development Framework'. However, it is not made clear whether this equates to the masterplan required by draft policy 21 or if not, who will coordinate this and how. It is suggested that the SPD needs to make the purpose and function of this 'option' clearer for the benefit and certainty of all parties.

##### 3.1.3

##### Support: 1

##### Object: 0

- Support prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists must be prioritised.
- Precedent: in Utrecht in the Netherlands is almost identical to Mitcham's Corner in initial layout: <https://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2016/09/27/designing-for-people-by-erasing-a-car-friendly-past/>

#### A shift in street design and addressing the issue of speed

##### 3.1.4

##### Support: 1

##### Object: 0

- Support, Gyratory traffic systems are being removed in London right now, with great effect.

#### 3.2 Current Problems

##### 3.2.1

##### Support: 1

##### Object: 1

- Where will the traffic be diverted to?
- No local roads can cope with a greater volume of traffic.
- Agree, existing gyratory is complex with the potential for accidents.

##### 3.2.2

##### Support: 0

##### Object: 2

- There is/was no need for the signal controlled junctions - if you don't like them, remove them (leaving, if you want, just the puffin crossing components). Don't use the present signal controlled junctions as an excuse for wanting to modify the entire design.
- Remove 's' from 'creates'.

##### 3.2.3

##### Support: 2

##### Object: 1

- Pedestrian paths are currently complicated and unsafe. At several junctures pedestrian paths intersect with cycle paths - very unsafe. Important that pedestrian and cycle paths are made wider and safer.
- The influx of large student numbers is making this worse.

##### 3.2.5

##### Support: 3

##### Object: 4

- If you want a quieter place then you must reduce the number of jobs in Cambridge.
- The area deserves to be more than a gyratory system.
- Enormous potential to be a super cohesive community.
- Yes, currently noisy and polluted.

- Support - Could do with decluttering, decent signage and rethinking the cycleways.
- Priority should be cyclist and pedestrian safety.
- Walking to Jesus Green /City Centre with children and pets is a stressful experience.
- Place to 'watch the world go by' is not a priority.
- Pedestrians are hampered by the road layout.
- Add additional conflict at Jesus Lock Bridge.

#### Figure 26: Challenges for pedestrians and cyclists

**Support: 0**

**Object: 4**

- Would add that the junction with Victoria Avenue is especially dangerous for cyclists.
- Diagram missing following difficulties and dangers: approaching the left hand turn heading toward Victoria Road from Mitcham's Corner, drivers speed to overtake. The width of the road also allows drivers to cut in from the wrong lane.
- Diagram missing following difficulties and dangers: the narrow traffic lane heading from road bridge toward junction near Staples is too narrow for drivers to overtake cyclists. The cyclists' alternative – positioning between two lanes of fast moving traffic and being overtaken on both sides – placates drivers but puts cyclists in great danger.
- Diagram missing following difficulties and dangers: approaching Mitcham's Corner from Victoria Avenue places cyclists on left hand side when the majority need to go straight on (to use the cut-through to get to Milton Road) or to get into the right hand lane (to go toward Victoria Road).
- Show the number of crossings to get from the Westbrook Centre to Jesus Green to highlight dangers.
- Pedestrians forced to cross over cycle paths (areas of conflict), this is not illustrated on the map.
- This map should extend to Carlyle Road and show the challenges for pedestrians and cyclists at the Chesterton Road / Jesus Lock Bridge / Carlyle Road junction.
- The blind corner currently opposite the Radmore Farm shop brings cyclists travelling in opposite directions into conflict.
- It is not currently clear how a cyclist is supposed to leave Milton Road travelling towards the city and join the on-pavement cycleway towards the light controlled crossing in the middle of the area.
- The unclear routes make travelling through the area feel unsafe, and on occasion actually lead to injuries.

### 3.3 A Solution...Severing the gyratory & creating a low speed environment

#### A Revised Movement Proposal

##### 3.3.1

**Support: 1**

**Object: 0**

- The existing gyratory is cumbersome and in need of radical transformation.

##### 3.3.2

**Support: 5**

**Object: 2**

- Support removal of gyratory.
- Agree – the gyratory system gives cars domination (racetrack mentality), scares cyclists and makes pedestrians feel marginalised.
- However, in the Greater Cambridge City Deal we were informed that there would be a 50% increase in traffic along Chesterton Road at certain times. How would this be controlled in the new Mitcham's Corner layout?
- Cycle, pedestrian and vehicle movements need segregating to improve safety.
- Must be done in such a way that it doesn't cause backlogs in the surrounding area.
- Concern as to how it can be used for people with sight problems or poor mobility.
- A mixed scheme/shared space could be possible with two crossings.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear what the design of the junctions would be.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.3.3</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This consultation should be revisited after the traffic modelling work is complete.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.3.4</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low speed highway design and disrupting vehicle priority is key to making the area more pedestrian and cyclist friendly.</li> <li>Low speed highway design must be enforced.</li> <li>Cycle, pedestrian and vehicle movements need segregating to improve safety.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.3.6</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sounds sensible.</li> <li>Safety concern over inclusion of double roundabouts.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.3.9</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is insufficient detail here on how traffic movements at the three key junctions would be controlled – traffic lights ? roundabouts ? other ?</li> <li>This consultation needs to be revisited in the light of the traffic modelling report when that is available.</li> <li>Suggest moving Victoria Road 'gateway' further out: in its proposed position there will be too much going on. Why not place at Albert Street/Greens Road or further still at Victoria Park?</li> <li>Detailed design of Croftholme Lane / Victoria Road will need careful consideration. For example, design speeds should be kept very low here to mitigate drivers overtaking cyclists problem noted elsewhere. And pedestrian crossings (preferably zebras, which are much more pedestrian friendly) must be retained. Also egress from the lane between 3 Croftholme Lane and Victoria Road must be considered. This lane serves about 20 residential properties.</li> <li>Reinstate zebra crossings by Mitchams. The very low priority given to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly on the leg right by Mitchams (currently the bed shop) causes very long wait times.</li> </ul>	
<b>Figure 27: Movement Proposals for Mitcham's Corner</b>	
<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 27</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More information needed concerning interconnection between various roads e.g. traffic lights and how they facilitate free traffic movement.</li> <li>Should include proposals for buses and pedestrian movements.</li> <li>More data needed to illustrate how this proposal would impact on vehicle throughput.</li> <li>Drawing is preliminary in nature and leaves many questions. Without this it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the SPD.</li> <li>The connection between Victoria Road and Mitcham's corner needs more investigation – this connection is not essential. Removal of this would improve commercial nature of area.</li> <li>Should help create a more cohesive community.</li> <li>Traffic routes need to be clearly defined – unclear how the new urban space would be accessed.</li> <li>Cycle lane provision between Victoria and Chesterton Road could be achieved without severing the gyratory.</li> <li>Not convinced that a large T junction is necessary – could lead to bottlenecks worsen the area.</li> <li>Existing gyratory works well. Returning to a pre 1970s traffic system would impact upon traffic flow.</li> <li>Reverse flow of Milton Road in front of Lloyds bank (shortcut).</li> </ul>	

- Demolish 133-155 Chesterton Road to create crossroad and create more space.
- Concerned that traffic lights will be proposed and cause insufficient queuing capacity for traffic heading North and South (Milton Road and Victoria Avenue).
- Junction of Westbrook Drive and Milton Road has poor visibility – cars encroach onto cycle lane. The location of the bus stop makes this worse. Move the bus stop and reduce pavement parking.
- Improve cycle crossings.
- No provision made for cycle trips south down Milton Road turning right towards Chesterton Road.
- If you reroute traffic to use Elizabeth Way it would avoid crossing the open space.
- If traffic does cross the open space there must be a pedestrian friendly junction.
- Reroute traffic behind 133-155 Chesterton Road to keep traffic away from the public open space.
- Traffic coming from Victoria Avenue should turn East and use Elizabeth Way Roundabout to head North.
- Support 'Local access only' roads.
- If traffic lights are required at the junction with Milton Road and Victoria Avenue consider a small roundabout instead.
- Route through traffic under the junction using City Deal money as a long-term solution.
- Another option could be similar but with Milton Road continuing on to Chesterton Road as it does now but with 2 way traffic. This would eliminate Milton Road crossing the yellow open space and might be more open space and pedestrian friendly.
- Need to take into consideration crossing point at Coop.
- I would like to see "movement proposals" for pedestrians, cyclists, and buses as well as just "traffic".
- The proposal involves making some streets quiet streets without any through motor traffic; I would have thought it would be best if the streets with shops on them had such traffic reduction (while keeping easy access to park near the shops).
- Changes in road layout could impact negatively on Citi 8 bus route.
- New cycle bridge from behind Barclays to Jesus Green.
- Would not support a double roundel junction. The double roundabout at Lensfield Road has a poor safety record. It is not clear if the 'local-access only' roads will actually be blocked to through-motor traffic, to create a low-traffic environment which would be quieter, more attractive and safer.
- Move the gateway on Victoria Road up to Greens Road, to slow traffic down before it gets into Mitcham's Corner.

### Relationship with The Greater Cambridge City Deal

#### 3.3.12

##### Support: 0

##### Object: 2

- Difficult to see how the City Deal scheme can be initiated before the changes to the gyratory are initiated. The two schemes are intertwined.
- Have been told that the City Deal scheme will increase traffic by 50% on Chesterton Road – impact to Mitcham's Corner?
- Changes to the gyratory need to be carried out as part of City Deal Tranche One to minimise Disruption.
- City Deal proposals are not compatible with the objectives for Mitcham's Corner.
- It is unclear that the current City Deal proposals will deliver any benefits for Mitcham's Corner (or indeed for Cambridge).

Phased Delivery	
3.3.13	
Support: 0	Object: 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Deal proposals do not benefit Mitcham's Corner (or Cambridge).</li> </ul>	
3.3.14	
Support: 0	Object: 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The phased delivery may cause confusion and increase risks for pedestrians and cyclists if rules are changed but users are not aware of them. A long drawn out development plan will also cause unnecessary and disruption and inconvenience for local residents and businesses - let's just get on with it.</li> </ul>	
3.3.15	
Support: 2	Object: 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support – Good Proposal.</li> <li>Victoria Road was closed for months and vehicles found other routes.</li> </ul>	

3.4 Moving Forward. Key Objectives for remodelling the gyratory	
3.4.2	
Support: 5	Object: 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the situation for people cycling and walking.</li> <li>Make more room for bus stops so that pedestrians passing by don't have to step onto the roads to get past.</li> <li>Will be difficult to achieve all aims.</li> <li>What is the definition of sufficient capacity?</li> <li>Sceptical that traffic flow can be free flowing.</li> <li>The priority must support local communities and businesses.</li> <li>Have wider footpaths.</li> <li>Include more trees.</li> <li>Keep hardstanding to a minimum to reduce flooding. Grass is cooler in summer and not icy in winter and helps absorb surface water.</li> <li>"Maintain sufficient capacity" – wording not strong enough. This is subjective and provides wiggle room for planners to reduce the junctions throughput. The objective should be changed to "Maintain or increase motor traffic capacity through and around the area".</li> <li>Request a further bullet point as follows: "Preserve and enhance the Central Conservation Area and the wider historic environment and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."</li> <li>The ideas in the document should be combined with strong demand management measures targeted at private cars.</li> <li>Objective to improve safety should be quantified e.g. reduced deaths and injuries.</li> <li>Need provision for all buses including Park and Ride to stop in the area.</li> </ul>	

3.5 Key Design Principles	
Introduction	
3.5.1	
Support: 2	Object: 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These objectives will achieve the opposite of the aim to maintain sufficient capacity and flow through the area.</li> <li>Add another principle to provide dedicated space for cycling (cycle track). Use London embankment cycle track as an example.</li> <li>The junction cannot be transformed into a pedestrian/cyclist friendly junction merely by reducing vehicle speeds.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated and segregated provision is needed.</li> <li>• Shared space causes conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and cars.</li> <li>• Elderly, disabled and children are likely to find shared spaces intimidating.</li> <li>• Not clear that the proposals constitute an improvement for pedestrians and cyclist. The proposals resemble Lensfield Road junction which has a high rate of cycle casualties.</li> <li>• Junction will favour motorists.</li> <li>• The low speed environment should be created by the road environment and ought not rely on excessive signage, speed camera, or police officer enforcement.</li> <li>• Disabled people would fight any scheme involving shared space concepts, by legal means or even civil protest. Even disability group and organisation of access professionals oppose shared space schemes are these having legal challenges at Kensington High Street, Poyton, etc. Please don't even suggest any shared space areas.</li> </ul>	
<b>Design Speed</b>	
<b>3.5.2</b>	
<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the reduction of vehicle speeds</li> <li>• Traffic Calming may result in traffic jams.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.5.3</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support two-way traffic flows and reduced width and number of lanes.</li> <li>• Increase the amount of tree planting.</li> <li>• Reverse flow of Milton Road in front of Lloyds bank (bus shortcut).</li> </ul>	
<b>3.5.4</b>	
<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support speed reduction, current speeds have resulted in crashes into Cambrian Villas.</li> <li>• Support. Should be treated as a place first and highway later.</li> </ul>	
<b>Reduced carriageway widths</b>	
<b>3.5.8</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in throughput for motor vehicles would lengthen queues.</li> <li>• Reduced carriageway widths is dangerous for cyclists.</li> <li>• CCTV monitoring of the traffic in the area needed to discourage aggressive driving and cycling.</li> <li>• Narrow carriageways should not be implemented unless combined with segregated cycle lanes.</li> </ul>	
<b>Other Elements that promote low speeds</b>	
<b>3.5.11</b>	
<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the introduction of two-way traffic.</li> <li>• Support, current system encourages fast driving.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.5.12</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Think the traffic flows well as it is.</li> <li>• The redevelopment of the Hills Road junction has made the traffic flow much worse and more dangerous for cyclists. This is due to the reduction in lanes, lines and signage. Sceptical that a similar approach on Mitcham's Corner will be successful.</li> <li>• Need more frequent but smaller, cleaner buses.</li> <li>• Support – The only way to return to two-way traffic flows is to dismantle the gyratory.</li> <li>• Traffic flows well here. Making it flow less well could easily lead to jams and</li> </ul>	

bottlenecking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sceptical of unsigned and unlined roads, which may make the area more unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists by removing some of the demarcations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Figures 28 to 30 – Transport measures</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The junction cannot be transformed into a pedestrian/cyclist friendly junction merely by reducing vehicle speeds.</li> <li>• Dedicated and segregated provision is needed.</li> <li>• Shared space causes conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and cars.</li> <li>• Elderly, disabled and children are likely to find shared spaces intimidating.</li> <li>• Not clear that the proposals constitute an improvement for pedestrians and cyclist. The proposals resemble Lensfield Road junction which has a high rate of cycle casualties.</li> <li>• Junction will favour motorists.</li> </ul>	
<b>Figures 31 to 33: Transport Examples</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support – Good Proposal.</li> <li>• Concern that there is no provision for bikes.</li> <li>• Too much weight is being place on the Frideswide Square Development.</li> <li>• Frideswide Square Development is not a good example, ugly and too much concrete.</li> <li>• Mini roundabouts, and double roundabouts, are dangerous.</li> <li>• Would like to see some Dutch examples.</li> <li>• Shared space causes conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, it is not effective.</li> <li>• Tightening junction radii is problematic for cyclists.</li> <li>• Segregated cycle lanes needed so that cycling is safe and attractive.</li> <li>• Shared space is only appropriate in a low traffic environment, this is particularly true for partially sighted pedestrians, who need clear crossing points.</li> </ul>	

<b>3.6 Promoting Place – rediscovering the mixed use high street</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	
<b>3.6.1</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support – better than the present layout.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.6.2</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What extra shops need to be brought to the area?</li> <li>• Remove all new development from the past 10-15 years. Recent development is bad quality.</li> <li>• More Trees.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.6.5</b>	
<b>Support: 4</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the area more people-friendly and let's have a gateway to central Cambridge which we can be proud of. Cafes/independent shops.</li> <li>• More trees and greenery.</li> <li>• Make more room for bus stops so that pedestrians passing by don't have to step onto the roads to get past.</li> <li>• How can traffic flow be improved at the same time as creating a sense of place and having more trees and greenery?</li> <li>• Wider footpaths would be welcome.</li> <li>• Likely conflicts between cyclists and spill out spaces.</li> </ul>	

<b>3.7 A New Public Space for Mitcham's Corner</b>	
<b>3.7.1</b>	
<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support</li> <li>• New space unlikely to be used if you have to cross two lanes of traffic.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.7.2</b>	
<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, but don't overlook amenities such as benches, plantings, trees, drinking fountains, public toilets, nice lighting etc.</li> <li>• An area free of traffic pollution would be a dream. The cafe "Stir" has done a sterling job with outdoor spaces but it comes with the noise and pollution of speedy traffic.</li> <li>• Support but, any outdoor space would be ruined by heavy traffic and the pollution that comes with it. Also must be mindful of possible anti-social behaviour which is often seen on corner across from the Portland Arms.</li> <li>• There are important views from across Mitcham's corner to Jesus Green and the open-air swimming pool (and from the green and pool to the other side of the river). Development of Mitcham's corner should be integrated with the promotion and use of the swimming pool and with the rest of Jesus Green.</li> <li>• New public space must be at least owned and controlled by a local council.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.7.3</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a prominent sculpture?</li> </ul>	
<b>3.7.4</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looks excellent, but don't overlook amenities such as benches, plantings, trees, drinking fountains, public toilets, nice lighting etc.</li> </ul>	
<b>Figure 34-43</b>	
<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, currently not a well-used area.</li> <li>• Shared space causes conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, it is not effective.</li> </ul>	

## Section 4. Planning and Design Guidance

### 4.1. Introduction

#### Introduction

##### 4.1.3

#### Support: 0

#### Object: 2

- There is no site specific guidance for the Westbrook Centre.
- Area around the Westbrook Centre is very disconnected from the rest of the Opportunity Area.
- SPD should include an objective of improved permeability in and around the Westbrook Centre.
- Need site specific guidance for Barclays and Tivoli.

##### 4.1.4

#### Support: 0

#### Object: 1

- There is no mention of affordable housing. This development should benefit the less wealthy and provide housing, not luxury hotels.

### 4.2 Area Wide Guidance

#### Area Wide Guidance

##### 4.2.1

#### Support: 0

#### Object: 1

- No mention of affordable housing. Developments in the area should benefit the less wealthy.
- There should be no extra development.
- Replace development with trees.
- Request sub heading of 'Historic Environment' in this section, followed by: "Conservation of the historic environment can bring wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits. Development should seek to draw out opportunities to maintain and enhance surviving buildings of good quality, where these make a positive contribution to the distinctive character of the area.

Development should have regard to its context and wider setting, ensuring the it relates well to all elements of the historic environment including the setting of Jesus College and Jesus Green; the setting and significance of individual listed and locally listed buildings within and adjacent to the opportunity area and to the conservation areas within the locality."

#### Figure 44: Composite Plan

#### Support: 1

#### Object: 9

- Connectivity and permeability between Mitcham's Corner and the Westbrook Centre and the new housing development behind it is poor. Figure 44 shows a double sided yellow arrow which highlights this issue without offering a clear solution.
- The closure of Victoria Road to through traffic presents the opportunity to create an attractive public area.
- The proposed closure of Milton Road to through traffic allows for new building, which would fill a resulting gap, screen views of the rear of Chesterton Terrace and provide finance from the change of use of the land.
- Land behind Chesterton Terrace should provide car parking facilities for shoppers (25 spaces). Local traders consider this a priority. Access could be from Chesterton Road and provide serious tree planting to improve the outlook from surrounding residential properties.
- Emmanuel College owns 26-30 Chesterton Road (Barclays Bank). The College

<p>request a meeting with officers to agree how they can assist in improving the SPD and delivering Policy 21 as appropriate whilst protecting its interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demolish the houses in the 133-155 Chesterton Road to create a crossroad. The space provided could also provide more green public open space.</li> <li>• Amount of potential development sites is scary.</li> <li>• Why is Barclays identified for redevelopment?</li> <li>• Imperative to the whole area that the old cinema/Weatherspoon's is successfully redeveloped into something that can be used for the community such as a cinema or arts centre rather than just redeveloped for flats or retail.</li> <li>• Avoid over use of concrete in Urban Space 1.</li> <li>• Access Road behind 133-155 Chesterton Road does not need to extend past the Springfield Road Junction. This area could be used for amenity space.</li> <li>• Need guidelines for the windfall sites (Barclays Bank and Tivoli). Preference that these sites serve the public in some way.</li> </ul>
---

<b>Promoting Creative and contextual design</b>	
<b>4.2.2</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that developments are of good quality and use local stone and are sympathetic to their surroundings.</li> <li>• Should refer to 'within the Opportunity Area' rather than 'on the site'.</li> <li>• Heights recommended will be the starting point of any new development, but where are these guidelines apart from Henry Giles House and Staples? Please no 5+1 storeys for Henry Giles House!</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.3</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What architects must do and how they should design should include developers and landowners, not just architects.</li> <li>• Uses of recent developments in Mitcham's Corner area have been altered at Student Castle, Your Space (Trafalgar Rd), King's residence. Development Guidelines must be adhered to, also after planning approval.</li> </ul>	
<b>Supporting the mixed use high street</b>	
<b>4.2.4</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There needs to be a balance between commercial units and residential property.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.5</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should mention "land exchange".</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.6</b>	
<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second bullet point in paragraph 4.2.6 be amended as follows; "Well defined and transparent edges, where appropriate to historic character - for shop windows and cafes to allow activity to be visible from the street, making the public realm feel safer and more welcoming."</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.7</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific heights given other than for the Henry Giles House site and Staples. Heights for windfall sites are required.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.8</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph does not make any distinction that the requirements of Appendix F are associated with proposed policy 60 and therefore are only meant to apply to tall</li> </ul>	

buildings. It is suggested that this should be phrased in a more discretionary manner	
<b>Sustainable Design - Overheating</b>	
<b>4.2.10</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would go further and require new buildings to meet the PassiveHouse standards for energy efficiency and sustainability.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.12</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support. Prevention of overheating inside buildings is extremely important. The more overheating, the more need for aircon, and hence energy consumption.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.13</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.14</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to direct the comments on G.R.A.I.N and water sensitive urban design at developers and landowners.</li> </ul>	
<b>Amenity Space</b>	
<b>4.2.16</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is considered that paragraph 4.2.16 is too prescriptive. The current wording of the SPD fails to appreciate the need to address each individual site. It is suggested that it is reworded to state: 'Access to private amenity space in the form of roof gardens, balconies and/or winter gardens should be encouraged. Where provided, it is essential that these amenity areas...'</li> </ul>	
<b>Car Parking</b>	
<b>4.2.17</b>	
<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shops should encourage parking at the rear.</li> <li>• Increasing number of parking spaces will encourage more cars.</li> <li>• The consequent lack of parking facilities along the northern side of Chesterton Road in particular, needs to be taken into account.</li> <li>• There should be another subsection under "car parking" dealing with parking for those using shops, banks, restaurants, take-aways etc. The provision of parking for those making such visits is important for the commercial viability of businesses in the area, and for making the facilities in area accessible to those who need to drive.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.18</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car free development is not achievable and causes parking 'wars'. Buses are not a solution to this.</li> <li>• Should instead discourage commuter from driving into Cambridge and to local shops – should not penalise local residents.</li> <li>• Support car free but need assurances that public transport services will be maintained.</li> <li>• Car free should be adopted throughout the city and surrounding villages.</li> <li>• There is a need to consider that at certain times of people's lives having vehicle access is needed, either for residents themselves, or their visitors / contractors / carers.</li> </ul>	
<b>Drainage and Surface Water Flood Risk</b>	
<b>4.2.19</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep hardstanding to a minimum to reduce flooding. Grass is cooler in summer and</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not icy in winter and helps absorb surface water.</li> <li>• Student Castle development is causing flooding.</li> <li>• Anglian Water would require prior notification for alteration or removal of foul and surface water sewers.</li> <li>• Anglian Water supports the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>	
<b>Cycle Parking</b>	
<b>4.2.20</b>	
<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, currently cycle parking is inadequate.</li> <li>• Boathouse and Portland Arms have the combined total of 0 bike parking spaces at the moment.</li> <li>• Should be secure cycle parking.</li> </ul>	
<b>Ecology</b>	
<b>4.2.21</b>	
<b>Support: 4</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support lots of tree planting.</li> <li>• Provide planters for trees and flowers.</li> <li>• Provide nesting facilities for birds.</li> </ul>	
<b>Public Art</b>	
<b>4.2.23</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might be nice, might be awful ... can we have specific consultation on this in due course please.</li> <li>• Money which could go into art could go into high quality architectural features on the buildings themselves, architecture itself is art.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2.25</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding sources should mention "land exchange".</li> </ul>	

<b>4.3 Site Guidance – Henry Giles House</b>	
<b>4.3.1</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, building spoils views from Jesus Green and context of area.</li> </ul>	
<b>Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 9</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing the usage of this site should also significantly reduce the need for car parking on this stretch of Chesterton Road.</li> <li>• Proposed two-storey block to the rear of 81-93 Chesterton Road would result in overlooking to rear gardens. Blocks would appear three-storeys high due to difference in levels.</li> <li>• Several trees exist next to the dividing wall to the rear of 81-93 Chesterton Road.</li> <li>• Reference to 'creation of pedestrian and cycle green links/lanes' is too fixed and fails to provide the necessary flexibility at this high level stage.</li> <li>• Massing design principles are too cautious</li> <li>• It is crucial that the SPD maximises the opportunities of the site rather than providing undue restriction. The full scale and massing would be subject to detailed modelling at the application stage.</li> <li>• Suggested amendments to building heights, which are higher than the proposed heights.</li> <li>• Objection to height causing overshadowing.</li> <li>• 4 and 5 +1 storeys are unsuitable given surrounding building heights.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term “possibility” with reference to heights places temptation in the way of developers.</li> <li>• Access lane to 81-93 Chesterton Lane needs to be retained for parking, rear access and waste storage.</li> <li>• Plan needs to be updated to show existing trees, different levels of the site and extensions to the rear of properties.</li> <li>• Site boundary includes right of access to 81-93 Chesterton Road.</li> <li>• Building forward of the existing building line will block views of Jesus green from the rear of number 81.</li> <li>• New pedestrian cycle link will increase noise and disturbance to residents at 81-93 Chesterton Road.</li> </ul>	
<b>Responding to a variety of edge conditions</b>	
<b>4.3.7</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty of Conservation Area names.</li> <li>• Need to reference that the site is opposite five Grade II listed structures and the impact that the development will have on their setting and significance.</li> <li>• Bullet 2: need to acknowledge the three storey property opposite the Henry Giles House Site. It is suggested that the description of this site edge acknowledges this variation rather than just the line of 2.5 terraced properties.</li> </ul>	
<b>Scale and Massing</b>	
<b>4.3.8</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should comprise of improve quality of public realm...and urban-designed approach should be taken.</li> <li>• “Urban design led approach” and “improve the quality of the public realm” should be made general principles applicable to any new developments in the area.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.3.13</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.3.13 needs to make clear that the modelling is justified on the basis of proposed policy 60 to ensure that the requirement is triggered by the appropriate height parameters. It is proposed that the paragraph should be worded to state: 'Applicants will be expected to produce accurate 3D computer models to inform an appropriate massing of the development on any key views and vistas, where the scale of the proposed development would trigger the requirements of proposed policy 60 of the emerging Local Plan'.</li> </ul>	
<b>A Series of Individual Buildings</b>	
<b>4.3.14</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support.</li> </ul>	
<b>Key Views</b>	
<b>4.3.17</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is suggested that it needs to be made clear that 'finer urban grain' does not necessarily mean breaks in plan form of buildings. 'Fine grain' can be achieved through height variations, voids at upper floors, rhythm, projections or set backs among others.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.3.18</b>	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Figure 52 not 57.</li> </ul>	
<b>Reconnecting Streets and spaces</b>	
<b>4.3.20</b>	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A through way to Victoria Road would be really useful.</li> <li>• It is suggested that the second sentence should encourage the specified connections rather than stating that they should be provided. This would better reflect the first sentence and the uncertainty.</li> </ul>	
<b>Integrated Water Management</b>	
4.3.22	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace 'should' with 'encouraged'. Flexibility is required at this stage.</li> <li>• Anglian Water supports the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>	
<b>Public Realm and Trees</b>	
4.3.28	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that this refers broadly to 'landscaping' rather than specifically 'street trees' to provide some flexibility, depending on the final design intentions and relationship with highway design/safety.</li> </ul>	

<b>4.4 Site Guidance – Staples</b>	
<b>Development Principles</b>	
4.4.5	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development principles, which include key long range views and retention of Lloyds bank.</li> </ul>	
<b>Scale and Massing</b>	
4.4.9	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should comprise of improve quality of public realm...and urban-designed approach should be taken</li> <li>• “Urban design led approach” and “improve the quality of the public realm” should be made general principles applicable to any new developments in the area.</li> </ul>	
<b>A Series of Individual Buildings</b>	
4.4.15	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support.</li> </ul>	
<b>Integrated Water Management</b>	
4.4.22	
<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anglian Water supports the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>	
<b>Planning Obligations</b>	
4.4.25	
<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should also mention the possibility of selling freed-up land for development.</li> </ul>	